

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, May 3, 1966 — Tuesday, June 7, 1966

No. 95

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Interim report, select committee on conservation authorities, Mr. Evans 2925

Juvenile and Family Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 2925

Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 2925

Jails Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 2926

Industrial Farms Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 2926

Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko 2926

Tabling reports, Mr. Dymond 2926

Question of Mr. Rowntree re telephone employees, Mr. MacDonald 2926

Question of Mr. MacNaughton re Highway 401, Mr. MacDonald 2926

Questions of Mr. Robarts re Scarborough council, Mr. S. Lewis 2927

Statements re Poland's Millennium of Christianity, Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Newman 2927

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2928

Liability on parents for damages caused by the tortious acts of their children, bill to impose, Mr. Peck, on second reading 2957

Recess, 6 o'clock 2968

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from Boyle Memorial public school and Knollwood Park public school, London.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present an interim report from the select committee on conservation authorities.

As chairman of the select committee on conservation authorities I would like to express my thanks to the committee members for their co-operation. The opportunity of working with them on this important study has been a privilege. I do not intend today to make more than a few remarks on behalf of the committee.

During the visits of the committee, the members and staff of the conservation authorities were most helpful, and additional information requested has been provided promptly.

Many excellent briefs have been submitted by the conservation authorities, municipalities, an Ontairo government agency, associations and individuals. The Department of Energy and Resources Management and other departments of the government of Ontario have supplied information on various phases of the matter. The committee wishes to thank these organizations and persons for their co-operation, also our staff for their assistance and advice.

Ninety-eight briefs and submissions were received from conservation authorities, municipalities, associations and interested persons. The committee held 21 meetings, comprising a total of 58 days, of which 37 days were spent in visiting Ontario conservation authorities and obtaining information in other areas, and 21 days in sittings in Toronto. During the ten days on which formal hearings were held, 22 presentations were made.

A final report therefore cannot be made at this time and the committee respectfully requests that it be reappointed in order to complete its deliberations and recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the statute so as to provide authority for an agreement between the province and a municipality, in order for the province to assume the operation of the juvenile and family court in return for which the municipality will pay an annual sum to defray the expenses incurred by this extended provincial aid. Such an arrangement will permit the co-operation which seems most desirable in many cases.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will provide the statutory basis under which we will be able to deal with the problem in Metropolitan Toronto and elsewhere, if a similar problem may be resolved by the same type of agreement. The terms of the agreement will have to be worked out in each individual case depending upon the local situation in the court.

THE PENAL AND REFORM INSTITUTIONS INSPECTION ACT

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr Speaker, this bill, in addition to two others I am about to introduce, is complementary to amendments to The Police Act, bringing the control and inspection of lockups under that Act.

THE JAILS ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Jails Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE INDUSTRIAL FARMS ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the annual report of the Ontario water resources commission, 1965.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, yesterday I undertook to table certain reports asked for by the hon. member for Scarborough West, and I now do that.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to direct the following questions to the hon. Provincial Secretary:

First, has the LCBO and LLBO employees association been circularizing LCBO store managers, providing each with a list of employees in his store who are not members of the association and soliciting his assistance in persuading them both to join the association and to sign checkoff authorizations?

Second, has any store manager in fact intervened in an effort to persuade one or more of the employees under his supervision to join the association and/or sign a checkoff authorization?

Third, what is the policy of the LCBO and LLBO with regard to the use of management personnel in persuading employees to join and otherwise support the employees association?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the liquor control board of Ontario was out of the city at the time of the receipt of this question. I do not know how much work it entails to make the necessary survey. I take the question as notice and we will table the information as soon as it is available.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the hon. Minister of Labour. Can the Minister tell the House why employees of telephone companies, serving fewer than 300 subscribers, have been exempted from provisions of The Minimum Wage Act?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, traditionally this type of work has been exempted from The Minimum Wage Act due to the very nature of the work. In the majority of cases, where there are fewer than 300 subscribers the switchboard is in the home of the operator. The operator is in fact a homeworker whose work is not concentrated in any eight-hour period; thus it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide how many hours these operators do work.

For the information of the hon. member for York South, I might also add that when these systems are under contract to the Bell Telephone Company, the matter becomes one of federal jurisdiction.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the hon. Minister of Highways. What plans has the department for modernizing the access from Highway 401 to Guelph by way of Highway 6 or some alternative route?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question is that contracts are being prepared and property acquired for reconstruction in the very near future of that portion of Highway 6, between the Campbellville road northerly to the south limits of Aberfoyle. This will be to a modern two-lane standard.

However, the solution of the final access between Highway 401 and Guelph is currently being considered in two studies. These are the Guelph area study and the city of Guelph study, which is currently being updated mainly because of the influence of the development of the University of Guelph.

We are working very closely with the officials of the University of Guelph since the expansion of the university will generate large volumes of traffic and therefore must figure prominently in any consideration of roads in the area. It would appear likely that a relocation or an entire new facility replacing Highway 6, between Highway 401

and Guelph, will be necessary in the future, and the final location and design will emanate from the recommendations of the studies referred to.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions actually for the hon. Minister of Agriculture, notice of which has been given. How many projects have been initiated in the province under the sponsorship of ARDA during the past year and what is the amount of money involved? What projects have been planned for 1966 and what is their value? What projects are under study at the present time?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may have thought he gave me notice of the questions but I was not in the office to receive it. I have been attending meetings since ten o'clock this morning and have not been back to the office.

However, my office did call me just before the House convened, and told me that the hon. member had asked the questions through the Speaker. I would suggest to the member that the questions which he has asked can be dealt with in the estimates of my department at the time I present them. They have to do with projections and plans that we have under discussion today for implementation of programmes. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the member would accept that explanation? I am perfectly willing to describe all of this to him at the time that my estimates are before the House, if this would be acceptable.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Highways, notice of which has been given to him. Would the Minister inform the House the number of roads to resources that have been completed under the agreement with the federal government and their payment of $750,000 to the province during 1965-66?

The second question is: What portion of the cost was borne by the province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member that this information is in the hands of the mining and access road committee. I have asked the secretary of the committee to provide me with the details of information required and I can only ask him to allow me to take his question as notice for this afternoon.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister consider meeting with Scarborough council, as requested by them, to discuss matters affecting Bill 81 and the Prime Minister's announced meeting with the council of the city of Toronto? I apologize to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker; it is poorly worded at the end. I meant matters that would arise out of that meeting tomorrow.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram from the council of Scarborough. Of course, I would be very pleased to give it every consideration.

Mr. S. Lewis: If I may ask a supplementary question, sir? Does that mean that the Prime Minister will consider meeting with them?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I was just answering the hon. member's question. He says: Will I consider meeting with them? I am simply saying that I will give it every consideration. I will undoubtedly enter into some contact with the council and find out what they want to discuss and whether a meeting proves to be necessary.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I would direct the attention of the hon. members of this House to the significance of today's date. May 3, in the year of our Lord, 1966, marks Poland's Millennium of Christianity. I read from the brochure issued by the executive officers of the Canadian Polish Congress of the Toronto district, as follows:

> In the annals of some European nations, Christianity was indeed the turning point, but not its whole history. With Poland—it was different! Poland's history begins with the acceptance of Christianity. Thus, the history of Poland is the history of a Christian nation. Without doubt, the commemoration of Poland's 1,000 years of Christianity, is the greatest and most sacred anniversary which the Polish people—about 32 million in their native land, and about 12 million scattered throughout the world —can celebrate in this 20th century. Today's manifestation then, is merely a further recognition of that qualification given Poland centuries ago by Rome: "Polonia semper fidelis."

Of the 12 million Poles who are scattered about the world, Mr. Speaker, many tens of thousands find their place in our nation of Canada; and the largest proportion is within the province of Ontario and perhaps within this city of Toronto.

In the course of this month, celebrations of this great date have been held and will continue. Canadians of Polish origin have,

for well over 100 years now, made their contribution to our way of life. The climax of celebration in Poland will take place today as tens of thousands of Roman Catholics throng to the shrine of the Black Madonna.

Celebrations will, however, continue. Today, interestingly enough, the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) is participating in celebrations in a hamlet in Ontario which bears the very significant name of Wilno, which marked the settling in that area of Canadians of Polish ancestry quite a number of years ago.

On Sunday next, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister will participate in a grand rally at the Canadian national exhibition grounds, at which time the residents of Metropolitan Toronto and surrounding areas will participate in this celebration. I am sure that all members of this House will join in felicitations at this time.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as one of the two members of Polish extraction in this Legislature, I think it is fitting that I should make a few remarks on this, the most significant day in Poland's history. Today not only commences the celebration of the 1,000th anniversary of the acceptance of Christianity by the Polish people, but it is also the anniversary, May 3, of the Polish constitution.

The celebrations have begun throughout all parts of Ontario—yes, in all parts of Canada and parts of the free world. In fact, not only the free world, but behind the curtain. In Poland itself, the people are not being allowed to celebrate this day as they would have wanted to. The 1,000th anniversary celebrations of the baptism of the first recorded ruler—Mieozko I, Prince of Poland—start with this day.

Poland's history records the indissoluble bond linking the Polish nation with western culture and civilization. For the past nine years the people of Poland have been preparing for today. The first Sunday of May is considered the opening Sunday for the millenium festivities. Men and women of Polish descent who have, for various reasons, migrated, to the four corners of the world, number about ten million. Mindful of their Christian heritage, they join with the brethren of Poland in the spirit, if not in person, to commemorate this joyful and historic event. The Canadians of Polish origin have set up scholarships to enable members of their own racial background to continue their studies in various Canadian universities.

Now, there are approximately 325,000 people of Polish origin in Canada and almost the majority of them—150,000—make Ontario their home. Many Poles have attempted to return to their native land for these celebrations, but because of the different type of government they have there, the present Polish regime has refused permission to large numbers. Because of their inability to return to their native land, these people are all the more enthused with celebrating this most important occasion in both Canada and the United States.

It is with a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I join with the hon. Provincial Secretary in paying tribute to the people of Polish descent on this, their most important day.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a telegram from the hon. member for Renfrew South, conveying his greetings and explaining that he is unavoidably absent today to take part in noteworthy celebrations in eastern Ontario celebrating this great millenium.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 28th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

(*continued*)

On vote 713:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned last night, the hon. Minister had made some reply to what we on this side of the House had to say at the opening of these estimates.

I will, in the course of the next little while, ask a number of questions of the Minister, having to do with the hospitals for retarded children; but what I would like to say at the very beginning, and in answer to what the Minister said, is this: He talked very quietly when trying to answer what we had asked on this side of the House and, more particularly, what we had to say about the home for retarded adults at Aurora.

I was shocked and appalled that he could, almost with indifference, give no answer at all to the allegations that were made about the mismanagement and neglect in the care

of retarded children. We tried to point out during the estimates that there was hardly any provision made—in fact, none whatsoever — for the overcrowding that already exists in our hospital for retarded children.

We know that, counting Orillia and Smiths Falls and Aurora, if you had proper spacing facilities, even there there is a shortage of about 1,000 beds, just in the way they are crammed in. This does not account for any waiting list, and it does not account for the fact that it is extremely difficult to get a child into one of our hospitals for retarded children.

The hon. Minister said that Aurora was not a firetrap. Mr. Chairman, it most certainly is a firetrap. They tell us that if you had, under normal circumstances, proper spacing at the Aurora hospital, there should not be more than about 80 patients in that hospital. When I say that, I am allowing 70 square feet of bed space for each patient. There is about one-third of that, and to say that it is not a firetrap—all you have to do is to look at the rooms they call "dormitories" in that place where they are crammed in like sardines.

I think it is unfortunate that the hon. Minister did not let the press in. The day after I made the allegations about the Aurora hospital, a press photographer from one of the Toronto newspapers wanted to photograph the dormitories. I went up and tried to get permission for him to go in and, of course, he was not allowed in to take the photographs; to do so, it was claimed would disturb the patients. All I can say is that the patients would be in the recreation room and the dormitories at that time would be normally empty.

I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that not only the members of this House saw, but the public and the province of Ontario saw, how we neglect the patients who are in the Aurora hospital for retarded adults. It is a crying disgrace on the part of this government. The hon. Minister said, in replying late last night, that our progress is slow but steady. Why, he goes at a snail's pace. The fact that you reduce the number of patients from 280 to 250 at Aurora is not nearly good enough. I had understood, when the hon. Minister of Public Works was talking, that we were going to have a new building at Aurora, possibly this fall; but the Minister in his remarks said the sketch plans for Aurora are underway.

Well, knowing how this government moves, if they are just talking about the sketch plans they are a long way from putting up a building at Aurora. I feel, if that building was going up, the Minister would have come out and said when. Obviously it is going to be one of these things where he is going to milk the headlines year in and year out. I hope I am wrong on that, but I would like to know when that building is going to go up; because certainly, if they do put a recreation hall up at Aurora, it will help greatly.

But when one looks at that place, when one sees how they are crammed in, when one keeps in mind that there is not even a place for these patients to hang their clothes, except the end of the bed—again I repeat: If you wanted to walk from one end of the dormitory to the other, the easiest way would be to walk from the top of one bed to the other. Sure, it is possible to walk through sideways; but if you want to walk from one end of the dormitories, you would be safer to walk on top of the beds.

Of course, it is a firetrap. All I can say is that either the fire inspection in that area is negligent—if they have authority to inspect our buildings, which I do not think they do. If they do not, our fire marshal in the province of Ontario should take a look at that building, because it should be emptied, and should be emptied to at least reduce the number of people there to 80 patients.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in his soft answer, the hon. Minister failed to give us some idea of what the rehabilitation was in that hospital at Aurora. I saw something going on there, but obviously it was in the very beginnings, and then maybe one has to discount a certain amount because they knew I was coming. Never, in any of my inspections of any of these buildings, have I tried to take anybody by surprise, but certainly you have to discount a certain amount for they have put their best foot forward. Well, I do not blame the staff for that. I feel sorry for the staff. As the hon Minister recognized, I admire the vast majority of the people who work in these places, and I think that it is an appalling situation where we ask highly trained men to work in the type of buildings that we supply, particularly at Aurora. When you do get a good building, as at Cedar Springs, you put them in such a place where they should not be, and you cram them as full as you possibly can.

The hon. Minister, almost lightheartedly, cast off the allegation that I said that at Cedar Springs, the 72 patients that are in the so-called opportunity class—that is, Mr. Chairman, these are the type of patients who have a very good chance, an excellent chance, of returning to the community—only receive

about 19 hours a week in teaching, a little more than half what the average child in school, the normal child, receives. This, again, is a terrible indictment of our system of education in our so-called hospital schools, in the way we treat our retarded children.

These patients in the opportunity class need more time; more than 30 hours a week, not less. Again I hope that, because The Department of Education is taking over the teaching of these children, we could say this is going to be changed, that they are going to receive the proper teaching; but not a word from the Minister. All I can say is: When he avoids answering these questions, when he avoids telling us that they are going to receive more training, and better training, all I can say is the same old situation is going to continue.

When he talks about sketch plans for Aurora, obviously he is not making any real attempt to meet this problem of our hospitals for retarded children being crammed from door to door. Whether it is the hon. Minister's fault, I do not know; it is most certainly the government's fault, because the funds have not been provided to give the proper facilities that we should have—either for the physical plant or for the personnel. I just make these observations because I have a number of questions to ask and there will be quite a few of them.

The first question I would like to ask, in regard to Aurora: Can the hon. Minister give us any definite date as to when a building—the so-called recreation hall at Aurora—will be opened?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I cannot give the hon. member a date. Public Works puts up the buildings for us and I have not asked the hon. Minister when he anticipates the building will be completed. He actually knows more about the progress of the building than I do. The latest report I have, I gave to the House last night.

Mr. Trotter: Well now, I pursued this with the hon. Minister of Public Works and I got the impression that it would be next fall. He was not that definite, it was one of those answers you get where they are very difficult to pin down. My own belief is that if it really was definite, the government would make a statement, a number of times, and keep milking it. But here is an indication of nonco-operation between departments.

I dwelt upon this between The Department of Public Welfare and The Department of Health, but surely, Mr. Chairman, if The Department of Health was planning an expansion of facilities for retarded children, surely they would know when that hospital, or new recreation hall at Aurora, was going up? Because if the recreation hall is up, I understand there will be more bed space. What they use for recreation now, will be used for the bed space and the situation be improved.

This is an indication of the chaotic state of planning, in this particular instance, for facilities for retarded children. I cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. Chairman, that this has been going on year in and year out. It is a shame that people have to suffer, their families have to suffer, knowing what is going on. I would urge any member of this House, Mr. Chairman, to go up there himself and see how we treat retarded children.

It is time that the public is awakened to what goes on and I would like to ask the hon. Minister this: Would he not permit the press to go in and photograph those dormitories, providing that no patient or none of the patients, were present at the time photographs were taken? All I want is to see those four walls and those beds lined up, wall for wall, because it is obviously a firetrap. Would the hon. Minister permit the press to go in there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the building—if the hon. Minister of Public Works gave the House to understand that the building would be built by next fall, this is quite conceivable, because it is not a large building. It is not a difficult building to construct. It is largely a hall, open space more than anything else, and it is quite conceivable that this building could be up next fall. This is The Department of Public Works' concern; we take the building when they complete it and turn it over to us.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made some very extravagant statements. He speaks about the dreadful way in which we treat the retarded in Ontario. Mr. Chairman, I hope, in fact I am grateful, that the public of Ontario does not take seriously what the hon. member says. The parents of those children, whom we have in our institutions, know better than that. I say to you, sir, with pride, and I think it is pride that every citizen of Ontario can feel, that the retarded are better cared for in Ontario than in any jurisdiction in the Dominion of Canada. That statement stands. We will argue that statement with anyone, and back it up quite handily.

The hon. member makes a great deal about me not allowing photography of our dormi-

tories. First of all, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that when the member began his remarks, his critique of what I said, he accused me of discourtesy because I had not put in his hands the speech that I would deliver myself—a thing that is not done by any Minister in government, to the best of my knowledge. However, because I did not do it, I was discourteous.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I leave it to you and to the members of this House; I got into my office at nine o'clock, the morning following the day when the hon. member started his address, to find a call waiting me, to call him at Aurora. He told me that a photographer from one of the local papers had telephoned him and asked him if he would go up to Aurora with him and allow him to take pictures of the hospital. Well, if that is not discourtesy, Mr. Chairman, I do not know the meaning of the word. Had I been in the hon. member's position, I would have stated, "No, I cannot, because I have no authority to take you or anybody else in the hospital; the Minister of Health is responsible for the hospital school at Aurora, you had better ask him."

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): What has the hon. Minister to hide?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have nothing to hide. I would say to the hon. member that if I were he I would hide my head in the sand; that is where it is most of the time.

He did not choose to refer the photographer to the department. If the department, Mr. Chairman, has to take responsibility for doing this job, then the department must be left with some right to determine to what extent that responsibility stretches, and be allowed to develop programmes as it sees fit.

When I became Minister a little over seven years ago, the government at that time embarked on a completely new philosophy in the care of the mentally handicapped in keeping with modern trends—trends, indeed, that were only then emerging. A part of the programme, a very essential part of the programme in my own thinking, was the education of society, to help remove the stigma which has, for thousands of years, attached to the mentally disabled. I wanted to do everything in my power to stimulate public awareness of the problems of the mentally handicapped, and to this end I encouraged the public to visit our hospitals and our hospital schools. I encouraged and stimulated, insofar as I was able, the news people to write about our work and to write about the problems and the things we believed were necessary on the part of the public and on the part of society in general. We invited them in to photograph our facilities. The stories that have been written about our work, I think, have been in the main very helpful; but I do not think the photographing of our institutions has helped in any way whatsoever. First of all, I believe and have believed for some time, that it upsets patients.

The hon. member himself—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would you ask that hon. member, sir, to save his interjections till later?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do not have to keep quiet. I can ask questions if I like.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the member for Grey North that the Minister of Health has the floor. If he wishes to ask questions, he may do so at the conclusion of the address.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member for Parkdale himself stated in his remarks that "patients have feelings," "they were sensitive," "they could be hurt." I feel exactly the same way and I also believe, from experience, that photographers going around our hospitals upset the routine of the institution and its operation, disrupt staff work, and distress patients. Therefore, sir, I have come to the conclusion that photographers in our buildings have made absolutely no contribution whatsoever to improving patient care; therefore, I am no longer encouraging it.

I recognize that the photographer undertook that no patients would be photographed. This, of course, we have never tolerated and we will not tolerate it; and I see no good flowing from them photographing our institutions. I do say, however, and with this my staff is in agreement, that if the news people want to do a complete story on our work, we will help them in every possible way. Any photographer necessary for such accounts will be approved, but this must be by arrangement so the programme of the hospital will not be disrupted.

Mr. Chairman, after I looked at both those notes myself, it was rather more than a coincidence that I got an unsolicited statement from my staff, and I want to read it into

the record, sir, a statement re visits to Ontario Hospitals:

> The primary purpose and objective of a hospital, whether it is a general hospital, a hospital for the mentally ill or for the retarded, is the care and treatment of the sick. The fact that a hospital is established and operated by the government does not make it any less important to give first consideration to the patients.
>
> Public relations are also important. A hospital is part of a community and must have the support of the community to fulfil its purpose. It is therefore important for the community to know something about the efforts being made to care for the sick, and the problems faced by the hospital in achieving its objectives.

The interest of the public, the hon. members of this House, in the services provided for the mentally ill and the retarded is encouraging and appreciated by those who devote their lives to this work.

This interest cannot, however, and will not, be permitted to interfere with the care and treatment of our patients.

My staff are prepared to make arrangements for a reasonable number of visits by individuals or groups to our hospitals so that they might better understand the work that is being done. We need to remember, however, that the staff are busy and the patients do not relish being put on display.

If the hon. members, in their efforts to serve the good people of this province, have a particular interest in the programmes of one of our hospitals, I would ask them to make arrangements to visit the institution through my own office or through the office of my Deputy Minister. We will do our best to accommodate you and I am sure that your interest will best be served if we avoid any unwarranted interference with the work of the doctors and the staff and observe a proper respect and consideration for the patients.

I added the last paragraph to this, Mr. Chairman; the rest of it is the submission of my staff.

I said in this House last evening, and I repeat, that it is passing strange to me that we are able to attract the type and calibre and number of staff that we do. It is a greater surprise to me, many times, as I listen to the criticisms levelled against them, that we are able to hold them; because I repeat, sir, that The Department of Health, or my office, does not dictate professional policy of any nature whatsoever. We suggest, we consult—

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. Minister talks about criticizing his staff. I have emphasized time and time again that I was not criticizing the staff.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Trotter: He said that we criticized the staff and he is entirely wrong; we did not. In fact, if anything, we are handing them bouquets. It is the government, it is the Tories we are after; so quit hiding behind the staff.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is only demonstrating eloquently his own inconsistency. If he is not criticizing staff, then who is he criticizing when he is criticizing the programme? The programme is in the hands of the professional staff, sir; they do not consult me about what programme they are going to institute or operate. They sometimes talk it over with me after it has been instituted, but they are on their own as far as programme is concerned. At no time have I interfered with them nor will I interfere with their professional judgment in these matters.

I have now found out the size of this recreation hall at Aurora. It is 168 feet by 56 feet, so it is not a large building. Again, I repeat, it could easily be completed by this fall. I think, Mr. Chairman, I have answered the last question the hon. member asked.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I want to follow this up. The hon. Minister says he takes pride in our institutions. Well, I want to say that any Minister who takes pride in Aurora, the way it is crammed, should quit—because it just does not make sense that we, as a people, as a government, or particularly as individuals, could say: "I take pride in that place."

To blame it on the staff is entirely wrong; and nobody could ever accuse me of blaming the staff. How in the world can you expect a staff to work in a place when you have a government so cheap and so niggardly, which just cares nothing about what is going on in Aurora? It seems to me, how can you blame the staff if they do not get the funds to put up the buildings? When you see the rotten pay they get—most of your attendants will be able to apply for OMSIP in order to be subsidized by the government, the pay is so low. How can you blame them? The fault lies with Tory administration. And I never heard more arrogant Toryism in all my life for a Minister to come back and say: "I take pride in it."

To the fact that having photographs taken would interfere with the patients; that is nonsense. The fellow who went up emphasized, time and time again, that he wanted to take pictures of the dormitories. When I was there, there was hardly anybody in the dormitories except the attendants and it was an hour of the day when they would have been empty—that is, if they were going according to the schedule I was given.

I emphasize to this House, Mr. Chairman, that I did not send the reporter up there. I was asked if I would go with him—and he always asked permission from everybody he saw. As they kept passing the buck—and I do not blame the staff or the superintendent—we kept telephoning Queen's Park, until we ended up with the Minister who said, "No."

If you want to stimulate interest in this problem in Ontario, you should let the people see. And I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the government does not want the people to see, because they are ashamed of what might come to public notice. No matter how good the hon. Minister's staff is—and I say this to him, through the Chairman—it does not make him a good Minister.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, there are several aspects of this vote which will doubtless be gone into in some detail, but I want to follow on the remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale, just to point up to this House fairly vividly what really obtains in Aurora.

Suppose the hon. Minister tells the House the capital expenditure in Aurora—per diem per capita, in that hospital—last year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: $5.47.6 per diem basis.

Mr. S. Lewis: $5.47 per diem per capita? Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to state on the floor of this House what has been stated before, that we are starving our mental hospitals and the hospital schools and the adult institutions for the retarded, like Aurora. Our per capital per diem in this province averages around $6.50 to $7 a day right across the whole treatment spectrum for mental illness, and there is no possible answer that can be given by this government to that kind of starving of the mental institutions.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): And that is not a criticism of the hon. Minister's staff.

Mr. S. Lewis: And that has nothing to do with the staff, Mr. Chairman, nothing whatsoever; that is departmental policy. For whatever reason, over the years, the government has decided that the Ontario Hospitals in the province, and the hospital schools and the institutions for the adult retarded, must somehow exist on financial outlays which completely cripple them—totally.

Nursing homes receive more. We spend more on jails. We spend more on industrial farms. I would point out to you that we spend more under The Homes For Special Care Act to move senescent patients from the Ontario Hospitals into private nursing homes, than we spend at the adult hospital at Aurora. $6.50 a day the government spends for that; in Aurora it is $5.47. There are no other institutions run by this government which are so shabbily treated as are the Ontario Hospitals—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let us have no more nonsense in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, just to pull it together. There is a tendency on the part of this government, and on the part of the Minister of Health, and on the part of the Minister of Reform Institutions, in particular, to hide behind the skirts of the staff, to whimper like school children in the wings whenever Opposition criticism is levelled at the conduct and quality of treatment given in those institutions. And it is never levelled at the staff; but never! Our criticisms are always of departmental policy, because that is the policy formation body.

Year after year, the same cries come across the House about the staff and their setting of policy; and, of course, the policies can be simply changed and worked with in co-operation by the department, and that is no answer whatsoever.

Let me say also, Mr. Chairman, that it is reprehensible for the hon. Minister to say that, from here on, all appointments have to be arranged through him or through his Deputy Minister. I want to protest on the floor of the House, and protest strongly, because that is a decision of fear and of humiliation. That is not an intelligent administrative decision. I visited at least eight Ontario Hospitals last year; I telephoned the superintendents; I made appointments with them; and there was not a single one who minded the visit. There was not a single superintendent who did not take me through the hospital. There was not a single superintendent who expressed a moment's reservation, either at the time, or subsequent to

the deliberations in this Legislature—not one. Obviously, if the normal channels are used, there is no reason in the world why individual members should not visit the Ontario Hospital establishments across the province.

The effort to be selective, the effort to carefully eliminate that which might not wish to be seen, is what the Minister is after in gearing it through his own department. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. Minister were proud of his hospital schools, if he were proud of Smiths Falls and Orillia and Aurora, he would welcome photographers and public discussion. And, of course, the member for Parkdale is certainly right; you cannot express pride in institutions that are large, conglomerate entities, housing hundreds of people under shabby and disreputable conditions. Not one of these have been broken down into the smaller treatment units about which we have been hearing for years and have not seen precise evidence of.

I will come back to certain other aspects of this, Mr. Chairman, but I want to suggest to you, sir, and through you to the Minister, that mental health suffers a degree of discrimination from this government that no other agency of government does. It must come to an end. And at some point in these estimates, perhaps when the hon. Minister has replied, I would appreciate him reading into the record the per diem per capita of every Ontario Hospital in the province—at least slowly enough so that we can get it. I would like to know, in fact, whether we are right in our thinking that the per diem per capita is somewhere around $7 a day. I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that those hospitals, the majority of them, are supposed to render active treatment for mental illness; they are no longer custodial institutions in the Minister's context.

Would the hon. Minister give us those figures?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Scarborough West obviously feels that Aurora is little more than a residence. A great majority of the patients are grossly retarded and only need care and housing and feeding; this is about all that can be done for them.

The member for Parkdale himself stated, I believe, in his remarks, that 25 only are capable of taking any kind of instruction or training at all and I would remind the members—

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. Minister said that I said that only 25 of the patients are capable of taking instruction; I said that only 25 have a possibility of being returned to the community.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I apologize. I misunderstood the member's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that for the people who are in nursing homes and who need a great deal of nursing care, we pay $6.50 per day. This is a recognized per diem rate all over the province, not only by us, but by many other nursing homes. I think that if the five dollars and almost forty-eight cents per day is looked at in its true perspective, it is certainly justified. Aurora, $5.47.6; Brockville, $6.70.83; Cedar Springs, $8.32.60; Cobourg, $5.39.70; Goderich, $12.-95.15; Hamilton, $7.55.80; Kingston, $9.12.61; London, $9.66.10; New Toronto, $8.93.20; North Bay, $7.69.44; Orillia, $6.37.30; Owen Sound, $14.14.55; Penetang, $8.72.07; Port Arthur, $8.41.44; St. Thomas, $7.47.91; Smiths Falls, $6.70.79; Thistletown, $49.78.54; Toronto, $8.60.10; Whitby, $7.50.43; Woodstock, $8.09.34; CPRI London, $34.19.49; Toronto psychiatric, $31.98.56.

Mr. S. Lewis: Just to follow up these individual figures, Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to go over with the hon. Minister what these per diems reveal. There are three high per diems from the Minister's remarks. One is Thistletown, at $49.78; one is CPRI at London, at $34.19; and one is Toronto psychiatric, at $31.98.

Let me point something out about Thistletown, CPRI and Toronto psychiatric, Mr. Chairman. They are all acute treatment institutions, or government agencies. They are all performing at a level which is desirable in the provision of mental health services; and, in order to do so, they are performing at a level of over $30 per diem per patient.

Now, take a look at the other Ontario Hospitals, Mr. Chairman, which purport to do the same thing. Brockville, $6.70: Hamilton, $7.55: St. Thomas, $7.47: London, $9.66: Toronto, $8.66. I repeat what I said, Mr. Chairman. These institutions of government cannot possibly be providing adequate care for the mentally ill at those per diem rates. Indeed, everything we know demonstrates that.

In today's Hamilton *Spectator*—others will elaborate—there is a shocking story of the situation at the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton, which is deteriorating daily to the point of total collapse. At the Toronto Ontario Hospital, the situation in terms of finances for staff, and in terms of finances for programme, is equally in a state of deterioration and crisis. That is true of one Ontario Hospital after

another, and it cannot be justified. It lives with the conscience of the Minister year after year, and at no time does he answer to his conscience. He simply answers to his Treasury board, which stifles any efforts at expansion on the part of worthy treatment procedures at Ontario Hospitals.

I do not know what the average works out to. Obviously I was a dollar or so out. Obviously it is $8 a day. So it is moving up, Mr. Chairman. We are moving up at the rate of $1 per year per capita. That is our increase in treatment for the mentally ill in Ontario. One dollar per year more for the mind; that is the government's attitude to mental health. I do not think any more need be said on that part of this estimate.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do not think any member of this House who has ever tried to get a retarded child into an institution, can go along with the Minister's statement that we have ample programme in this department.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. At no time have I said we have ample.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I suggest to the hon. Minister that the way this government tries to keep the public from seeing what is going on, and the crowded conditions, there must be some reason for the secrecy.

I want to say that it is a shocking thing for the Minister—I think it is irresponsible on his part, in his thinking and his practice—to get to a point where we will never catch up in this. We have 2,500 retarded children in Smiths Falls, crowded bed to bed, and he sits there saying the public should not know what is going on.

I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if he thinks it is more important to spend $50 million on this complex at Queen's Park, a monument to architects and contractors, than to do something for retarded children? I think that the answer, as my colleague has stated, is that for the public to know what is going on is the key, not only to this institution but to all public institutions.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the statement the hon. member has just made, that we are hiding from the public. During this week—this week is Mental Health week, is it not? During this week the pattern is the same this year as it has been in the past seven years since I became Minister. There will be thousands of people passing through all of our hospitals in the province, all of our Ontario Hospitals in the province. There is no intention, there is no attempt made, to hide anything from the public.

I started open hospitals, and I am proud of it. We have invited the people, we have encouraged society to go through our hospitals, and I do not hear these things from the people who go through our hospitals. They have got no reason to hide anything or to mince words, insofar as what they see is concerned; and the people who go through our hospitals, I think, are just as capable of judging as any of us who stand in this House.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister answer: Who sets the policy insofar as photographers being there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do.

Mr. Sargent: Will you tell me why?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have already told you why, because I think it is in the best interests of the patient.

Mr. Sargent: I would suggest that it is in the best interests of the department to hide what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think I am a little bit better equipped to judge than my hon. friend.

Mr. Sargent: Your performance is not showing that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Where did you get your degree?

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, just one other matter having to do with Aurora and in regard to the remarks that the hon. Minister has made. I had complained that one could imagine the stench in those dormitories when the windows were closed and the Minister said, "Well, they are healthy people, they are healthy patients." I want to emphasize two things. One is that, when they are retarded, they are far more susceptible to ill health. I think that they are, on the average, only about 70 per cent as healthy as a normal person; but certainly they are far more susceptible to disease. In that regard, I would like to point out that, of the 250 or 249 patients who are there, there is no nurse there; they could not have a female nurse there because there are no facilities for a female person in the building.

When I asked about the doctor, the only doctor there is the superindent; and if he is away, it is understood that there is a doctor in the community on call. But even for medical services alone, with no nursing staff,

and with only the superintendent to really look after things, you are asking him, I think, to carry out an impossible task—not only to supervise that but to be the medical man as well.

Surely you could at least have a male nurse on the staff? I was in the infirmary, such as it was, if you want to call it that, and there were a few patients in bed who were ill; but, at the same time, you do not have the care that you should have. It was even worse than Mercer reformatory when I was going through that a year ago. Mercer reformatory is bad enough, but Aurora tops that. These children—let us say admittedly some of them, a lot of them, are over 18, perhaps most of them; they maybe should be called adults, but they certainly require more medical care than most people.

They are more apt to injure themselves. In fact such great care was taken by the administration that they do not even have regulation size volleyballs when they play volleyball. Either the government does not want to spend that money on sporting equipment, or else the equipment they were using was a safety precaution.

But you are a long way from giving proper medical treatment to these people, and I was not at all impressed with the medical treatment they were getting. Again, emphasizing that I do not blame the superintendent, I just think you are asking the man to do too much.

Would the hon. Minister answer this question? What medical facilities does he think should be available in a place like Aurora, where you have 250 patients? Does the Minister not think there should be at least one nurse on staff?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not in a position to judge whether there should be. My personal opinion would be it is not necessary; but if the doctor in charge of the hospital believes that he needs a nurse, he should let us know about this. He knows this. And there is no attempt, as the hon. member for Scarborough West said, to hide behind the skirts of the staff. I am a professional man with them, and I respect their right to exercise judgment, not from policy; and I did not say anything about policy. We do make policy, but they determine programmes and that is what counts in the hospital.

To say that they are not getting proper medical care is nothing short of a falsehood, Mr. Chairman; and I say that deliberately in this parliamentary session. The member is guilty of telling a falsehood in this regard.

An hon. member: Oh, nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I suppose one could be kind and say it is an error of judgment, because I accept the fact that he is not equipped to know whether—

Mr. Trotter: Listen! A point of order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —medical attention or not.

Mr. Trotter: On a point of order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Trotter: I am asking you to take that back—saying I dictated a falsehood. Any man who tolerates what you have done, to get up and say you are proud of your hospitals—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Trotter: —is certainly guilty of giving any—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, that is no point of order.

Mr. Trotter: It certainly is.

Mr. Chairman: The member—

Mr. Trotter: I believe he should take that back, Mr. Chairman, because I have been informed by certain people, who are well informed, that having a hospital or even a home with 250 people, and having no nursing staff, is not proper medical care. And that certainly is no lie!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: This man is so ashamed of himself and the way he has been carrying on that he has now turned to personal insults. We on this side of the House did not personally insult anybody until he started it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of retracting it. I have stated it as a fact and I am prepared to back this up.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister of Health just wait for a moment, please? The leader of the Opposition has stood in his place in connection with a statement which has been made and has asked for a retraction.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to retract, because I have stated what I believe to be facts.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, surely the hon.

Minister recognizes the rules of the House? You do not call another member a liar—which he was doing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I said the hon. member had made a statement which was false; and I state this unequivocally, sir, because he stated that they were not getting proper medical attention. I will back the action of my staff with my own professional and ministerial reputation, that the patients in Aurora are getting adequate and proper medical attention. There is one doctor in charge, but there are 249 relatively healthy people.

They are mentally handicapped but the morbidity is no greater there than it is anywhere else and Dr. Rice has the authority and the right, whether he is there or not, to call anyone at any time in consultation. He further has the right to transfer any patient to a general hospital at any time he believes the patient's condition is of such a serious nature that he and his own institution cannot treat him.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the rules of this House are such that you do not call another member a liar or say that he has made a falsehood. You may disagree with the point he has made but you certainly do not lower the debate to that level. Therefore, sir, I would ask you to so rule as stated in the legislative rules.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition has asked for a ruling in connection with this particular point. My reaction to it is that the Minister of Health has stood in his place and said that there may be an error in judgment and it appears it has been a false statement that has been made.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He said it was a falsehood.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if he said it was a falsehood and it is shown in *Hansard* that he did say that, then we would ask that it be retracted.

Mr. Chairman: I know of nothing in the rules at the present time that would say it was unparliamentary.

Mr. Trotter: Just to follow this up, Mr. Chairman; in comparison to what nursing staff or what medical staff should be available, even in Mercer reformatory, where there are only 100 people—and I suggest in far better health than the patients at Aurora—they had far better nursing staff at Mercer. And there was a lot of criticism of Mercer that was justified because, over a certain period of days, there was no nursing staff on call at any time. Here, at Aurora, you have no nursing staff on call at any time during the day. So again I say our prison inmates are receiving far better treatment than we are giving the patients at Aurora, and Mercer was bad enough.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, just to perhaps tie this part of it together, for some time the hon. Minister of Health has asserted that the great achievement of his administration would be the recognition that mental illness should be treated on a par with physical illness, that the great psychological breakthrough in government attitude and in public attitude would be achieved. And I want to remind him through you, Mr. Chairman, that we spend $28 a day on active treatment in general hospitals; we spend $20 a day in convalescent care; we spend $14 to $16 a day in chronic care, and we spend one-quarter of the active treatment for physical illness on mental illness. That in itself, I think, stands as a pretty simple but straightforward repudiation of all that the government offers in this field, despite its protestations.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: No, I would not call it a falsehood what the hon. Minister has said. The Minister has that delicious phrase that he says across the House, "I think what has been offered is out of line with the facts." I think what the Minister has suggested is out of line with the facts. The truth is, the animation and the exercise demonstrated at this point in the Health department, year after year by the Opposition, stems from the appalling inadequacy of the department in the mental health field. There is just no other explanation for it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to relate this to remarks the hon. Minister made last night between 11.15 and 11.30, before we adjourned; because one of the greatest areas of indictment in the mental health pattern in Ontario is the complete absence of aftercare. And now I am not talking about the 250 people in the adult retardes home at Aurora. I am talking about the thousands of people being treated for mental illness across the province of Ontario.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the aftercare procedures in the province of Ontario are probably worse than anywhere on the North American continent and I am about

to show why. One of the things which the hon. Minister has successfully done, which his department has done, is to reject categorically, for reasons which frankly mystify me, co-operation, intensive co-operation, with the public health units around Ontario—the people best placed to do the aftercare follow-up.

And in his answer last night—and I have done a little work in the interim—the hon. Minister said to me, "I spoke to my superintendents at a meeting last week. They told me we were working with aftercare patients, so we are." Of course, that is just a lot of nonsense, Mr. Chairman. I named 16 or 17 public health units in the province clamoring for help on the discharge of mental patients and the fact that they were receiving no information. And the Minister, in reply, named three specific areas.

He named Scarborough, and it turned out we were not talking about the same thing at all, so we can dismiss that. He named Lambton county and just demonstrated what I had been trying to demonstrate, the complete breakdown between public health and mental health. And he named Welland as an example of where there was an active mental health programme. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have with me the report of the medical officer of health, the public health doctor, in the Welland and district health unit, for last year. On page 11 of that report, under the section "mental health" he says as follows and I would like to quote it into the record:

> It is unfortunate that the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton ceased to supply the services of social workers for patients discharged from that hospital. There is no question of the value of this programme and, in our estimation, it should have been continued until the nucleus of a complete mental health service is fully established throughout the county.
>
> The mental health clinic at the Welland county general hospital has provided a great deal of help but the demands on this are so great that the major accomplishment possible could not be provided.

And what the medical officer of health in Welland and district is saying, Mr. Chairman, in his report, as he said to me in person, is that there is a complete breakdown of liaison between the aftercare department of the Hamilton Ontario Hospital and the Welland county public health unit; and that when we ask them for names of people, either admitted or discharged from the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton, they will not give out those names.

Mr. Chairman, that reflects a departmental policy; that is the policy of the mental health branch. It cannot be attributed to public health; it cannot be attributed to the staff; it is the policy of the branch because they have the right to order a change. In the case of Welland, Mr. Chairman, it amounts to a crime—a crime against the people who are in Ontario Hospital, Hamilton. I pointed out, without having a certain document before me at the time, as I pointed out when I spoke earlier, that there was an aftercare programme in Welland. An aftercare programme existed with social workers from the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, who worked with the public health nurses in Welland county, and followed patients who were discharged back into the community for purposes of rehabilitation.

While the aftercare programme was in progress, the medical officer of health had this to say in a speech that he delivered to a conference of social workers at University of Western Ontario in 1962, and I quote:

> The location of a social service worker in our county, who is attached to the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton, has been a logical development in a more complete service.
>
> After a period of six months, it is all too soon to arrive at any definite conclusion. However, the fact that there has been only one readmission of the 65 persons admitted to the hospital from the county in the last six months—

one readmission, Mr. Chairman, out of 65:

> —is particularly significant when this is compared with previous readmission history.

When the public health people were following up the patients, there was one readmission out of 65.

I have the mental health branch report for the year 1964 beside me. I take a look at Welland county and I find that, in that year, there were 100 readmissions from Welland county. So, in a six-month period when you had the public health unit participating, you had one readmission; and when you withdrew the public health services you had 100.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that is an increase, if you will forgive the use of figures, of 5,000 per cent. That is a pretty substantial increase in readmission without the participation of the public health personnel. One of

the interesting things, Mr. Chairman, is the nature of the readmission rate across the province of Ontario.

I dug up the figures and have taken a little time to put it into percentages, and I want to put them to the hon. Minister slowly so that he can absorb them: Brockville Ontario Hospital readmission rate, 42 per cent; Goderich, 38 per cent; Hamilton, 44 per cent; Kingston, 41 per cent; London, 46 per cent; New Toronto, 44 per cent; North Bay, 41 per cent; Port Arthur, 43 per cent; St. Thomas, 45 per cent; Toronto, 58 per cent; Whitby, 45 per cent—across the board, in the heaviest active treatment hospitals, a 44 to 45 per cent readmission rate.

That is just incredible! That is higher than readmission rates for most jurisdictions that the Minister can name, because I have taken just a little time to look at some of the other jurisdictions. And the reason it is higher, or certainly one of the reasons it is higher, is that our aftercare programme in Ontario is nonexistent. Indeed, some of the superintendents have attested to that themselves.

I can remember the speech made not so long ago by Dr. Pratten of Kingston Ontario Hospital, when he said that over 75 per cent of the patients who return to the community have no follow-up procedure whatsoever. And yet government repudiates the one agency that could be integrated into the aftercare programme.

The mental health aftercare, last year, was a revolving door. This year it is a treadmill to further readmission. We are constantly bringing back to the mental hospitals the people we discharge from the mental hospitals; first, because of the money, we are prepared to; and second, because of the overcrowding in certain of the areas. But, third, and fundamentally, because of the absence of a viable aftercare programme.

That is criminal! It is a hoax for the people who enter those hospitals. And it is particularly reprehensible when we have an agency to follow up; this is what I do not understand. You have public health units right across the province champing at the bit to enter the field of aftercare, and when they turn to superintendents for names they are rejected. And when they try to develop a policy they are rejected. So the one obvious avenue to use as a corrective vehicle to lower that readmission rate so that it drops to 15 or 20 per cent where, in a civilized mental health operation it should be, is simply not possible.

There is no excuse for that kind of thing, Mr. Chairman. And the Minister had better move with his mental health division, and get it across to all the Ontario Hospitals that this should be the nature of their activity because the only ones that do have some liaison—London and St. Thomas and Kingston—curiously enough are the hospitals whose readmission rates dropped in 1964. All the others, where the liaison is absent, the readmission rates went up.

Mental illness, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you, sir, need not be a cyclical pattern. One does not have to visit a perpetual state of mental illness on people who can be rehabilitated with some help in the aftercare programme. We will come, a little later perhaps, to the variety of community agencies that the government had available. If there were some day hospitals or night hospitals or halfway houses, or any of the rehabilitative concepts right across North America that are absent in Ontario; if there were any of those facilities that might also help the aftercare procedures; but in the absence of a programme, public health is there to fill the role and they should fill that role.

The refusal of the Minister's department absolutely flabbergasts me. I cannot understand his rationale. I cannot understand his operation. And I am prepared to spend the afternoon reading one report after another into the record to demonstrate that public health is not involved.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, will the hon. Minister say why the public health—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Somebody else is on his feet, another member recognized.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am not clear—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this House seems to forget that there is no seat in this House any more important than each individual seat. We must not forget that. This Minister gets up and tries to brush off the backbencher, whoever it may be; but every seat in this House is the most important seat in democracy, and do not forget it.

I am not clear on one thing—there are many things I am not clear on. I am not clear on how many beds for retarded children you have planned to build this year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: None, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Scarborough West has made a great deal of the department repudiating public health departments or public health units. He has also been very vocal about the fact that it is department policy that patients' names be given to the public health officers.

I want to state, without equivocation, that this is not correct. The department has issued no edict to superintendents relative to this. The department has never repudiated public health officials; indeed, as I stated yesterday, if the hon. member had listened to what I said, the department officials have worked assiduously with public health officers and the superintendents and local community facilities to get co-ordination in programmes.

If it is the decision of the superintendent, or the doctors and staff, that they do not want to give the names of patients to public health officers, they probably have a very sound professional reason for doing so. I have no intention of dictating professional policy to them because, again I repeat, they are responsible people, capable of doing their job, or they would not be there.

The hon. member has made a great deal, as he always has done since he came into this House, about readmission rates. And frankly, as a physician, I cannot get exercised about readmission in the way that this hon. member does. Indeed, I think this is part of the evidence of the success that our programme has met with over the past few years.

In the first instance, I think our policy in recording readmissions is not right. I learned that any patient who has been at any time in his life a patient in an Ontario Hospital, and goes back again, it does not matter how long after discharge, is considered a readmission. In my opinion, that is wrong. Once a patient is discharged from hospital and comes in again, it is a new admission.

However, this is what the statisticians have set up and I am quite acceptive of it. But the very fact that patients are willing to come back, and are encouraged to come back when they need the services of a hospital, I think is evidence of the success of the programme. And this did not happen in days gone by because they were so glad to get out of Ontario Hospitals. There was such a stigma attached to them when they were admitted to Ontario Hospitals that they did not want to go near the place unless they were taken in by force, or on committal order of two doctors, or of the courts.

The fact that our voluntary admissions, the fact that our informal admissions, the fact that our 30-day admissions on one doctor's certificate, are going up steadily by leaps and bounds every year, I think, is evidence of the success of the programme.

To say there is no active treatment programme in our hospitals is completely wrong. The results contradict this every day, and those who are knowledgeable about what is really going on in mental health in respect of the programmes of Ontario Hospitals will bear this out. Again, I have to say, that if the medical officers of health cannot get co-operation from the superintendents, the public health administration division of the department and the mental health division of the department, are both willing and anxious to go to bat for them and with them to try to break down any barriers that may exist between the two agents.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell me if Dr. Pratten, the Kingston Ontario Hospital superintendent, is a responsible person, vis-à-vis mental health practices?

Hon. Mr Dymond: Absolutely.

Mr. S. Lewis: And is Dr. Christie of Toronto Ontario Hospital a responsible person—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Every one of them. Why?

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, it is from those men that the statements about the appalling readmission rates have come—not from the members of the Legislature alone. It is from the papers they have presented, and the articles they have written, and the annual reports that they have submitted to the Minister's department. That was where the material was garnered—from the analysis of the superintendents of the hon. Minister's own Ontario Hospitals.

They are the people who have deplored the rise in the readmission rates. So let us not play games with the readmission rates. The people in the field are terribly distressed about the tendency for readmission rates to rise as, supposedly, the treatment becomes more sophisticated.

If, in fact, Mr. Chairman, it is the policy of the department to collaborate with public health units, then there is a tremendous gap between theory and practice. Because it is not happening in Welland; it is not happening in Lincoln, or Huron, or Bruce, or Carleton, or Wentworth, or Kingston, or Hamilton, or Scarborough, or Lambton, or Waterloo, or Peel, or York—I could name

another dozen or 15 across the province. In some of them it is nonexistent, and in others it is so miniscule as to be inconsequential in the total picture.

I really think, Mr. Chairman—I admit the handicaps of the laymen in the field—but I suggest to you, sir, that if the government was prepared to finance aftercare programmes in a serious manner, if it was prepared to raise its per diem from $1 per year increment to $2 or $3 per year increment, with a focus on aftercare, then, indeed, we would cut down the readmission rates; because that is the experience in other jurisdictions.

I have no argument with the efforts of the Ontario Hospitals' personnel. How can they follow through on an aftercare programme? Their outpatient department is now absolutely overwhelmed. They can barely survive with the pressure of active treatment cases, and people awaiting diagnosis; and each year we have another crisis in one of the major Ontario Hospitals: How can they possibly even cope with aftercare problems?

The normal function is simply to dismiss the patient, to hope desperately that nothing will go wrong, and hope desperately that the private practitioner will keep an eye on the patient—and then to watch the readmission rates rise. That is a mental health treadmill, and it is not satisfactory in terms of the pretensions that this department makes about its mental health apparatus.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order on which you have not moved as yet—I know, sir, that as Chairman you want to keep decorum in this assembly and see that fair play is done. The fact is the Minister of Health who questioned my quote to him—which he can check in *Hansard*—has lowered the dignity of this House. By saying that a member has uttered a falsehood and then, if I recall correctly, he said:

> Deliberately I say to this Legislature, again, an hon. member has uttered a falsehood.

And I would say, sir, reading from "Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario" by Alex. C. Lewis, at page 26 where it says:

> Personalities are taboo as lowering the dignity which should characterize proceedings in the House and it is a serious infraction of the rules for a member—

even the Minister of Health:

> —to impute improper motives to another member or to—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Is that an accurate reading?

Mr. Singer: Well, follow it; the hon. Minister has his book there!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Thompson: I am quoting it:

> —or to reflect upon the honesty or good intention of any vote in the House—

And may I say, sir, that with that as a basis you, in wishing to uphold fairness in this House and the dignity of the House, will ask the hon. Minister to retract his statement.

Mr. Chairman: It might be worthwhile for members of the House to hear some of the things that are in the same book, under the same rule on page 26, preceding what the leader of the Opposition has just read. It says:

> A member taking part in debate must be careful to adhere to the rules. No crossfire of discussion with another member directly across the floor is permitted, and may be checked by the Speaker. A member is expected to confine his remarks to the subject under discussion and not to introduce irrelevancies or to indulge in repetition.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: And this prefaces what the leader of the Opposition has just read, that:

> Personalities are taboo as lowering the dignity which should characterize proceedings in the House—

I think that it could be fairly well established that we may not impute falsehood to any member of the House, and I know that the Minister of Health had indicated that he thought that the member has been misinformed or that it was an error of judgment—

Mr. Trotter: He said falsehood!

Mr. Chairman: —and I would ask the Minister of Health, if he will, to modify his statement.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I still say, Mr. Chairman, that the statement was, in my most kindly interpretation, a grave error in judgment.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Many times in this House the Speaker has suggested—indeed, without him suggesting it—

the backbenchers would start a claque resounding throughout the House, "Withdraw, withdraw, withdraw," particularly when the Speaker has asked for a withdrawal. I suggest that even though the hon. Minister is a stubborn Scot, he should obey the rules of the House and not weasel!

Mr. Chairman: I think he has already done so; he has—

Mr. Thompson: Withdrawal!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I hope that the members will not find it necessary for me to reread this section.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Wentworth East.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this point, am I to understand that the hon. Minister has withdrawn the offensive words?

Mr. Chairman: As I understand it, the Minister of Health has indicated that it was an error in judgment. Is this correct?

Mr. Oliver: This is what I want to know. I want to know from the hon. Minister if the offensive words have been withdrawn and the others put in their place. Is that what the hon. Minister has done?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have stated that the most kindly interpretation that I can put upon the hon. member's remarks was that they were a very grave error in judgment.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, pardon my insistence, but what my hon. friend is required to do under the rules of the House, as anyone understands them, is to withdraw an offensive statement of that character. Now, he has not intimated, as I have heard him, that he is willing to withdraw what are clearly offensive words! All he is doing is saying that he—he adds to them, almost—and leaves the offensive words standing there. Now that is not a withdrawal, and it is not meeting the requirements of the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. Minister has modified the statement, and that is the practice—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This has been the practice for some time.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): In asking the hon. Minister to withdraw his statement, what about the comments of the hon. member for Parkdale who said that the whole administration was "insipid"? That is equally as bad as what he has said!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I think the Minister of Health has made it very clear that he thought that it was a grave error in judgment.

Mr. Sargent: Chicken, chicken, chicken!

An hon. member: Oh, what about that!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What about the recent interruption?

Mr. Oliver: I do not want to press this, but may I say—

Mr. Chairman: Would you suggest to the member for Grey North that he withdraw that remark?

Mr. Oliver: Well, we had better get one of them withdrawn first. My hon. friend, the Chairman, says that he is satisfied that the hon. Minister's present interpretation is quite all right. I have listened to many withdrawals in this House in my time and, always, the withdrawal came. Then if my friend, or whoever was the guilty one, wanted to interpret it in some other way, he did it—but after the withdrawal. That is the point. My hon. friend has not withdrawn the remark at all.

Mr. Thompson: Withdraw, and we will be satisfied.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health spoke in answer to an admonition from the Chairman, who said: Will the Minister modify his statement? Thereafter the hon. Minister did modify his statement, and thereby the words become subject to—

Mr. MacDonald: With respect to the Chairman, and I have never had greater respect for any Chairman in this House, the rules do not ask for a modification of a statement. The rules ask for a withdrawal. Right. Read your rule book. It is in there.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for York—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, in the interests of the business of this House, if it is going to make the hon. member any happier, I withdraw the statement.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a statement from the Hamilton *Spectator* of Wednesday, March 3.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder, before the member for Wentworth East starts, I suppose the member for Grey North would like to withdraw his statement; would he?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would gladly do so, but I feel you should let this remark stand. Any Minister who disagrees with a member of the Opposition could declare it a falsehood and I go along in withdrawing my remarks to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. All right. Now we are back to business.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, on vote 713, dealing with the Ontario Hospitals in the province of Ontario, I have an article from the Hamilton *Spectator* of Wednesday, March 3:

HOSPITAL FOUND CROWDED

> Two wards in the Ontario Hospital here are approximately ten per cent overcrowded, a grand jury reported to the county court yesterday. The wards in the basement of the Barton building are also damp in the summer and have strong objectionable odours, causing a very depressing atmosphere, the jury stated. Some of the rooms of the older buildings are incapable of being heated properly due to the poorly fitted windows, the report stated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to raise this question and ask the hon. Minister if he has received the grand jury's report and what action his department might take in regard to it.

By the way, this building referred to was built in 1876 and, as I found out later, still has heavy iron grilles on the upper windows. This, Mr. Chairman, might have been the extent of my participation in the estimates of The Department of Health, knowing that the critic for our party was capable of presenting to the House the kind of a job that we feel has to be done. But, before leaving Hamilton around one o'clock, I picked up today's issue of the Hamilton *Spectator* and of course, page seven being the one we like to read in Hamilton—it carries the local news—I turned immediately to take a quick look at it.

My eye caught the headline: "At Ontario Hospital MD Staff Shortage 'Critical'," and I sat and read the article, Mr. Chairman. I am bound to put it on record because I do not think anyone could put a clearer picture of the most inexcusable and intolerable conditions existing in that building in the province today.

I might say the article is by Peter Moon of the Hamilton *Spectator* staff; and I understand, on inquiring, that his information was gathered through interviews with the staff at that hospital:

> Resignation, sickness and a leave of absence have created a medical staff shortage at Hamilton's Ontario Hospital which authorities term "critical." The situation has reached the point where this week the hospital had to operate with only one full-time staff psychiatrist available for 1,640 inpatients.
>
> The result, it is claimed, is overwork, limited treatment and a serious drop in staff morale.
>
> The first important staff problems began to appear four years ago when the hospital had its accredited psychiatric training period for students cut from two years to one.
>
> As of July 1, it will cease to be a training hospital for psychiatrists at all, according to a recent ruling by the Royal college of physicians and surgeons.
>
> Provincial government officials and the hospital's administrative staff are doing everything they can to combat the situation, but they admit the staff position at the hospital is likely to become worse before they can do anything about it.
>
> The Ontario Hospital here has the highest admission rate of any Ontario Hospital in the province. Anywhere from 160 to more than 200 apply for admittance each month.
>
> The staff shortage means that now, for the first time, the hospital—which serves the five-county area of Halton, Wentworth, Lincoln, Welland and Haldimand—must be selective in whom it admits, with the most serious cases receiving preference.
>
> Government staff figures for the hospital tend to be misleading, because they include all the psychiatrists at the hospital in its list.

But four of them do not count as far as inpatient treatment is concerned. They are the two psychiatrists with the mental health clinic, who deal with outpatients only, and the superintendent and his assistant—Dr. Frederick Snedden and Dr. John White—who do only administrative work.

The medical staff that deals with the 1,640 inpatients consists of two full-time psychiatrists—one of whom has been away sick for three months—and three part-time psychiatrists.

There are two full-time physicians who have completed their training but do not have their specialist certificate examinations in psychiatry and one doctor in his first year of psychiatric training.

Completing the full-time medical staff are two retired physicians who are responsible for nonpsychiatric medical treatment.

The part-time staff consists of the three qualified psychiatrists—one of whom says he may resign soon—and a general practitioner in charge of the hospital's infirmary.

Two full-time psychiatrists resigned in March in disagreement with hospital policy and a third has taken a year's leave of absence.

In addition, the hospital is short nine psychologists—it has only three—and requires two additional social workers and 18 attendants.

"There's no doubt that Hamilton is undergoing a crisis at the moment," says Dr. H. W. Henderson, executive director of the provincial Department of Health's mental health division which administers the Ontario Hospitals.

Staff doctors at the hospital agreed to talk to a *Spectator* reporter on the understanding their names not be used.

They complain that they work "twice as hard" as doctors at other Ontario Hospitals, that they must rely too heavily on medication for treatment, and that they are unable to do a satisfactory job because of what they claim is the highest patient-doctor ratio of any Ontario Hospital in the province.

One physician said doctors don't want to come to the Ontario Hospital here because the medical grapevine has been told of poor morale, overwork, and limited opportunities to practise meaningful psychiatry.

They prefer, he said, to go to Ontario Hospitals such as those in Toronto, where more funds are allotted and there is the staff to carry out research and new methods of treatment.

The Rev. Leonard Medley, Roman Catholic chaplain at the hospital for the last two years, said: "The deterioration in the staff situation has put the doctors' morale at rock bottom."

"Only the development of powerful drugs in the 1950s has saved the situation from becoming hopeless," he said and many doctors have told him there is too much emphasis on drug therapy at the hospital. Several doctors think more active research should be carried on at the hospital but admit that without additional staff they have not got the time.

"How can you expect a bright young man, or any psychiatrist for that matter, to want to come here with a situation like this?" said a staff doctor. "Obviously they are going to head for places with accredited programmes of research and training."

Doctors at the hospital complain that too much of their time is wasted on the treatment of alcoholics, many of whom use the Ontario Hospital as a convenient drying-out centre.

Figures were not available but Dr. Snedden, the hospital's superintendent, agreed that the treatment of alcoholics, many of whom are admitted with delirium tremens and require careful and time-consuming care, does take up treatment time which should be devoted to mental patients.

The workload is so severe that most patients receive only one psychiatric interview of 30 to 60 minutes during admittance. The rest of their treatment tends to be based on reports made to doctors by nurses and other hospital services.

"It would not be far wrong to call it treatment by remote control," said one doctor. "I am lucky if I can spare a minute or two after the initial interview to talk to patients during ward rounds."

He said the system is simply not satisfactory and is unfair to patients. "You get the feeling that you are only giving custodial care rather than having the satisfaction that you are doing as good a job as could be done," he added.

One doctor, who has resigned from the hospital, said he could not put up with the system any longer, even though it is a place where there is the most urgent need for psychiatric care. "There is more need per square foot for trained psychiatrists

and doctors there than anywhere else in the province but I could not put up with it any longer."

The hospital occupies 75 acres on the Mountain at West 5th street and Fennell avenue and approximately one-third of the 1,640 inpatients are occupied in each of the hospital's three units—the modern looking Auchmar building completed in 1960, Orchard House completed in 1904, and the grim looking Barton building built in 1876, which has bars and heavy grilles on its windows.

Other complaints involved the hospital's infirmary where patients undergo normal medical surgery; because many are old and with chronic conditions, it is in continual use. There are usually about 80 patients in it at one time.

One doctor said its equipment would have made it modern in the 1930s, and it is now badly out of date and totally inadequate for the number of patients who must use it.

There are an average of 15 deaths a month at the Ontario Hospital; and although specialists are on call, the bulk of medical work falls on the hospital medical staff, including the part-time general practitioner and the two retired physicians who are now on full-time staff.

Sudden or accidental deaths rarely come to the public's attention. And the last hospital inquest was in 1959.

One staff member said no one thinks an inquest should be held into every death at the hospital but that occasionally one might prove a useful safeguard. One case in which he thought an inquest should have been ordered, involved the death of a woman patient who died after falling from her bed in the hospital infirmary.

Dr. Clare Buck, provincial director of Ontario Hospital, admits the infirmary is not up to standard and that it is not fair to expect part-time and semi-retired doctors to run it.

"The provincial Department of Health hopes to begin removing Ontario Hospital patients to Hamilton general hospital for surgery, and begin phasing out the infirmary within the next two months," he said. The shortage of fully qualified doctors on the hospital staff has resulted in a greater load thrown upon the nursing staff and the hospital attendants.

Substantial salary increases last January have, for the first time, solved the hospital's nurse shortage but low salaries for attendants remain a serious problem.

Starting salaries for attendants begin at $3,360 and go to a maximum of $4,400, in a city where the average industrial wage is more than $100 a week. The result, according to Father Medley, and a number of doctors, is too many poor-quality attendants.

There have been isolated rumours of brutality, and occasional ones of unusually strict and even cruel disciplining of difficult patients by attendants who should not be doing this demanding job.

"Unfortunately, these are very difficult things to prove," said Father Medley. But doctors and nurses support his statements.

"The nurses and the attendants are the backbone of the hospital," said one doctor. "Unfortunately, they are being forced to carry too great a load because of the shortage of medical staff, and this applies especially to the nurses. Some of the attendants, of course, are simply not up to standard and simply get worse under pressure."

Several nurses said they are now forced to work under greater pressure than before. They know something is wrong at the medical staff level but are unable to pinpoint the causes of the trouble.

"They never talk about it," said one nurse, "but we all know something is wrong."

No one in a position of authority is prepared to say how the situation here compares with Ontario Hospitals elsewhere.

The nearest statement to an outright comparison is that "naturally, we're very concerned at the situation that has developed in Hamilton."

This came from Dr. Henderson, the mental health division's executive director.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are other articles in the same paper that indicate that the situation has some other peculiarities that are not inducive to the kind of treatment people deserve in our mental hospitals.

I do not think there is any doubt that this is an inexcusable and intolerable condition. It seems to me that we do not give consideration to the patients who are mentally sick and to the families of these 1,640 patients, who are naturally full of anxiety and concern about the fact that they have a relative that has this kind of illness. They have to read to get knowledge of the kind

of conditions that exist in our mental institutions. Certainly it must make them wonder if we are not back in the early 1800s, when people were taken away for custodial care and just left there.

Certainly, if there is anything that could be done to rectify this under this vote, I had the intention of moving that this vote 13 be deferred for two weeks; then let the Minister bring in a programme that would satisfy the Opposition and the public of this province that something is going to be done. Then we could deal with it at that time. I understand that that kind of a motion is not in order, and if I could be advised of any way that could defer the taking of this vote, I would be happy to do it. I think it would be conducive to the needs of the people in this province.

I would think that the hon. Minister himself would ask for an adjournment of his estimates, take some time to look the situation over, and come back to the House and assure us that these conditions are going to be cleared up just as soon as it is humanly possible to do the job.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, first of all I do not think that it is reasonable for this House or the public of Ontario to judge what is being done for the patients on the basis of a feature article in a daily newspaper. First of all, this is why I ask that newspaper people would get the whole story from those who are capable of telling them the whole story, and then print the whole story—not take parts of the story out of context and put it together. After all, to hear the remarks read from this report, one would think that our patients were worse than they were 50 years ago—which, of course, is quite out of keeping with fact.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have said, and I said in my opening remarks, that there was still a shortage of professional help. This is not unique to Ontario. The situation is no worse in Ontario. Indeed it is better in Ontario, as it ought to be. But we cannot make psychiatrists overnight, and no matter what we do to encourage them—and I repeat as I have on each session when my estimates are considered, that psychiatry is supported better at the postgraduate level than any other specialty in medicine.

Only a certain number of people go into psychiatry. It is a long, trying course. It is not an easy life. And it attracts only a limited number of people. I would recognize that the doctors are pressed for time and are overworked, but they are doing good work, and the patients are being well treated, and are being discharged as cured or at least greatly assisted. This, again, is on the basis of professional judgment.

The hon. member quoted from the newspaper something about the need for more inquests. May I assure the hon. member that every death, according to law, must be reported to the coroner. The decision to hold an inquest rests with him; and if he chooses to have an inquest on every patient who dies in our institutions we cannot alter that, nor would we attempt to do so. I would like to point out that we have no record of any accidental deaths in the last year, and while we expect accidental deaths with the kind of patients we deal with, and we expect some violent deaths from time to time, at Hamilton hospital we have not had them.

This report of the nurses saying that something is wrong at the professional level, but nobody talks about it, is the sort of thing that you hear in any institution. It leaves an entirely wrong impression. There is no seething upset in this hospital, by any means. Of course, they would like, and we would like to give them, more psychiatrists; and as soon and if we can get more psychiatrists, we will.

Our salaries, I stated in my opening remarks, have greatly increased over the past year. We are now competitive, and better than competitive in many ways; but in spite of all this, more and more doctors are looking with less favour on institutional work. This does not only refer to our hospitals; I hear the same thing about chronic care facilities. The boards of those hospitals are having as great a difficulty getting permanent professional staff as we are in ours. I can only assure you, sir, that the department will continue its efforts to recruit and encourage professional staff to come to us to help relieve the pressure from the staff we now have.

Mr. Gisborn: I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. I was listening to "Open Line" this afternoon driving down, and Mr. Ronald Nixon, administrator I take it, or psychiatric administrator at the Hamilton clinic, was being interviewed by the announcer. He said one of the problems was that the pay for psychiatrists was too low, that it now ranged from $14,000 to $17,000. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Our salary range for psychiatrists goes from $14,000 to $23,000 a year.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth East and I fully concur with him that our hospitals are 50 years behind the times so far as keeping pace with modern-day medicine is concerned. I agree with the hon. Minister that it is hard to keep trained people in psychiatry, but I must get this point across: We are paying top dollars for machinery in all medicine fields yet you must realize, to meet this demand for trained psychiatric help, you must pay top dollars here too. People are more important than machinery so you must pay top price in this field to get them.

But it is inconceivable to me, Mr. Chairman, that this hon. Minister tells us that, in view of places like Smiths Falls having 2,500 beds back to back for retarded children, the target is zero for 1966-67. He tells thousands of people who are begging for admission that there will be no more beds planned. It is shocking. I would like to ask, as a citizen of Ontario, and I would like to get on the record a straight answer to two questions: When does the Minister plan to build more beds for retarded children? That is number one.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there are 450 beds vacant now, in new institutions, to be filled this year; so that is tantamount to adding 450 beds this year.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister: If this is the case why is it so hard to get a retarded child into a hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think this was pointed out very clearly last year when there was so much discussion of the overcrowding. I stated then that we had done everything possible, as a department, to admit children into institutions, oftentimes not doing what we believed was in the best interest of the child. But our policy in this regard changed.

We still have too many parents and too many doctors asking that infants be admitted almost as soon as retardation is diagnosed; and in some cases this can be diagnosed in the first few days of the infant's life. This is not in the best interest of the infant, and no child will be admitted to our institutions from now on, or beginning last year, until it has been screened, diagnosed and assessed, and the determination made primarily on the basis on what would be best for the child.

This is why waiting lists, about which we talk so much now, are quite irrelevant. Many of the children on the waiting list can be far better looked after in the community and through the community facilities. It was for this reason that this government provided much more substantial grants, both for capital purposes and for maintenance, in order that what is in the best interest of the child would be done for it.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow this—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: If it is on the same point, then I would give the floor to the hon. member.

Mr. Trotter: The amount of physical plant that you have for hospitals, for the keeping of retarded children, is very important. I am not arguing with the theory that the hon. Minister puts forward, Mr. Chairman, that it is far better to keep the children in the community or keep them with their families as long as possible. Wherever this can be done, fine! But, and this is the big "but," and this is what I have said two or three times on the estimates, we know there is going to be a certain percentage of retarded children or adults who are going to require institutional care. I believe that the government, Mr. Chairman, should have an overall policy of how and where these people, who are going to require institutional care, are going to be kept.

We have been told that if they are going to require institutional care, they should be in a small hospital school. This is in the instance of those who can be trained—that they should be close to the community. This is why, again, I say there should be planning to see to it there is such a hospital in Windsor, there should be such a hospital school closer to Toronto. Toronto does not have enough. And when I say we need bed space, I am not asking that great monolithic buildings be put up; this is, of course, completely contrary to any theory that seems to be modern. But when the hon. Minister says we have bed space for so many, I do want to ask what kind of bed space. It is just not enough to say we have so many beds, because we want to see in what kind of an atmosphere, how much room they have and so on, and on this we are not doing a proper job at all.

I believe that these people who make the estimates are certainly well informed, and that we now have 1,000 too many crammed in our institutions, when we take into regard the amount of bed space we have. In other words, these large units that we have should be broken down and smaller hospitals schools be established. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we in the Opposition are not asking too much to say to the government they should come forward and say, "Look, we have a plan for the next number of years. This year we will begin building a hospital school in Windsor and the next year we will do one in someplace else, where it is needed, and get rid of the crowding." Because we must bear in mind that our population is increasing and, as much as we may encourage keeping the retarded individuals in their homes, we have to bear in mind that many of these retarded individuals will break up the family unit unless they are removed.

I have seen instances, and so has probably every hon. member in this House, where a child has been taken from the home setting simply because the mother could no longer stand the nervous distraction. It seems to me that if, as a right, you have children, as a right they shall be educated if they are normal, then certainly those who have a retarded child have every bit as much right, if not more, to see that these children, as they become older and become adults, get proper care.

Medical science has advanced. Many retarded people live far longer than they ever have before, most of them—and it might have been a blessing in some cases had they passed on. But we do not give the care that we should give them. We are not supplying the physical facilities, among many other things.

I deplore the fact that the government has no overall policy. All we have had are excuses. All we have seen are men striving to keep the numbers down—and you might say, in Cedar Springs, down to 1,000. And this is considered quite an achievement. But it is not proper care under modern-day standards. Still we do nothing to try to break up the great complex at Orillia—2,700 souls in that place. We do nothing to break up the complex at Cedar Springs—1,000. And yet they tell us the optimum is 300 and that it should be close to the community.

We look at these great hospitals, far too large, stuck away out in the fields, away from the community. The time has come when we should have, from the government, a policy that will give us the type of hospital schools and the type of care that is required for retarded adults and children. You are never going to have the proper staff, you are never going to have proper rehabilitation, until you at least give them decent facilities in which to work.

So I am perturbed, I am shocked, Mr. Chairman, when I hear the answer that is given to the member for Grey North. The government lacks a policy and it is failing to come to grips with a very serious problem that is not only very serious now, but which is going to increase in the future. It is something that we, on this side of the House, are going to press for on every possible occasion we can, to at least give us some solid plan for the future in the keeping of retarded children and retarded adults.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on the same subject, the Minister mentioned that the workshops at local level, or the retarded children's workshops at local level, have taken some of the pressure off. I believe that is what you said. I think that is what you said, Mr. Minister? You said that is why you are giving more money for retarded workshops?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member did not listen to what I said. I said the community resources were being supported in far greater measure by government, as announced last year, and that in many cases this was the proper thing to do in the best interests of the patient.

Workshops are part of it, but basically the community school is, in my estimation, the centre or the core of the community programme.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister. I would say to the House it will be a sorry state across Ontario if the workshops had not come into being at a local level; and they are saving the government a lot of face, I would say.

I would like to ask the Minister this then. How many beds would he say we are short at this time in Ontario for retarded children?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not believe we are short any beds, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will just try to tell the hon. member, sir, that the waiting lists, about which we talk so much and so loudly, are quite irrelevant. My staff is not convinced

that these patients should all be in hospital schools, and to say that the government should develop a programme of building hospital schools is not wise. Indeed I think it would be doing a disservice to our people.

There are provisions for other facilities being made. For instance, there is need—and we are emphasizing the provision for this need—in the area of the retarded infant who is also suffering from severe physical handicap as well. I am simply going over time and time again, what I have already said in the House.

One hundred beds to serve this group will be provided in Kingston; 15 additional beds for emotionally disturbed in CPRI; 35 beds for the mentally and physically handicapped will be added at Port Arthur; 250 places for young adults undergoing vocational training will be provided at Edgar; and 200 beds are still to be filled in the new hospital school at Palmerston.

But it is not the intention—we do not believe it is good policy—for government to be building more hospital schools. The facilities to be taken—the whole spectrum of facilities must be taken into consideration. Wherever the need is evident, that need will be looked after. But to say that we are going to build hospital schools would be quite wrong.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on this particular—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on the same point? Because the member for Scarborough West has yielded the floor.

Mr. Trotter: All right. Thank you very much. Is it not—I would just like to ask the hon. Minister two or three questions on this to pursue it. Is it not understood that hospital schools should be located close to the community and should be of an optimum number of about 300 patients?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the government of 1959 adopted that policy and I think the evidence points to the fact that we have lived up to that policy. We have not built a big institution since then. I cannot, in conscience, recommend to the government that we abandon the institutions that exist. The people of Ontario have a very large investment in these buildings, and they are serving and can serve a useful purpose.

Schools that we build—if we were building schools or institutions at all—of course we put them closer to communities. This we have demonstrated by the hospital in the hon. member's own riding of Grey North, the one in Huron.

Mr. Sargent: That was a football—

Mr. Trotter: That is the one in Palmerston?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. Very obviously he does not either, but the institution for the retarded at Palmerston is a small institution. The place at Edgar is a small institution. Every unit we have established since—we have undertaken to support in very generous measure the new centre in Hamilton, which will accommodate 100 inpatients and provide for a very large number of outpatients. A small unit is being supported in Ottawa. This has been the pattern since we adopted the policy and we have not deviated from it; nor do we intend to, unless experience indicates that the policy should be changed.

Mr. Trotter: Well surely, Mr. Chairman, experience would indicate, just to see things, just to look at these places, that they are stacked like a can of sardines? I know there are extreme views in this whole situation of how much bed space you should supply. There was a brief here a few years ago, put out by the Ontario association for retarded children, that said that ten per cent of retardeds would require institutionalization. That would mean we would almost have to double our capacity. This probably is an exaggeration, but for the hon. Minister to come along and say we do not require any bed space is going to the other extreme.

I just quote from one man here, Professor Dr. D. W. Richards, who was the visiting professor in mental retardation. He is from the department of psychiatry, University of Toronto, and he was writing this article as the result of funds provided by the Ontario association for retarded children.

In his article—it appeared in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, he said many things. I do not agree with them all, because he rather exaggerated, possibly in his view, that we need a tremendous number of beds. But he said this:

> The hospital schools are overcrowded. According to the official estimate Orillia, Smiths Falls and Aurora are overfilled by a total of 599 beds. If overcrowding were to be estimated by the distance between beds—

and again I emphasize this, Mr. Chairman:

> —if overcrowding were to be estimated by distance between beds, I believe that

a reasonable estimate would be a thousand beds. That is to say, space for an additional thousand beds is required to abolish overcrowding, without altering the present rate of supply or reducing existing demand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is: You go into these places and you must say, in any standard of decency that most of us would understand, they are overcrowded, they are shockingly overcrowded, and there definitely is a shortage of bed space both for adult retardates and in our hospital schools. And it is ridiculous, it is nonsense, for the Minister to say there is no bed shortage. They are crying—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: At no time have I said there is no bed shortage.

Mr. Trotter: That is what you said to him. That is why I got up on my feet. After the answer the Minister gave to the member for Grey North, and for me to hear him say that, and have these facts in front of me, to see what I have seen, it staggers the imagination that the hon. Minister gives such an answer!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that we better have the hon. member visit the audiologist and get his hearing aid tuned. First of all, I did not say that we had no overcrowding. I have never said that.

Mr. Trotter: I have pretty good hearing. No broad shoulders—but good hearing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the hon. member would stop talking and listen for a change then some of this might sink in. We have never stated that we have no overcrowding, and our whole programme has been aimed at relieving the overcrowding. Now, we do not agree with the figures that Dr. Richards states, or the person whom he quoted as saying that ten per cent of retardeds should be in institutions.

My staff—and they are just as knowledgeable, and their opinion is just as valid as that of anybody else, Dr. Richards included, is that four to five per cent of the total mentally retarded population will require hospital care at some time in their lives, but not continuously.

If the hon. member had read the whole of Dr. Richards' statement to this House, he would have also noted that Dr. Richards stated that Ontario provided a far greater ratio of beds to population than did his own country of England, and this obtains in respect of a great many other jurisdictions. So much so, in fact, sir, that many of our people here sometimes wonder if we have not provided too much by way of institutional beds, again recognizing that the consideration now must be directed to what is in the best interest of the child and not all the other fringe concerns that have apparently loomed large in all our considerations in the past.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Chairman, we may have more bed space for retardates than England, but remember England has far more in the way of outpatient facilities and aftercare services for this type of patient than we have. There is a big difference.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to shift the subject for a moment to another area under this branch, and that is the area which has been given short shrift both in the leadoff speeches and in this estimate thus far, the area of disturbed children.

I realize that we have run into a wall here which appears to be impenetrable in terms of the government's response, and I frankly cannot find words to express the distress and despair which members of this caucus, and I suspect the whole Opposition, feel about the government's attitude towards disturbed children, and the refusal to take any concrete steps when steps are so obvious and compelling.

If it was necessary to sit and wait endlessly for an interdepartmental committee, then some of us might be assuaged. But when there are obvious steps that can be taken while that committee's report is being prepared, then there is no excuse for rendering an entire group of youngsters into the category of a forgotten generation, which is what is happening under the aegis of this hon. Minister of Health. For seven years, the situation has deteriorated. By the time we do anything we will have lost a generation of children, Mr. Chairman. And nothing could better demonstrate the nihilism of this department in its attitude on that than the thousands and thousands who are neglected.

One instance after another comes to the attention of members of this House, some of them heart-rending, some of them a little more graphic, some of them all-embracing in pointing out the problem. I have had brought to my attention by a pair of distraught parents from Brockville—indeed I think they have also approached the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information to make representations on their behalf, very

recently. I just recently had from a pair of parents in Brockville an outline of a disturbed child which bears directly on the problem, because there is a fascinating point of irony about it that I will indicate at the end of it.

But without belabouring the point, I want to read into the record a letter to the parents sent from the chief child psychiatrist at the Kingston general hospital. To my knowledge, he may be the only child psychiatrist in the Kingston area, and I shall, of course, not read the parents' name into the record, and substitute a name for the child which sounds like, rhymes with the child's real name, but does not reveal it.

> Dear Mr. and Mrs. P.: Thank you for your letter. I am pleased to hear that you are continuing to attempt to gain help for Terry.

This is a nine- or ten-year old girl who is deaf, with attendant emotional problems.

> I will try to bring you up to date on my thoughts about Terry and what I have attempted to do to put these into action. Firstly, I believe that we are agreed in the fact that Terry has emotional difficulties which interfere with her ability to expose herself to possible failure, frustration or punishment, and so create a major barrier to her learning, even simple school work. On psychological testing, Terry demonstrates a potential for academic learning—

I repeat key sentences:

> On psychological testing, Terry demonstrates a potential for academic learning, that is, she is educable but she was very much afraid of failure, she interpreted instruction as criticism, requests for repeating a task as evidence of her failure and requests for her to undertake a difficult task as our wanting her to fail. These are problems that are best dealt with in a residential treatment centre.

The chief child psychologist recommending a residential treatment centre.

> In view of the fact that Terry had made considerable progress during her year at the school for the deaf, in learning to get along with other children and adults, I contacted Mr. Demiza about the possibility of her returning this year.

Now, I ask the hon. Minister to ponder this next sentence:

> We were agreed that Terry could not benefit from a regular classroom. Unfortunately they no longer have a special class for children with problems, and so the school for the deaf had nothing to offer.
>
> Actually, as I mentioned above, Terry really needs treatment in a residential setting first to prepare her for returning to the school for the deaf. I had set this aside because of the great difficulty in gaining admission to such an institution—

and, of course, as an aside, Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to gain admission:

> —and of the very high cost for private families. The low cost institutions are Thistletown hospital in Toronto and the children's psychiatric research institute in London. Both of these tend to have long waiting lists. Sunnyside recently had a vacancy but their rate was $12 per day and will be going up to $15 per day in the near future.
>
> I took it upon myself to approach the children's aid society, Brockville, for financial help or preferably that they might consider temporary wardship and so bear the total cost. However, children's aid societies are reluctant, and rightly so, to spend so large a portion of their budget on one child. I have not yet received an answer to my—

I gather the answer was in the negative. The doctor goes on:

> As to private financing, this is not as costly as $15 per day, but is still expensive. The welfare department sets a subsidy rate at each institution.

Now, this is going to be difficult to grasp.

> At Sunnyside it is set at $13. The welfare department will pay 75 per cent of this subsidy rate, in this case $9.75. The parents are then responsible for the balance, which would be $5.25 per day or approximately $160 per month. Treatment usually runs from 12 to 18 months.
>
> There is one other problem here. The welfare laws prevent any money that is paid over the $13 per day to go to make up the balance to $15. That is, they will only allow you to pay $3.25 per day at Sunnyside. If you pay more, they will deduct it from the $9.75 per day that they pay. However, Sunnyside cannot meet costs unless they are assured of the $5.25 per day from the parent. The only way to get around this is to have a service club, such as the Lions club, donate the balance, not specifying how it should be used, but having a verbal agreement with the institution that it is to cover the extra costs for

Terry. It is a very confusing and complicated arrangement not designed for easy understanding.

And it is a despicable subterfuge to get around the impossible financing arrangements of The Department of Public Welfare. That is obviously my comment.

I wrote The Department of Education requesting their help, either for special placement or financial aid, but Mr. Clark of the special schools and services branch, though most willing, was unable to offer any concrete suggestions and so referred me to The Department of Public Welfare. I wrote Mr. Rousell of the child welfare branch of The Department of Public Welfare who noted that my interpretation of the present legislation re financing a child in welfare institutions was correct and that he could offer no further assistance. Thus, I seemed to have reached a blank wall.

As I mentioned to you before, we did have a three-bed treatment unit in the general hospital last year and achieved surprisingly good results. However, the hospital was not in favour of treating disturbed children. It did not feel that there was a particular need for such a service and would not allow the extra staff necessary for such a programme. So the unit was closed.

Without extra staff and specialized programming, such children cannot be successfully treated. The department of psychiatry at Queen's University has, over the past year, been negotiating with the Ontario Hospital, Kingston and the Ontario government to establish a 16-bed children's treatment unit at Ontario Hospital. The budget request was submitted in September, but we do not expect to hear of its fate until March.

That is March of this year.

If it should be approved, it will take at least six months for renovation to the building. However, since the salaries offered are the same as those in larger centres such as Toronto, it will be very difficult to obtain staff, and for this reason it may be some time until such a unit gets operating.

I mention this to show that we are trying to remedy some of the problems, but of course, this does not solve our problem about Terry. This has been a long and sometimes involved letter in which all I state is the fact that I regret that I have come up with no answers for Terry.

I hope that your efforts meet success; I would appreciate being informed of any such developments and trust that you will write if you require further information, and so on. In the meantime, I will try to think of some other possibility.

Needless to say, Mr. Chairman, despite the most energetic efforts on the part of this very eminent and reputable child psychiatrist, nothing was available in the province of Ontario. The parents, of course, have been unable to find anything and Terry is now at home, along with thousands upon thousands of other disturbed children for whom there is no recourse in this society.

Let me just summarize for the hon. Minister the content of this letter; what, in effect it says: No provisions for such a child in the regular school system; no provisions for such a child at the Ontario school for the deaf; no residential treatment centre facility available, either because of cost or waiting lists; no help from the children's aid society; no viable financing under The Department of Public Welfare's child welfare branch; nothing through the special services branch of The Department of Education; nothing in the general hospital in the area; and nothing available in the Kingston Ontario Hospital.

What better résumé of the existing services for disturbed children across the province could possibly be made, and what better catalogue of failure could possibly be put on paper? It is an indescribable thing, the number of calls that are received and letters that are written from parents in identical situations. There must be thousands of such parents—we know that—across the province, and we wait while the time passes.

The interesting thing about this case is that it has two peculiar clinical ingredients. It concerns a primarily deaf child with attendant emotional problems.

Slightly more than a year ago, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* and all of Ontario picked up the case of "Jamie" who had two peculiar clinical symptoms—a deaf child with attendant emotional difficulty. What I am saying, very simply, is that an entire year has passed and we have not moved one solitary inch in the area of emotionally disturbed children—not an inch! We have not come, in any sense, to meeting the incredible problem of providing the beds and residential treatment centres, the special classes in the schools, the special units in reform institutions and all the related agencies. An entire year, and we have gone nowhere!

The hon. Minister is doubtless relatively pleased; the public apprehension subsides; it only stirs from time to time; the pressures abate; the select committee takes up the slack. As we move around the province from city to city and town to town, hearing the feelings of desperation and inadequacy on the part of social planning council groups, social welfare groups and parents as they express their complete incomprehension of government policy, we get a promise about an interdepartmental committee, and then we get another report, and now we have been told that we may not even receive the report this session.

The forgotten generation will lie on the shoulders of the Minister long after he has moved out of this department. The greatest crime of all—well over and above the neglect—is that there are two fairly simple and straightforward answers now available, and the refusal of the government to do anything about them is a complete abdication of conscience.

One is quite straightforward. There are residential treatment centres in this province now of very high quality—half a dozen or more—under The Children's Institutions Act. They have resident psychiatrists and they have resident research workers and they have resident psychologists and they have an absolutely phenomenal staff-patient ratio. In some of them, like Warrendale, it is better than one to one.

There is no reason in the world why they could not be considered medically equipped institutions to be covered by Ontario hospital services. If the hon. Minister is not prepared to cover them by Ontario hospital insurance because of some completely unacceptable rationale about federal participation—after all, that rationale was suspended when the hon. Minister wanted to finance certain beds in nursing homes; that rationale was suspended when he wanted to finance a home care programme in Metro and the OHSC did it. If the hon. Minister falls back on that totally unjustifiable excuse, then it is within the finance wherewithal of The Department of Health to make the moneys available to such residential treatment centres to expand.

As the hon. Minister knows, for a variety of reasons I have been closely in touch with those treatment centres for the last couple of years. Let me assure him that they would do a job tomorrow if they were given the money. They are confident of finding the staff and they are medically qualified. No one can say that they are not, because no one has ever looked at them from a medical point of view. They have been dismissed with contempt and scorn when it has been raised—completely unjustifiably, I might add. These residential treatment centres could expand and at least bring into their ken the most extreme cases now deposited in the wasteland of society because of a lack of facilities.

This is a fairly simple procedure; it is not so complicated. As I say, the department could do it or the Ontario hospital services could do it. The children's institutions are there and they are already authorized by the province; they simply have to be given a little assistance.

One of the things that worries me is the attitude of the medical profession—the suggestion that maybe these institutions are not sufficiently medically oriented. But no one ever takes a look at them and the only two institutions that have received repute across the province from the government are Thistletown hospital and Boys' village.

As it happens, I disagree with the treatment orientation at Thistletown and with the treatment orientation at Boys' village, but I would stand in my place and beg, hour after hour, that those institutions and others like them multiply and proliferate across the province of Ontario, because the problem now is not a question of the methodology and treatment; the problem is experimenting with every conceivable treatment process and providing the residential treatment centres to do so.

We need not hold up their dependency on The Department of Health to meet certain categories and attitudes before we will allow a certain treatment centre into the privileged circle of handling disturbed children. It is an absurd philosophy not to allow them to develop, particularly when many of them—Warrendale, the Ottawa Protestant children's village, Sunnyside centre in Kingston, Merryvale in Windsor—have shown an astonishingly excellent success rate with severely disturbed children.

All they need is Ontario hospital coverage or government grants and not only would they expand to include more, but individual families could have coverage and you would not have this kind of incredible letter from leading child psychiatrists in the province.

The second thing about this whole crisis of emotionally disturbed children which I want to raise, because I think it is relevant, is that in this field, like many of the others, the manpower could be made available if the

Minister of Health and the Minister of Public Welfare were prepared to move this month with the financial grants. What we are talking about here, primarily, is courses for child care workers. All of these institutions are prepared to train people and have no hesitancy about finding the numbers providing they have the money for such training. So would the children's aid societies, so would the various welfare councils, and so would Thistletown and Boys' village expand if the money was forthcoming for major courses for child care workers.

In this area, even the staffing problem could be solved if the government felt strongly about it. Indeed, while on the subject, I think it is worth pointing out that in this area as no other there is a role for the volunteer. The most exciting successes in the field of disturbed children that have been achieved in the United States, like the "teacher-mom" experiment in Almont county in New York, have derived from the participation of volunteers—usually mothers in their own home who are willing to spend half an hour a day in an educational system or in a treatment centre.

The only thing that can possibly stand in the way of a fulfilment of this kind of plan and a collapse of the entire situation is initiative of government. And initiative of government has stood still for yet another year, an entire year, after the astonishing and frightening and unhappy facts came to light.

I say to the hon. Minister that I do not know what it takes to jolt him. I do not know what his problems are with the Treasury board. I do not know what the incredible difficulties behind the scenes may be. But I plead with him to persuade his colleagues to give him the funds to provide the interim solutions because they permit of solution.

They can be achieved; and it is heartbreaking, abhorrent and morally inexcusable that thousands of children should be assigned to a lost generation as we sit chattering about the problem, and debating it year after year in the provincial Legislature, basically untouched ourselves.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow up on this question of having no proper provision for disturbed children because there is a great tendency for a disturbed child to end up in a hospital school for retarded children, or in a training school under The Department of Reform Institutions. This results completely because we do not have the facilities—first, to detect disturbed children properly and, second, when they are known to be disturbed, neither really criminals nor retarded, there is no place in which to put them to give them training. Or, if there is such a place, they are so few, the demand is so great, and so expensive for most people, that you may in essence say: For the vast majority of disturbed children in the province of Ontario there are no facilities.

We know that the greatest lack in this particular field of disturbed children is the lack of residential treatment for emotionally disturbed children. At present there are only 75 hospital beds—that is, 65 at Thistletown and about ten set aside at the Ontario Hospital at Smiths Falls for the long-term treatment of emotionally disturbed children. It has been estimated—I believe it was estimated by the director of the Warrendale school—that there were only facilities to treat about 300 children in such places as the Warrendale school, and Merryvale and Sunnyside, and the Protestant Boys' village at Ottawa. The two others, I believe, are the Boys' village in Toronto, and New Haven in Cornwall.

They supply facilities for about 300 children here in the province of Ontario and we have approximately 75 beds for bed treatment. As a result, and I hope it is an extreme estimate, we are told that there are 150,000 disturbed children in the province of Ontario. I hope that is high. It seems high to me but it is obvious, even if it were much lower than that, and even if we were to be overly optimistic, we still are not coming close to doing what is needed.

In Toronto, to get any type of treatment, either for an adult or a child, there are three main places they go to. They go to the men's Toronto psychiatric clinic, the sick children's clinic, and the Toronto mental health clinic. I called at the Toronto mental health clinic a few years ago, and at that time, they told me it would take nearly three months to even get an appointment. Even today the situation has not changed, because with these three institutions they have extremely long waiting lists. It can take up to three months just to get an examination, particularly at the mental health clinic. Their principal problem is shortage of staff and, I might add also, it is a shortage of space.

The creating of a task force—I asked them what would be the solution, or in part the solution, either dealing with disturbed children or disturbed adults, but in this particular instance it had to do with disturbed

children—the creation of a task force of psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers to tour the province, similar to the one in operation in British Columbia, would appear to be the only way to handle emotionally disturbed children in smaller communities. The University of Toronto's school of social work now assigns students to summer projects, but this is designed mainly for their benefit rather than for the benefit of the community.

I know that the hon. Minister has a serious problem in this area. We cannot expect him to solve everything, but what is happening is that he is making no real effort. We hear no overall policy, no plan, of what he is trying to do to meet this very serious problem. We know that they are doing something in British Columbia, at least making a start, and thank goodness there are, here in the province of Ontario, at least two places where we can look for some hope and some guidance.

Ontario institute for studies and education has an applied psychology division which is doing good work. And also the University of Waterloo, I believe, has a postgraduate system where the graduates spend half their year out in the field working with disturbed children and the other half in the university. This is the type of thing the government needs to encourage and we have had little or no indication of what is being done. No matter what steps Thistletown has made, and it may be debatable as to what is good and what is bad, at least they are trying and they are steps forward.

I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, from what information I have received, that there are a number of children in the Orillia hospital school who are emotionally disturbed, but are also functioning as mental defectives. We do not know how many people who are listed as mentally defective were, in fact, only emotionally disturbed. If this is true, it shows that, in the long run, by our penny-pinching, we are being very short-sighted. Also, in the long run, it is going to cost us a great deal of money. If we have, and I am quite sure we have, emotionally disturbed children in Orillia, then we are really condemning children who are going to be in institutions nearly all their lives.

It is well known, in the vast majority of cases where you can get to and assist an emotionally disturbed child at the beginning of its illness, or near the beginning of its illness, they can be rehabilitated almost 100 per cent and be back working in the community. It is far better to have these people out working and paying taxes than having them institutionalized for the rest of their lives.

Just as a final word on this, and to show it still goes on, back in March of this year, appearing in the London juvenile court there was a boy who was committed to a training school and he was considered emotionally disturbed. The judge did not want to send him to a training school, the psychiatrist working on the case did not want to send him to a training school, and the children's aid did not want to send him to a training school, but he had run away a number of times and they had no place to put him. So he ended up in a training school. And one of the officials on the case said, and he was quoted in the paper, "What we need is a hospital for disturbed boys."

We hear and read of these cases, literally now month in and month out. It seems, as we become more urbanized, as we get these large cities, we have more and more problems with disturbed children. But here was a case in London, Ontario, of a boy 14, who is now in training school, where he certainly would not get the care he would get in Warrendale—but a place like Warrendale is $15 to $20 a day, and the children's aid society normally cannot pay those fees, nor can the average family afford $15 a day to $20 a day. So, as a result, he is in a training school. Probably he is lucky he is not in Orillia.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): We get some of them back from Warrendale; you know that, do you not?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, that is true. But the difficulty is, in dealing with this type of problem, that there is no system of really trying to decide when somebody should be treated more as a criminal or more as disturbed. This problem of trying to centralize, and put them through some kind of a strainer or inspection, to see where the wheat can be separated from the chaff—this we do not have. This we know: There are many children who should not be in training schools, who should not be in Orillia, who should be in a hospital for disturbed children.

And again, as in putting up buildings or anything, or getting staff, we do not seem to have an overall goal, any overall plans. We here, in the Opposition, are not expecting Utopia all at once; but we are expecting to see progress made from month to month, and from year to year, and this we are not

seeing. The waiting list at the mental health clinic in Toronto is as long as it was three years ago when I called to check, and this is the record of this Tory government in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 713 carried?

Mr. Trotter: No, Mr. Chairman. I would like to get from the Minister some idea of what he considers a proper course for rehabilitation. I will try to stick, for example, to the hospital at Aurora—what does he consider a proper course for rehabilitating the patients to return to civilian life? Have you any overall scheme or plan, what you consider proper rehabilitation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, first of all I think it is ridiculous to speak of rehabilitation in respect to the mentally retarded. They have never been rehabilitated, and this is what we try to do in so far as is possible. And again I repeat, this is a professional judgment. If the professional staff develop a programme, as they have the right and a responsibility to do, the department will support them in their efforts.

I believe programming is directed along several lines. Our new activity development programme is going on at Aurora, and new knowledge is being gained by the people who are working with the retarded—even some of the quite severely retarded. They are learning new methods, new procedures, new techniques for dealing with them and rehabilitating them, but I would be very loath to leave you, sir, or any member in this House, under the impression that I am optimistic that many of these young people can ever be returned to the community as self-supporting.

I think the hon. member himself pointed out—and again I believe I have got his statement right this time—that only 25 out of every 250 would ever be able to return to the community. That is ten per cent. Of course, ten per cent is better than none; but how near to being self-supporting they will ever be, in spite of any efforts to habilitate them, it is quite impossible for me to say.

Again I repeat, in summary, sir, that whatever programmes of habilitation and rehabilitation the professional staff, in concert with those who are still in other disciplines and capable of helping in this area, may develop for them, the department will support them in those efforts.

Mr. Trotter: This is what I am getting at. My understanding is that at Aurora there could be 25 patients; that it is quite possible for them to be returned to the community. There are another 25 who could, it is quite possible, with some supervision, go out and work during the day. So these are, strictly, 50 patients who, there is a reasonable amount of hope, have some type of training.

I am also given to understand that if this type of person is encouraged—and, let us say, even if they are doing some type of work; they were at Aurora, for example, putting in cellophane bags the different scrapers that the housewife uses, and these would be on the market—this would be a useful bit of work. It is relatively easy to do, but it was something. Now this type of work is encouraged.

I am particularly interested in this, Mr. Chairman, because when I have been to these hospitals, either for adults or for retarded children—or, in the cases of the older people there are many items in my home that I have purchased, and I know that they can do some work. In fact, some of it is good work and probably all of it done under supervision. But is there any provision that these people who work in your workshops or work centres receive pay? Now, I ask this question for this reason. I asked the staff when I was at Aurora and they were rather hazy as to whether these people were receiving any money. It is said that if you encourage these people, and even give them a small amount of pay, this gives them some independence. This is important, particularly with the 25 for whom you may have some hope of turning back into the community.

Now, when I was asking if they got any money, they said "yes," and I said, "How much?" and the whole answer was rather hazy. I said, "Well maybe $5 a month," and the answer was "Yes." The whole thing could be hazy. I did not know if there was any overall scheme where those people who were capable in the long run of going back into their community were given any encouragement in this line, were given any pay.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes they are, Mr. Chairman. These jobs that they do are all sub-contracts which the hospital gets. This is part of the programme and there are many different kinds of things. These are gotten at competitive rates, there is no undercutting, and it is my understanding that the hospital does not bid on a job any lower than anybody else would bid on it. It may take them longer to perform it, but the aggregate return for the job is equal to what any other contractor, or sub-contractor would tender for it.

All of the income from this is divided among the employees. Now to say how much each one would get, of course, would be quite impossible for me, because again this is given to them on the basis of the work they perform. Just as the normal worker, working a full eight-hour day would earn more than the one working three or four or five hours, so it is with our patients. The pay, or the income, is divided according to the extent of the productivity, and this all goes back to them in the pin money account.

Now, if there is any pin money in their account, when any one of them is sent back to the community this is given to him, not likely directly, but in trust to someone who is charged with the responsibility of looking after him.

This, Mr. Chairman, is in very brief detail the story of the industrial therapy programmes which are growing, not only in number, but in extent, to embrace more and more. And this is the sort of thing I referred to very briefly in my remarks. The division of mental health and the department division of rehabilitation are very anxious and very actively seeking to promote this sort of thing, and the time, I would suggest, is not too far distant when our patients will be in competition with normal people in various lines of endeavour.

Mr. Trotter: I have seen other places where this rehabilitation work — maybe I should not call it rehabilitation, but "attempt to habilitate" perhaps would be the proper wording of it—was being done and I know many of them can do good work, not just for those who have been senile because of old age.

Now, I happened to be at Cedar Springs on the day they were having a sale, so I know that many of these patients can do good work and they can be put on the market so that there is something to encourage them. We see the beginnings of it at Aurora and I am grateful that the steps are taken. Those of us who will perhaps go back every once in a while to see what is going on will be interested to know how this programme improves.

One other item is the education of the children in hospital schools.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The thirtieth order.

LIABILITY ON PARENTS

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre) moves second reading of Bill 16, An Act to impose liability on parents for damages caused by the tortious acts of their children.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, in introducing Bill 16, I do so because I feel it is at least an attempt to curb a problem that is increasing and plaguing most, if not all, of our school boards, councils, and parks and recreation boards throughout the province.

I spent seven years on the Scarborough board of education and attended many of the conventions during those years of the Ontario urban and rural school trustees association, the Ontario public school trustees association, the Ontario school trustees and ratepayers association and the Ontario secondary school trustees association, for which I was a member of the board of directors. One theme that constantly recurred at these annual meetings, one resolution that came up time after time, one concern of the various boards, was the constantly increasing incidence of vandalism, the cost of broken windows and of break-ins at the schools, and the damage done by young vandals once they had broken into the schools.

The city of Toronto last year spent $85,000 on broken windows alone. The township of Scarborough spent $58,000. I could go on at great length and quote chapter and verse of the various boards, not only in Metropolitan Toronto but across the length and breadth of our province, who are finding this a serious problem.

I do not feel that a bill such as this is by any means the only answer to this serious problem. It may perhaps be only a minor means to this end, but there is a public demand for legislation to make parents liable at least to some degree for such acts on the part of their children. Indeed, the bulk of the response that I have had to the press reports on this bill, is that it does not go far enough, that $100 is not enough of a penalty, that $500 is a more realistic figure to ensure that parents will take at least some responsibility to see that

their offspring are not out breaking windows of schools or other public buildings or committing various other acts, Mr. Speaker, that are so costly a charge to the taxpayer and public.

Several other jurisdictions have enacted similar legislation. The state of California has legislation similar to this on its books and in 1962 the state of Michigan enacted a similar statute with a $500 maximum penalty clause. In questioning the officials in Michigan during a trip there by the select committee on youth, I was assured that the Act had been a decided deterrent and was responsible for a noticeable decrease in vandalism in that state.

There are various other jurisdictions that do have similar legislation. So if this legislation does pass, it will not be unique.

As I mentioned, there is a public demand for it and I would like to quote from a few papers and editorials on this very matter. One item here is, "Vandalism continues to be a problem in Metro schools." This was a clipping from last year:

> Troublemakers last night broke into the J. G. Workman public school on Birchmount road and caused $1,500 damage. The culprits fled after breaking a window to get into the art room, strewing books and paints, ransacking drawers and flooding the room by plugging a drain.

There is an editorial here from one of the Scarborough weekly papers—and we have been plagued by vandalism in Scarborough. It goes on to say:

> How long must we endure senseless breaking up of our schools by vandals? We had another example of school damage this past weekend in Scarborough when parties unknown broke into the Precious Blood separate school on Pharmacy avenue.
>
> After creating havoc in classrooms on the first floor by wrecking the contents of these rooms, the culprits went up to the second floor of the school. There a fire was started in a sports equipment storage room which resulted in $2,800 damage to the school and contents.
>
> The next step will be that the police will find and arrest the culprits or culprit, and if they are young, they will be fined the sum of $50 after a severe lecture by the judge, and so the case will be closed. The Precious Blood school case will be closed, but there will be another case in another location again in a few weeks or months.
>
> School vandalism in Scarborough was so serious that this past summer the board of education was forced to create a mobile group of their employees to tour schools in the evenings in order to stave off school damage. When is our society going to take needed action to stop vandalism?
>
> A step that could be taken is to follow the action of the state of Michigan a few years ago. The American state had problems like this and the state created a law whereby a minor's parents would be financially responsible in the event that their offspring were found to be guilty of vandalism. This was all, and that was sufficient.
>
> In the space of two years, malicious damage by minors fell to the near zero mark. When parents had to pay for slashed theatre seats and broken-up schools it was amazing how well-behaved Michigan kids became and how fast Michigan kids found out that it was smart to respect other people's property.
>
> Imagine, if you will, the reaction of the young people in the community in the case of the Precious Blood separate school if the parents of the individuals who did the damage had to pay the $2,800 repair bill. We are assuming that the school damage was done by minors. The kids concerned would not be able to sit down for a month and the parents would have to go without a new car this year.
>
> This is what is needed. Legislation of this type cannot be created by civic or school authorities. Action has to be taken at the provincial and federal levels.

Another clipping I have here from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of last fall says:

> Vandalism cost the board of education $86,000 a year. It can be assumed that most of the damage to the schools, broken windows, paint smeared on buildings, is the work of students themselves.
>
> Unfortunately, there are now no laws which demand payment from parents under these circumstances. But there should be such laws enacted immediately. They would provide compensation to the board of education and the taxpayers from the mothers and fathers of rock-throwing, paint-smearing hoodlums.

Another editorial appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star*. I will not read the entire edi-

torial, but there are a few things here that I think are very pertinent:

> Vandalism is not behaviour that has to be tolerated as adolescent high spirits out of control. It is malicious damage to public property, usually by pupils or ex-pupils of the school, and should be dealt with firmly.
>
> Oakville has had a rash of such vandalism, the latest incident being two fires set in a separate school there Sunday night. The week before, hooligans in Gosford public school in North York caused $3,000 worth of damage and so much havoc that the school had to be closed for a day. On the first of the month Sault Ste. Marie classrooms were sprayed with fire extinguishers, desks dumped, record players smashed.
>
> All told, last year the senior boards of Metro's four largest municipalities had to pay $212,000 to replace windows wilfully broken, and throughout the year numerous schools in Metro were maliciously ransacked at further public cost. Parents in such cases have a lot to answer for and the Ontario school trustees council proposes to make them more answerable than they are now.
>
> Last month the council asked Education Minister Davis to sponsor legislation holding parents responsible for their children's wanton destruction of school property. Mr. Davis should consider introducing such legislation at the next session of the Legislature.
>
> Some school vandalism is obviously the action of emotionally disturbed pupils whom the school should be able to identify before they get out of hand and arrange for psychiatric help. But in more cases it is a matter of parental laxity and juveniles running amuck out of unbridled spite. If the law is altered so that their pocketbook feels the effect, parents may be prodded into taking more responsibility for their children's behaviour.

Another article I have here about North York concerns that same case in Gosford public school of last Christmas:

> The North York school board today ordered Gosford public school to be closed following the worst outbreak of vandalism in the town's history. When teachers arrived this morning they found every room in the 473-pupil school littered with textbooks, dark blue duplicator ink and water—

and so on. I could go down and read the whole item; it is the same time and time again.

There is also another item from last fall in which the Ontario school trustees council asked the hon. Minister of Education to bring in such legislation.

> P. M. Muir, executive director of the Ontario school trustees council, will ask Mr. Davis for legislation requiring parents to be responsible for the wilful acts of their children when they result in damage to school property. Mr. Muir said that reports from more than 30 per cent of Ontario's 1,300 school boards showed a much heavier toll of vandalism in the large urban areas where the costs are going up fantastically. Douglas Henderson, assistant business administrator of the Etobicoke board of education said a single act of vandalism cost the board $5,000 last year when a youth turned a water hose on school office records. York township last year paid $500 to replace the glass in June in one school. Total cost to the township was $6,000. North York has replaced 5,545 windows this year in 128 schools, and so on and so on.

These are but a few of the many press reports and editorials that appear almost daily, and I could easily use up all my time tonight reading them, but I feel that I have made a very decided point—that the public are disturbed about the situation and wish action to be taken on it.

I mentioned earlier that this bill is not a panacea for curing vandalism; that there are other causes we can look to. To society itself, our educational system and other factors outside the child's home environment may be the cause. Emotional disturbance left too long untreated is undoubtedly the root of much of this problem. But in attempting to do some research in vandalism, I find that there are very few authorities who really do know the causes of such behaviour.

Dr. Nathan Goldman of Syracuse University completed a two-year vandalism study under the auspices of the federal office of Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He found in his study that much of the cause of vandalism lies in a poor identification of the school group with their school and with their teaching staff. This, in turn, is caused by a rapid turnover of staff, so that students find it very difficult to establish a rapport with their teachers and administrators. The attitude of the parents towards the school is also a most important

factor, and Dr. Goldman named six signposts in the school and community that point to high property damage.

These six signposts, as he found in his two-year study, are:

(1) Disassociation of school staff, students, and parents from the school; (2) poor relationship among students, school staff and parents; (3) inadequate school administration and leadership; (4) rapid or extensive change in the school programme, population and staff; (5) student and school staff dissatisfaction with school administration; and (6) community instability coupled with neighborhood deterioration.

He goes on to say that probably no one school either possesses all these unfortunate characteristics, or is free from them all, but in those school systems where they overshadow wholesome conditions, we may well find fertile soil for the growth of vandalism.

Of the six signposts of vandalism, Dr. Goldman singled out disassociaton from the school as the factor most closely related to high school property damage. When members of the school group feel a sense of belonging to the school, and when they feel that the school belongs to them, morale tends to be high and damage low. But where there is little sense of belonging you can expect to find a greater amount of property damage. Boredom was the reason for vandalism most often cited by teachers and students in high damage school. This points up to a lack of student interest in the school. Dr. Goldman made the statement that:

> Many millions of dollars are spent annually throughout the country repairing the wanton damage done to schools by vandalism. More than hurting the community in terms of expense, school vandalism also interferes with the education process and may also present certain health and psychological hazards to students.
>
> Teachers and parents, as well as students, tend to alienate themselves from high damage schools. Indications of this were reports by students in these schools that the teachers were casual, and reports by both teachers and students that the parents were either disinterested or unfavourable. Where school personnel were able to establish a good relationship with students and their parents and communicate to them respect for property, damage was low.
>
> A good relationship among students, teachers, parents, principals and custodians was much more characteristic of low damage than high damage schools.

Parental indifferences, according to Dr. Goldman, are not the only cause of juvenile vandalism, although he points out that in those areas where parents do have a pleasant relationship with the school and the community, vandalism is not so great as in those areas where there is an indifference. And these feelings are transmitted to the youngsters. If the parents show no interest in the school and the community, it is likely that their children will feel the same way and feel no pride in the public institutions and parks in their community, and thus sow the seeds that lead to the vandalism that is such a great distress to all of us.

In the *Globe and Mail* on January 21, 1966, David Spurgeon had a very excellent article on vandalism, called "What breeds the urge for destruction?" I would just like to read a paragraph or two from this article:

> When David McEwen, the caretaker, entered Gosford public school in Downsview at 7.30 a.m., on the Monday before Christmas he found guineapigs and rabbits running throughout corridors and classrooms. Dead goldfish from smashed aquariums lay on the floor. Books were strewn all over the library floor. Potted plants had been smashed and dirt mixed with the ink and glue and spread about wildly. Paint was smeared over classrooms walls, floors and ceilings. Obscene pictures were scrawled on the walls. Glue, ink and grease were smeared on a piano keyboard.
>
> When the police came, an inspector called it the worst case of vandalism he had seen in 20 years of police experience. Classes had to be cancelled for the day, and it took a 15-man maintenance staff more than 14 hours to clean it up.

And this was caused, Mr. Speaker, as it was found out later, by 13- and 14-year-old youngsters.

Early in November, vandals toppled more than 100 headstones at St. John's Norway cemetery at Woodbine avenue and Kingston road.

A few days earlier, the Toronto board of education's management committee found that the broken windows in schools cost $800,000 during the previous year; break-ins, $4,000; and other acts of vandalism, such as defacing buildings, another $2,000.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): $800,000?

Mr. Peck: $80,000—I am sorry. So the record goes month after month, year after year. Newspaper clipping files report vandals daubing the paint and mud on the

John Kennedy memorial in England; spraying paint on treasures in Canterbury cathedral; beating a swan to death in a Halifax park; and so on.

Curiously, youth experts, social workers and others in close contact with youngsters do not seem to know why. Few want to venture generalizations, and relatively little is found in the literature on this particular subject.

"I think we understand this less," says Dr. Tadeusz Grygier, professor in the University of Toronto school of social work. "Usually one understands causes by seeing what the activity is associated with. For example, extreme poverty and certain types of crime. But with vandalism there just are not any definite relationships between it and anything else."

I do not think we can generalize as Judge Lorne Stewart of metropolitan juvenile and family court, and I do not have the answer as Inspector Ralph Boot of the Metro police department, but in this same article, Inspector Boot of Metro's youth bureau claims that youngsters seldom damage their own property because their parents would not stand for it.

The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to point out to these youngsters that in damaging public property, it is their own property that they are damaging.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Will it come to a vote?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): We would like to get a vote on that.

Mr. Peck: We will find out in time.

The parents are liable to pay for it and it becomes a more personal affair. If a youngster knows that his parents will have to pay for broken windows, he is likely to hesitate before breaking them, and the parents themselves will take a firm stand to ensure that their youngsters are not destroying public property and subsequently a charge on their pocketbook or bank account.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The government is not interested in what the hon. member is saying; there are only two Ministers present.

Mr. Peck: I will send everybody a copy of the *Hansard*, including all the people in Scarborough. They are all interested in it.

Mr. Speaker, since the first reading of this bill, I have had a great many letters, telephone calls, letters from various public bodies, and there have been many editorials about this. I will not go into private letters but I think there are a few items on the editorial page that support this. From the Hamilton *Spectator*, I quote:

> A private member's bill placed before the Ontario Legislature by George H. Peck would make parents responsible up to a $100 limit for acts of vandalism to public property committed by their children. It is an appealing idea, but it must be considered carefully.

Another editorial I have here is called "Peck Bill"—I thought that was very interesting. Shall I read all of this or just a paragraph? Shall I read the whole thing? Time is getting a little short and I—

Some hon. members: Read it!

Mr. Peck: I will just read part of it:

> We are pleased to note that George H. Peck, member of the provincial Parliament for Scarborough Centre, has introduced a private member's bill that would require parents to pay for a portion of moneys lost caused by their children in cases of public building vandalism.
>
> Many thousands of dollars are lost each year by taxpayers when young apes break into schools and other buildings to go on a rampage of destruction. We have had several instances of this in the past few months right here in Scarborough—

I forgot to mention that this is a Scarborough paper.

> The result of all this is that Mr. Taxpayer has to pay to clean up and paint up classrooms that have been damaged. It cost $2,800 to repair a school on Pharmacy avenue that was hit, and this $2,800 of tax dollars could have been well spent in other directions.

An editorial in the *Telegram* titled, "Make Parents Pay," is very much along the same line, and points out that in Metro Toronto a total of approximately $212,000 is spent every year to repair damage, broken windows and various other things caused by the vandalism of children.

The board of education for the city of Toronto dropped me a line signed by Graham Gordon, director of education, and one paragraph of it reads:

> The board decided to appoint a delegation to present a brief to the Ontario government in support of legislation to make parents responsible in law for damage caused by their children and it is expected that the brief will be presented in the near future.

In the township of Scarborough, the recreation and the parks commission and the council said:

> The commission and the council have expressed approval to the principle of such a bill with the hope that by imposing a degree of financial liability on the parents or guardians of children found to have committed such acts of vandalism, the result will be a decrease in their frequency. The suggestion is made, however, that the proposed limitation of liability of $100 for each such act is low and that such figure be increased to a more realistic amount of $500.

The Ontario arenas association said at its annual meeting:

> At a general meeting of the Ontario arenas association incorporated at Peterborough on Wednesday, February 16, a motion was passed supporting your proposed vandal bill.

The Ontario school trustees and ratepayers association secretary, Miss Jean Watson dropped a line and said:

> You have, of course, the support of this association in your attempt to curb the rising incidence of vandalism on school property.
>
> There is a little place called Tavistock in Oxford county, and when I was in the school there some years ago there were notices above the classroom doors which informed the children that their parents would be held responsible for any damage incurred by them.
>
> As a result, over a period of 20 years only one desk has been marked, and that, slightly. The school board there and the teachers were aware that their position was not legally tenable but they made it stick anyway.

The Ontario parks association wrote:

> Dear Mr. Peck:
>
> Vandalism in parks, cemeteries and other publicly owned property has been of grave concern to the Ontario parks association for a number of years. This association, which is composed largely of elected and appointed personnel, the local parks authority, as well as staff members, at a general meeting held in Guelph on March 12 went on record endorsing the provision of Bill 16, An Act to impose liability on parents for damages caused by the tortious acts of their children, which was given first reading on February 12.

The board of education for the township of North York wrote—and perhaps the hon. member for Downsview might be interested in this:

> Losses caused by vandalism have been a matter of great concern to our trustees and staff, and resolutions were passed previously by our board on the subject of parents' responsibility for the acts of their children. These regulations were forwarded to the Minister of Education and the Attorney General for their consideration and also the various trustee organizations for their endorsation.
>
> The board of education therefore went on record at this meeting in support of this bill and in this connection decided to submit the following suggestion to you for your consideration: That the maximum liability of parents be increased from $100 to $500; that the provision of the legislation be extended to include all property, in addition to public property; that a copy of the bill be forwarded to the various trustee organizations requesting their support.

Another communication from the board of education in Oshawa, and I quote just one paragraph from it:

> In summing up, I think if the proposed legislation were to admit to this specified amount and allow it to read that parents be responsible for any wilful damage committed by their children, the legislation would be effective in curbing damages to public property.

It is apparent that juvenile vandalism is a serious problem to many of our public bodies, an expense to the taxpayer, a problem that is constantly increasing, and a problem that the people of Ontario feel we should take a look at and make some attempt to resolve.

While this bill is by no means the only answer to the problem, it will go a long way toward decreasing juvenile vandalism and be some relief to the overburdened municipal taxpayer, because this thing is coming in day after day. Just this week there is a little article in the paper about Scarborough:

> For the third week in succession a Scarborough school has been damaged. During the weekend teenage vandals broke many of the mirrors and japonica in our Lady of Wisdom school. This is the third time this school has been damaged this year.

Of the phone calls and letters from all over the province which I have received since moving first reading of this bill, 100 per cent are in favour of the principle, if not in

favour of the penalty. I feel that this bill should have the approval of this House.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were expressing grave concern about the physical health of our children. Today we are asked to brand them as criminals. Yesterday we were discussing human rights and free enterprise and today it appears that we are prepared to introduce a new concept to our law—vicarious liability. Yesterday, I listened to a discussion of venereal diseases and gonorrhea—which I can only define as "clap trap." Today I listened to the hon. member reading a lot of editorials and statements from school trustees and what have you. Those I can only describe as "infantile paralysis."

I was so perturbed to listen to those fantastic amounts that were mentioned by the member. What a disgrace it is that there is so much damage being caused. The only thing that disturbed me is that while I was waiting for five o'clock to roll by, I was going through some documents here, checking on some contracts for road construction, to which this government had contributed 50 per cent. On one stretch alone, the people of this province were beaten for $300,000, which would cover all the damages that the hon. member mentioned.

The hon. member did not mention the money being spent by those school trustees on carpets, on swimming pools, on parking lots for the teachers, on all these special projects for projectors and electronic equipment—some of it seldom used—and how much money goes down the drain on that. He did not mention that at all. He said that would offend the teachers and the trustees and everybody knows that our educational system is sacrosanct. He did not mention the money spent on those beautiful temples of learning—architectural dreams that have nothing in them at all in the way of developing good citizenship.

If the schools were doing their job, we would not be hearing all this drivel that we are hearing here today. There is no doubt in my mind, and I doubt whether this is not the situation with every hon. member here, that vandalism of children does cause damage to public property, but good gracious, it causes damage to private property also, and I dare say, hundreds and thousands times more damage to private property, than just to public property.

If the principle of this bill is acceptable to this House, that parents should be vicariously liable—that is without any responsibility whatever for the act—for the damages caused by their children to public property, why in heaven's name does not the member extend that same principle to cover all property, and make the parents liable for everything the child does?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Your front bench is ignoring you.

Mr. Ben: Well, at least we have a front bench, which is more than I can say about the government side.

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Ben: Now, why is the responsibility of parents for damage caused by their children restricted in the bill to the use of the words "jointly and severally liable"? Does this made a parent liable for the vandalism of children, even though they are under the age of seven years? Is this what the bill purports to do? There is no definition of the word child in my friend's bill here. There is no definition of the word child. Now, section 13 of The Criminal Code reads that no person shall be convicted of an offence in respect of an act or omission on his part while he was seven years of age or more. But under the—sorry, I am reading a second section. Sorry. This is the second section.

Now, the bill speaks of a child. But what is the definition of a child? Section 12 of the Criminal Code says that no person shall be convicted of an offence in respect of an act or omission on his part while he was under the age of seven years. Now, does this bill purport to overrule the section of the Criminal Code? If so, I suggest it is ultra vires. Or is the intention of this bill, through the use of the words "jointly and severally liable," to make a parent liable for damage caused by a child, even though the child is under the age of seven years? Is that what this bill purports to do?

Now, section 13 of the code reads that no person shall be convicted of an offence in respect of an act or omission on his part while he was seven years of age or more, but under the age of 14 years, unless he was competent to know the nature and consequences of his conduct and to appreciate that it was wrong.

How would this bill be applied to the parents of those children, who, when they committed a tortious act against the sacred

property of the government, were not competent to know the nature and consequences of their conduct, nor appreciative that their conduct, was wrong? Are those parents also going to be held liable? Is this the type of system that this government is prepared to introduce?

Let us say, for sake of argument, that this particular bill presents no danger in that particular regard. Just for the sake of argument, let us assume that the parents will not be punished for tortious acts where the children committing such acts did not know them to be wrong. Let us just take another example.

Some ten-year-olds are playing in the school yard, of the school that was described by the hon. member, and a brick goes through one of those crystals the board of education is using these days for window panes. A teacher comes running out and catches the boys, but they all point their finger at a seven-year-old who is standing by innocently. Now, who is going to pay for the damage when they get to a court?

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): They are not under the custody and care of their parents at that time.

Mr. Ben: We are getting to that. I will try to keep it short, so perhaps you will have an opportunity to interject.

What happens in such a situation, when they all point the finger at this seven-year-old? Will the court, or whoever is going to adjudicate on this matter, accept a plea of innocence of this seven-year-old, as against the statement of two or three ten-year-olds? And how about the lad, who out of loyalty to a gang, refuses to tell who did do the act complained of, he being innocent? You know it is called squealing and it is against the rules of the gang. How would you feel if you were the parent of that lad, and knowing that he was innocent—but that he would not put the finger on the real culprit—and you had to pay out of your pocket? That is justice, too; or at least it is Tory justice. I should not say it is justice.

Now, the hon. member over there talked about "in care or custody." All right, let us discuss that. It speaks of parents in the Act, and it describes a parent as being a guardian. So what will happen if a child has a guardian? Will that guardian have the right to be indemnified by the parent for moneys paid out by him for damage caused by that child? The Act does not say. And what if the child in question is the ward of the children's aid, and in a foster home? Does the word guardian or parent include a foster parent, and if it does, and this foster parent has to pay for the damage caused by a ward of the children's aid in his custody, will the children's aid indemnify him? Or would he have to pay out of his pocket?

Now, if you believe in vicarious liability, the schools are supposed to develop a spirit of good citizenship in our children and teach them not to go breaking windows and being guilty of vandalism. Obviously, in some regards they are failing in this respect, and nowadays in this society we feel that it is the responsibility of the school to raise our children. So why do we not make the teachers vicariously liable for these acts of vandalism? And why do we not carry it a little further then. Besides making the teachers liable, why do we not make the public school trustees liable for these acts, for not hiring teachers that will bring up these children not to be vandals? I mean, we might as well go whole hog in this thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: There is no length to what we could do on this. Now let us get to this word, wilful misconduct. What is wilful misconduct? It speaks of wilful misconduct. Who is going to determine whether a specific act was wilful, or for that matter whether it was misconduct? You know it could be simply uncontrolled exuberance. But how is this going to be determined? Is it going to be determined in the school by school teachers or the principals, or is it going to be determined by a committee or referee set up by this government? Is it going to be determined by a court? If it is going to be determined by a court, which court? The magistrate's court, or the juveniles court? Juveniles court? All right, how are we going to hear these charges? Are we going to hear them in open court, or are we going to hear them in chambers? Or are we going to hear it in that modern star chamber which the government set up in The Deserted Wives and Children Act, which calls in private, where nobody knows what goes on? Who is going to hear it?

It is fine to bring in an Act here, but I would suggest if something is brought here for the consideration of the members of this House, one should be rather serious about what he puts in here. In submitting legislation, it should be thorough legislation, and not as haphazardly written as this. People may all feel rather perturbed that we have to pay out $4,000, $8,000, or as my

friend read in a statement from the *Globe and Mail*, $83,000. Have any of you people here any concept of what we spent to supply free swimming pools, free tennis courts, free artificial ice rinks, free recreation centres to this city? We are trying to instil in them something, and we are willing to spend the money. Now, for $83,000 we are going to brand these five-, six-, seven-, eight-, nine-, ten-year-olds criminals. We are going to make their parents responsible, where the parents may not have anything to do with it—

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Will the hon. member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Ben: I have a habit, I try not to interrupt—

Mr. Walker: The only thing we want to know is if he is in favour of child vandalism.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I will inform the hon. member just before I get ready to sit down, and I will leave a few words unsaid. You can interject then, and perhaps the Speaker will permit you—

Mr. Walker: Get to the point of the bill.

Mr. Ben: I am at the point of the bill. There is no point to this bill. It is as flat as a pancake, there is no substance to it at all. I was going to call it half-baked, but even if it was fully baked it lacks so many ingredients that nobody could swallow it anyway. I do not know what you mean when you are talking about a "point of the bill"—it's the dullest piece of legislation that has even been introduced.

Mr. Walker: Is the hon. member in favour of child vandalism?

Mr. Ben: Am I in favour of child vandalism? Well, that is like asking me if I stopped beating my wife. Is it necessarily vandalism that is being caused by these children? You are prepared to find them guilty without due trial and process. I am not.

The point of this bill is that there is no point; it is a vicious piece of legislation, which would impose vicarious liability. I suggest to the hon. member that if he does want to find some solution to what the hon. member in front of him calls child vandalism, then he should take the road that is easiest to take. If the member is really concerned about this damage, then I would suggest that he turn the matter over to the favourite sugar daddies of the Conservative Party, the insurance companies.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us will agree with the hon. member for Scarborough Centre when he speaks of the extent of vandalism and the damage which is caused principally to the schools throughout the province and mainly in the urban centres.

I think we also will all agree with the hon. member when he outlines the many possible causes of vandalism amongst adolescents in our society. I think, however, the measure of the bill is whether or not what he proposes is in some way either going to eliminate any of the causes of vandalism in the first place; or whether, in fact, it is going to result in a reimbursement to the public authorities or the public school boards of any amount of money. Obviously the bill is a confused bill because it seems to have two overlapping purposes. One is in some way to provide recompense to the school authorities for damages caused to school property, and the second purpose of the bill seems to be to impose some kind of a penalty on the parents of children in order to enforce better conduct on the part of children within the society.

I think, Mr. Speaker, whenever you find a bill which is so confused as to its purposes you usually find that it will not accomplish what it is intended to accomplish, even though it may have a very plausible appeal. I am grateful to the Hamilton *Spectator* for pointing out that appealing though the principle of the bill may be, it deserves very serious consideration before it is ever enacted into law.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member did read that particular part of the editorial.

Mr. Renwick: As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre did read the reference to the Hamilton *Spectator's* editorial.

There are many points which are inherent in this very simple appearing bill. The first one is that I cannot gather, although the bill refers to the "tortious" acts of children, whether it is intended to mean that a public authority if its property is damaged has a right of action in a civil court against the child, and if the child is found to have caused the damage to the property, and found liable in damages for the loss which has been suffered by the authority, whether then automatically the person standing in the relationship of parent to that child is to be responsible to the extent of $100 for the damage caused. If that is one interpretation of the bill, I would simply point out that the costs to any school authority of suing children in

the court in order to establish their liability in damages for the damage which has been suffered, will be very, very great in terms of the likelihood of finding particular children responsible for particular acts of vandalism.

On the other hand, if it is the intention of this bill to impose a fine or a penalty on a child who has been—in the words of the bill—guilty of an act of wilful misconduct, and by imposing that penalty to then say that the parent will pay $100 on account of the damage which that child has caused because of the act of wilful misconduct, then I would say that we here will have to oppose the bill.

We would have to oppose the bill, and I know it is not simply because of a constitutional reason that we would oppose the bill. But I would carefully point out to the House that any Act which deals with conduct and misbehaviour in our society is a matter which is not, in fact, within the jurisdiction of this assembly, and would be a matter which would have to be dealt with—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): What about The Highway Traffic Act?

Mr. Renwick: —apart from The Highway Traffic Act—would have to be dealt with under the Criminal Code because this deals with the malicious damage to property, and that kind of behaviour, if enjoined, can only effectively be punished under our Constitution by the Criminal Code.

However, Mr. Speaker, that is not the principal reason why I would oppose it. I would oppose it because if it is to be a penal statute, then the child is going to be, in most cases, before the juvenile and family court. And in the juvenile and family court, for those who have had any experience in that court, the strict proof of criminal liability is something which is not adhered to under all occasions. You would have a situation in which a child might very well be held liable for an act of wilful misconduct in that court without, in fact, having been proven that it had been committed. I think we tend to accept in the juvenile and family court a certain, shall we say, informality in the way cases of juvenile delinquency of one kind or another are dealt with, and we do not require from that court the same high degree of evidentiary accuracy as is required in a court of criminal jurisdiction.

You would find, I am certain, that if the parents themselves were going to be responsible, it would become very difficult, if not indeed impossible in most cases, to ever fix criminal responsibility on the child for this particular misconduct. I would, of course, support the remarks of the hon. member for Bracondale when he referred to the specific provisions of the Criminal Code dealing with the liability under that code of children seven years and under, and between the ages of seven and 14.

It is, however, Mr. Speaker, always strange to us here in this party to realize how often and how easy it is to propound a bill which is designed to protect property rights, and how difficult it is in this assembly ever to propound a bill which is designed for the protection of personal or civil rights in our society. I need only hark back to one of the first resolutions, which was the subject of a private members' hour at the early part of the session, dealing with the question of hate literature. You will recall that on that occasion I suggested one thing which this province could very well do was to provide, by way of a statute, a civil claim for slander of a group, and to provide damages if such a claim could be proven in a civil court.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the hon. Attorney General felt that it would be ineffective for us to make any such provision under the law of the province of Ontario and that we should, therefore, conveniently shift any responsibility for dealing with that difficult problem to the federal government. And that, of course, was the result of the vote, if my memory serves me properly.

Now in this case, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that in this particular instance we have a bill where the property rights will not in fact be protected, if that is the aim and purpose of the bill; where the procedures which would be required in order to give that protection to property rights—which this bill claims are deserving of such protection—that the procedures which would be involved in providing that protection are not procedures which are, in fact, known to our system of law. Because again on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, it would either have to be a civil action for damage to property of some kind or other, which would hold the child liable for the damage, and then would vicariously impose the responsibility on the parent for the damage caused. Or it would have to be a criminal charge, principally in the juvenile and family court or in magistrate's court, where the full burden of proof would be on the Crown to prosecute the action on an information laid by a public authority.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is only necessary to

make those distinctions to show that as plausible and appealing as the bill may be, in fact the measure of its merit is that it is unenforceable, in my view, on either basis, either whether it is designed to provide a civil cause of action in a civil court, or whether it is designed to provide an additional punitive penalty for parents for the acts of their children. I would think that before this assembly were to depart from what has been accepted over many, many years as a traditional position under the law—that a parent is not in fact responsible either for the criminal or tortious acts of the child—that we would have to have a lot more debate and a great deal more thought given to the principles embodied in this bill.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would oppose the second reading of this bill.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of the bill on second reading. I congratulate the hon. member for Scarborough Centre for bringing forward such a bill.

I can appreciate that there are many legal implications in connection with such an Act. I realize this because I proposed such a bill a year or two ago myself, and in consultation with our legislative counsel, they brought out these several legal points. But at the same time, I think it is a fine idea that we should have this before us for discussion and I think it is high time that parents in our province should be made responsible for the unlawful acts of their children.

We were in California a year or two ago and I happened to notice a sign in one of the beautiful parks around San Francisco. They do have a law in California, as the hon. member pointed out, to deal with this very subject. This sign said, "Parents are liable up to $300 for vandalism committed by minors, California State Civil Code No. 1714, San Francisco recreation and parks department."

In talking with some of the people in California, although they have had some problems, particularly in prosecuting the young people involved and their parents, I found that the mere fact that they do have a statute on the books and the fact that it has been given great publicity by the press, radio, television and in other ways that the parents are liable and would be liable for the vandalism of their youngsters, has had a great effect in reducing damage to public property.

I am not only concerned with the property of the schools, I think of our public parks. I think of the park which is in my riding, High park—I suppose one of the finest areas in all of Ontario for recreation and for the use of people. There are several fine buildings in the park, a beautiful garden, a swimming pool, skating rinks, tennis courts, a small zoo, everything that you could think of. And I have on occasion seen young people deliberately damaging places in that park.

It was pointed out here today, how are you going to say that a youngster has wilfully damaged some public property? I should think that if a responsible citizen, for example, was standing beside a youngster who threw a rock through a window which belonged to the public, he would be in a pretty good position to say, "I saw the young lad throw the rock through the window while his father stood beside him and he did it." Surely the parent would feel that he is responsible for the broken window. And if he did not, I think—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the hon. member: Did he do that when he saw the children in the park deliberately spoiling the park ? He said he actually has seen children doing this in the park and I wonder what action he took when he saw the children.

Mr. Cowling: No, the hon. leader of the Opposition misunderstood me. I did not say that I had actually seen youngsters destroying the park property.

Mr. Thompson: I apologize, I thought the hon. member did.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It sounded like it.

Mr. Cowling: No. But I am speaking of specific cases where parents are with children who damage public property. It constantly amazes me in the parks, on the streetcars, in public washrooms, and in any place that is public, how some of our citizens seem to feel that it is fair game to damage this property. I cannot understand why. Perhaps the reason for it is that the parent knows he does not have to pay.

The whole purpose of this bill with its shortcomings, and maybe there are some—I do not think the $100 is enough; I think it should be more—is that we must bring very forcibly to the attention of the parents

that they are going to have to pay, and nothing hurts like the pocketbook.

As I said before, some parents have absolutely no consideration for the public property. I can think, for example, of washrooms in public places that seem to be fair game for vandals. They rip off the door, they plug up the toilet, they smash up the porcelain, they run the water all over the place, they just have a ball in the washrooms. Why, I do not know. Is the parent not responsible for that damage? Is the taxpayer generally supposed to pay for that fun? I do not think so.

Are children allowed to go into the schoolrooms and make a mess to the extent of a couple of thousand dollars of our classrooms and then have the general public pay for it with a smile? I do not think so. I think that parents must realize that they are responsible for the vandalism of their children.

I have never expected anybody else in the whole world to pay for any damage that my boy might cause, private or public. I will pay for it. And I think that is the attitude that parents should take. I am not that interested if some boy up our street goes over to the church or goes into the school or any other public place and breaks up chairs and smashes benches. I do not expect to pay for him, I expect his father to pay for that damage.

I do not think that the legal barriers should be sufficient that we cannot promote something in a bill of this kind whereby parents will have to pay. To support that, I have a letter from our Toronto city council perhaps some of the other Toronto members received a copy, which says:

> Dear Sir:
>
> The council at its meeting held on March 16, 1966, gave consideration to a report from its committee on parks and recreation relating to vandalism in city parks and directed that the provincial government be requested to favourably consider the bill now before it which would require that parents be held liable for the cost resulting from acts of vandalism committed by their children, and that you be requested to support such a bill.

Which I am very happy to do.

I know, too, that the way they operate in the United States is not the same as we do here, legally; but I think that we can accept the simple principle that parents are liable for the damage to other people's property or to public property by their children—just that very simple fact.

I think if we had a statute on the books along those lines that we would save the taxpayers of our province millions of dollars in the future and I trust that the hon. members of the House will support this bill on second reading.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 96

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 2971

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3007

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 28th order. House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

(continued)

On vote 713:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned, I was trying to pursue this question of education in hospital schools for retarded children. Now I know that The Department of Education is taking over this task, but I would like to know how far it goes. For example, retardates, even in what they call the opportunity class. I will go for an example at Cedar Springs where 72 patients out of 1,000 are what is known as the opportunity class, but receive only 19 hours of education per week, compared with the standard public school teaching rate of 30 hours per week. Could the hon. Minister give us any indication of those who would be classified of the higher type in the sense of learning, would be receiving a full week's schooling?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The hon. member is correct, of course, that according to the new co-ordinated programme, The Department of Education took over the responsibility for the education in our hospital schools as of April 1 of this year.

The basic school programme for the retarded child is very similar in nature and design to that provided for children in community schools, again going within the limits of their capabilities. First there is the programme for the trainable child, that is the child with an IQ of less than 50. The aim is to provide skills and self-help, the use of arts, crafts, games, dances, music and recreation to develop co-ordination, to teach the child to use the things that are around him in daily living. These programmes are designed to help the child to learn social skills and are not geared to academic achievement.

The other programme for the educatable child—that is the child with an IQ over 50—the programme for this group is similar to that of auxiliary classes in community schools. More emphasis is placed on academic skills, and classes are provided for the ungraded auxiliary type through kindergarten up through regular classes at the grade six level.

For the more serious retarded, ward school or ward activity programmes are provided for children who are not yet toilet trained, or who cannot benefit from the programme for the trainable group. The programme for these children is designed to prepare the child for the trainable group programme as soon as possible.

For the older boy or older girl, vocational training programmes are provided in all hospital schools which are designed to prepare the child to return to the community. These programmes also prepare those who cannot be habilitated and returned to the community for institutional work.

The Department of Education, as I have already stated, accepted the responsibility for the school programmes for the trainable and educatable groups as of April 1, 1966. Additional teachers are now being engaged to intensify these programmes and, where it would be of benefit, to extend the length of time the child spends in the classroom. Last year I spoke of the unit system to be developed in each of the hospital schools. The developments which I have recorded in respect to educational programmes at the beginning of this new organizational pattern are to be adopted in all Ontario Hospital schools. Work is going ahead with regard to the extension of the unit system into other areas of patient care, particularly for the more severely retarded children, and those children and adults who have completed the training in the school programme.

Now in the various schools, here are the number of children engaged in either the trainable or academic programmes: In Orillia, 607; in Cedar Springs, 217; and at Smiths Falls, 614, for a total of 1,438.

Mr. Trotter: Well, actually those I think who are really receiving what you might call proper schooling would be at Cedar Springs, and would be the 72. The 278 really includes people who just work in the workshops. As

far as actual schooling goes, my understanding is there are really only about 72 that would really attend a proper school.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not got the figures for them down into that classification, sir. In Cedar Springs, 217 is the number I have. We would have to get it.

Mr. Trotter: I happen to have the figure of 278 that you have, but that really includes the bottom layer that does the very ordinary tasks.

I am just trying to emphasize my point, that I feel there are very few on the whole who are going to be able to take any type of an advanced course. By advanced, I mean close to a normal public school training.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 713 carried?

Mr. Trotter: No, I have a few more questions on this. Those who have an IQ of 50 or less, Mr. Chairman; I was wondering if the hon. Minister could let us know if there is really much possibility of giving them any type of training?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not other than the development of social skills, the ability to accommodate themselves, or adjust themselves to daily living.

I would like to say at this time, sir, that my own staff were quite unaware of where the hon. member got the figures. They have not got these figures. The figures that are presented to us come from the principals of the schools in question, and we take them as the figures of the children who are involved in the various educational and training programmes.

Mr. Trotter: Where do I get the figures here? I will just repeat what I have got. Now, these would be about last December. Of course they change, but they have what is called at Cedar Springs the "academic class," which is known as the opportunity class. There were 72 in it and they had seven teachers. They received schooling that totalled 19 hours a week.

Then there is the next class down the scale, that I have called more or less the retarded school. There are 123 of them. They only get three hours of schooling per week.

Then there is vocational training, at Cedar Springs. There are 50 in that class, then there is occupational training and workshops where there are 35 pupils. Now that is the complete total that I have of those that get any type of training, out of 1,000.

The reason why I use these figures—and I got these right on the spot at the time—is that even the great majority at Cedar Springs, which I considered well run and with an exceptionally dedicated staff, showed that the vast majority of the patients do not get any training, quite possibly because at this stage they do not have the staff, or maybe the knowledge to train the majority of their patients. This is why I have been emphasizing you are going to need more facilities and more in the way of hospital schools of a smaller size.

I am quite sure my figures are correct. They may vary since December, but by a very little amount. But again, it is this difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in training or getting any type of decent living to these children, or in the case of adults who are retarded, unless you have more staff. I believe the ideal is one supervisory staff, or one staff member to ten patients. Of course we are a long way from that. It is the ideal and we may never reach that. But if you use Aurora or Cedar Springs, we are an extremely long way off.

It is to this question of staff I would like to turn in order to see that these patients get proper training, and even proper recreation. We know, for example, in colder weather you cannot take these patients outside because they have a tendency to want to take their clothes off in some cases. This was up in Aurora, and you cannot have that going on in cold weather. Obviously your people in charge do not want an incident where someone wanders off, or someone is suffering from the cold. So that unless you have a number of staff to supervise them, they literally stay inside, and this is what I certainly feel is happening in Aurora.

To give you some idea of your staff troubles, for example, when I was at Cedar Springs, in December of last year, they were probably at their best. There was only a shortage of 26 on the staff. When I say only, I am pointing out that this is the best situation they have had for some time. Back in the summer of 1965, they had a shortage of 80 people. Even though they had close to their complement in registered nurses, I was told they could use five or six more registered nurses at Cedar Springs. At Aurora, the complement, I believe, on staff is 92, that is they are allowed to have 92 and this has been raised to 105 just as of two weeks ago, I believe. But even when they were allowed to hire as many on staff as 92, they only had 89. Now, I am hoping that they are going to be able to find the extra people. But I do ask the question, if they cannot reach their former

complement of 92, how do they hope to reach their present complement of 105?

Now, what I would hope to hear from the hon. Minister and what I would expect from this department in overall planning is how are you going to solve the staff problem. This is not necessarily touching on psychiatrists and more or less top personnel. We all know that this is extremely difficult to overcome and is going to take a number of years to overcome, but there are other ways of solving the staff problem and that is in hiring the attendants of grades 1 and 2 and up to 7. These types of people can be hired if decent working conditions are given and decent attractive salaries are given. The people who can do this type of work do not need a great deal of education, certainly they need preferably grade 10, but they need a kindly disposition and a co-operative nature. Certainly there must be people in this province who can do this type of work. And if the Minister emphasized more in-training, more attractive salaries, I am sure that a lot more could be done if a certain amount of drive and energy was put into this problem. It is all well and good to blame the hon. Treasurer of Ontario for not paying more money but staffing of hospitals is something that the hon. Minister is essentially responsible for. Much more persuasive methods should be put on the hon. Provincial Treasurer to increase the salaries of people who are doing this work.

It is obvious, I think, that in the long run you are going to have to give them some type of bonus for working under conditions which, at the best of times are most difficult and also calls upon the individual doing the work to have a particularly kindly disposition and a dedication to his task.

So in hiring the lower echelons of staffing, I do not think that problem is insurmountable if you make the effort that is required. This would go a great way in helping the supervision of these children, both for training to get them habilitated where they can be, and seeing to it they get some decent recreation. I am quite certain that in the case of the adults in Aurora, the recreation is pretty meagre, and the days must seem very long even to someone whose ability to think and concentrate is not too good. They know when they are sitting and left alone; I think, more than people who are completely normal, these retardates are very sensitive.

A final point on the business of getting workers. We know that the federal and provincial governments give grants to social workers, psychiatrists and psychologists who are in training. But these grants were set some time ago; I believe a married man is now allowed about $200 a month while he is in training. This simply is not high enough in this day and age. A single or a married man, but particularly a married man with a family, is going to have a very difficult time living on $200 a month. If we want the people who are in the higher brackets of our staff—social workers, psychiatrists and the psychologists – one way to encourage them would be with better grants—and this we have not done. Even the professional staff has had pretty rough treatment from the government in the past few months. Professionals in Ontario hospitals for the mentally ill received pay increases, Mr. Chairman, but their summer holidays were cut back. This no way to improve the morale of your staff—to come along and say: "We are increasing your pay, but we are cutting back your holidays." You do not see other jurisdictions doing that today; you do not see industrial firms or those in the commercial world cutting back people's holidays. These things must be extremely difficult on the professional staff when they see that in other jurisdictions, particularly in certain states of the United States, their services are at a premium. I think it is highly important for the health services in this province that we keep the good people we have. To do that we have to keep in mind that many other organizations are anxious to have their services. If we come along and say we will increase their pay and make an announcement about increasing their pay, it appears the government is made up of a real fine group of people. At the same time you cut back their holidays. This is not the way to encourage our staffing problem.

I would just like to ask the hon. Minister this, Mr. Chairman. Has he any overall plan of how to hire more of the non-professional staff? And secondly, any overall plan, not only for the present but the future, increasing the staffing by those people who are in the professional status?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As I pointed out this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, the psychiatrist in training is probably the best treated of any specialist or any person taking specialty in the whole area of medicine. We have started this year three different types of programmes. In one case, the trainee is paid $7,300 to $8,800 a year while he is taking his training. The other group, geared to provide psychiatric training for people who have been in general practice and who are willing to go back to

their community and practise community psychiatry, will be paid during their training $8,800 to $10,300 per year. From each of those will be expected some return in service. The third group—those who we shall recruit for training in our own service—will start at $10,000 per year. They will be sent for the type of training to which they are best suited and for which we need them. They will then be employed in our own service.

The usual level of bursaries are set in agreement, as I understand it, with the federal department, because federal grants are used for these bursaries in social work. We, of course, provide only social work bursaries for those interested in medical or psychiatric social work.

Mr. Trotter: How many do you have now?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I gave these figures, Mr. Chairman, during my opening remarks. We had last year 375 persons receiving bursaries in the various areas of public health nursing, advanced public health nursing, doctors of public health, master of public health, nursing education, nursing education master, nursing administration, mental health teaching, mental health nursing, psychiatry, psychology, social work. In the ones in which the hon. member is particularly interested, in psychiatry we had 35 trainees, in psychology six, in social work 24. In diploma in public health, diploma in dentistry and public health, public health engineering, PhD civil engineering, speech pathology, hospital administration and pharmacy. In addition, there were 115 in other special courses—occupational therapy assistants, public health inspectors, laboratory technology, medical record library science and dental hygiene. A total of 490 were receiving bursaries under the aegis of the department last year.

Mr. Trotter: I was not certain. How many would be considered the non-professional staff? Would there be any attendants in that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No.

Mr. Trotter: This is strictly professional?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is quite apart from attendants' training; we train all our own attendants. We train very sizeable numbers of those every year.

Mr. Trotter: When I was having my supper, Mr. Chairman, this problem became more noticeable because on watching the news on TV they had one of the men active in, I believe, the Ontario Hospital at Hamilton, where they point out there is one psychiatrist for 1,800 patients. They called it care by remote control. This is the problem that your entire system of mental health is suffering from and you are most certainly going to need this type of bursary.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have to counter that figure. There is certainly more than one psychiatrist in our Hamilton hospital. The total population of the hospital is not that, and I think many of our patients are not under active treatment. The population of the Hamilton hospital is 1,456. We have 14 doctors on staff, and an additional four are on sessional employment. The number of attendants trained last year in our system was 550.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is the right vote or not, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he can inform us as to what has taken place in regard to discussions with the Homewood sanatarium in Guelph in regard to outpatient psychiatric care? When I met with them last fall, one of the problems that came up was arriving at satisfactory arrangements in regard to payment to a private institution.

Could the Minister inform us as to what has taken place?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes. I am pleased to advise the hon. member, sir, that we are making progress, that we have reached a common meeting ground and are now ironing out the technicalities. I would hope that within a very short time the community service will be established at Homewood. This will be a unique programme in that we are utilizing the facilities and the staff of a private organization to provide a community service. This part of the set-up will be set apart insofar as their operation is concerned. They will operate it, they will provide the space, they will provide the service and we will purchase these services at actual cost.

This, of course, as you will understand, is a private organization. I am certain the hon. member is better aware of the method of operating this institution than we are, but we appreciate this splendid co-operation we have received from the board of this particular hospital. I am looking forward to the continuation of the pattern of provision of psychiatric care in the Guelph-Wellington county area to which the people have been accustomed over many years.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, on this precise matter, there is

one part about the Homewood sanatarium that I want to ask about. You say it is a unique programme. The Homewood sanatarium is a profit-making venture, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: That means that in this institution, and this alone in the province of Ontario, the government in effect will be financing profit—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no, Mr. Chairman, no, not at all. The hon. member very obviously does not listen to what I say. I am not worried about that. I can understand that. But I have just finished saying that they are going to provide the space, the staff, the service, at cost.

Mr. S. Lewis: In other words—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No profit.

Mr. S. Lewis: No profit making at all?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No profit whatsoever.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments and at the same time thank the hon. Minister for his approval of the grants to the IODE hospital in the city of Windsor. Originally we had hoped to see a 300-bed hospital in there. It has dwindled from the 300 figure. As of now it will be only an 80-bed psychiatric wing. However, we are more than pleased to have the 80 beds, and we hope that the Minister will be a little freer with his funds, so that the hospital may continue its expansion and eventually reach the size that it is hoped it will be.

We hope that the Minister impresses on Ottawa, if he can, the need to increase the grants to hospital beds. We have facilities at IODE, which was supposed to have been a unique one and the start of a community-type of hospital. However, in my community there is still inadequate aftercare or followup care for individuals released from institutions. I do not know what the answer is, but I certainly would like the Minister, if at all possible, to do something so that individuals released from the various mental institutions who do come back into the city of Windsor, do get sufficient home care.

The director of the Catholic family service bureau, a Mr. Arthur Drummond, even mentions there are cases where a person is given treatment for a few weeks, sent home with a few pills and no followup. For a situation like this, there must be a remedy, Mr. Minister, and the sooner the remedy is obtained, the better off the health of all individuals concerned will be.

Now I would like to ask the Minister also if the department is considered establishing—as have our American friends—an anti-suicide centre? I happen to have a press clipping where the Americans claim that the tenth leading cause of death in their country is suicide, and I would assume from that it would hold true in the province of Ontario. I think there is need for such a centre, and I hope that the hon. Minister in his wisdom will see that one is established.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 713 carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a good many questions under this vote.

There are parts of the mental health treatment apparatus in the province of Ontario which I am uncertain about, and I would like to ask a few questions about them.

First, in the pattern of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, I would like very much to ask the hon. Minister whether he has thought of establishing suicide prevention centres services in any parts of Ontario, affiliated with any hospitals? I think it is an excellent question and a very valid one.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have not.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, let it be said then that there are valid experiments on this continent. I can think particularly of the Los Angeles suicide-prevention service which is estimated to save 25 per cent of those people who call who are contemplating suicide.

The purpose of the person at the other end of the phone, of course, is to sustain contact conversation with the caller for as long a period of time as possible, until people come to the scene, or indeed until such person can be persuaded on the phone to avoid the contemplated act and to enter treatment. There has been some considerable success in this field, and again, as part of the whole spectrum of mental health services, as part of the community orientation that we have been discussing, I think that suicide prevention services are something which the government might seriously contemplate. I offer it as a suggestion. There are patterns to model it on.

Now Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, relating to other parts of this pattern of services, what day hospital facilities, specifically, do we have in Ontario and where are they?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Chairman, this day hospital business has become greatly misunderstood. The day hospital does not mean a building necessarily. The day hospital is a programme, and it is offered by all of our hospitals in Ontario, I am advised.

I would like to point out before we leave this suicide prevention service, which has been suggested, this is the sort of thing that I have been trying to tell the hon. members all afternoon that head office does not dictate professional programmes to local institutions. I could not agree more with the hon. member in what he has said, but this is a community service. The superintendent and staff of an Ontario hospital should be part, and are part of a community service, and it is my understanding that this is being very carefully considered and studied by several of our hospitals in the province. They have every right, and they also have the authority to set up this service if they believe it is in the interest of their community.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I simply have to disagree with the hon. Minister. I think that such agencies are part of a community mental health service. That is what he calls his branch, or did call it until this year. It could be within the aegis of that branch to link such services, I suggest, with the various Ontario hospitals involved.

Now, if there are day hospital facilities at the various Ontario hospitals in the province, how many patients are covered within day hospital care?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I will have to get those statistics for the hon. member; I do not have them.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, let me say that day hospitals, as a pattern of treatment for mental illness, are considered to be separate institutions in most jurisdictions. Now, "institution" is an unnecessarily cumbersome word. They are day care centres, and I want to put on the record of the House some of the things which they have achieved.

In the New England *Journal of Medicine*, relating primarily to Massachusetts where they have a very excellent programme of day hospitals, Dr. Becker and his colleagues have made an analysis of day care treatment for mental patients. They say this about the day hospital, and it may be of some interest to hon. members:

> Many day care centres report that they are able to provide an alternative to hospitalization for 50 per cent or more of patients who appeared destined for hospitalization at the time of the referral. By averting hospitalization, or shortening the period of hospitalization, the day hospital accomplishes a significant reduction in the cost of psychiatric services. One nursing shift suffices, whereas three are required to staff an inpatient ward. Despite the higher staff to patient ratio in day hospitals and in wards, the total staff budget remains less. Additional savings accrue because no beds are required and only one meal a day must be prepared. The economy and efficient use of personnel at a day centre make it particularly appropriate in communities where there are few psychiatrists and other trained mental health personnel and funds for psychiatric services are limited.

Now, again, as part of the community health pattern in the province of Ontario, I think that a series of day centres should be established. I realize that except on a sort of ad hoc basis, they are not established in Ontario, but they most certainly should be. They will attract literally hundreds of people and those with less acute psychiatric conditions, but who can still use some preventive care. Again, you see, a day centre providing preventive care is not espoused by this government, but a hospital setting with acute emphasis is espoused. I would like to narrow down the range of services which are removed because of the attitude of the government.

Let me ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, what night hospitals or night centres of comparable worth are there in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member has read is being done in our hospitals. Of course we know that this is a pattern, but what I want to emphasize to the hon. member is that he has said that it does not consider beds, it does not consider a patient being in the day care programme—not the day care centre or the day care hospital, but in the day care programme. It is not in a bed, as the member has already pointed out. This is the sort of thing we are doing in our hospitals; an extended outpatient programme is being done in our hospitals. I believe that in only one of our hospitals do we have an organized night care service.

Mr. S. Lewis: I suggest to you, sir, that if the day care programme were as widely organized and as integral a part of the services as implied, the figures of day care patients and services would be readily available because it would be an identifiable segment of the programme. I think it is most unfortunate that in Ontario there is only one hospital with a night care programme.

Let me ask the hon. Minister about walk-in emergency psychiatric care facilities in either the Ontario hospitals or the psychiatric wings in general hospitals. Are there any of those readily available?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Every hospital will accept walk-in emergencies. They really have not got any alternative; the hospital cannot turn a patient away who comes in for service. Under The Public Hospitals Act, the psychiatric unit of a general hospital could not possibly do it; they could not possibly turn them away, by law, and our hospitals have always accepted the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, it might be of interest to hon. members to know that the latest score is Montreal two, the other fellows zero.

Mr. S. Lewis: Speaking to the other fellows, as it were, I want to ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether there are any systematic treatment programmes emanating from the hospitals which follow people into the home—community centred treatment of schizophrenics, I think, is the primary programme in other jurisdictions where psychiatrists and special medical personnel will actually follow a patient to the home, do some of the treatment there to prevent the hospitalization and then shift the emphasis to the community again.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no programme where the psychiatrist does visiting, but we have community visiting by social workers from the hospitals so that they can note any alteration or deterioration in the patient's care and direct the attention of the psychiatrist to it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, to sum up: I want to say to the hon. Minister that until this province has a complete pattern of day care and night care centres and suicide prevention centres, emergency walk-ins with around-the-clock, psychiatric personnel available and community centred treatment in the home, in the sense of psychiatric personnel being able to visit and treat people in the home, our mental health facilities are badly disoriented and the medical model provides that disorientation.

The hon. Minister said that the medical model is not purely a physical location, that the medical model can extend into the community. I do not deny that, Mr. Chairman; of course that is true and I would also agree that to some extent the hospital must be pivotal. But the hospital cannot be pivotal at the expense of all the related features which are of such consequence. I venture to say that in Ontario, unlike most other places, our hospitals are not only pivotal, but they are almost total; services do not exist outside the hospital and everything is gradually being brought within the hospital ken. This is a disastrous trend in mental health policy.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could clarify something for the House. I am thinking of the Toronto general hospital psychiatric outpatient clinic. I have been there and I admire very much the work that is done by the dedicated people. I think there are certain limitations in facilities, and I speak as the layman going there. I see that they have a small billiard table and a few facilities, but they seem to be short of true facilities for therapy. I do not know if these meagre facilities are done for some reason with people who are suffering from mental illness, but I would explain that from the people I know who have been there, this is doing great work.

I have reservations about the fact that they have to go down to the Toronto general, just near here; I have reservations that I do not think it is known throughout the community, and I would like to know what the role of the province is in this work. Does the province pay the cost of the psychiatrists who work there, and what other help is given? How does the community know about this service?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Where an organized service is set up, we insist now that the service shall begin with an outpatient service, backed up with a day care programme and by inpatient facilities. We provide the capital construction grants to assist in the building of these. In the case of psychiatric facilities we are very generous insofar as the province is concerned. Then, when we recognize a service, we give to the hospital the professional salaries for the team or numbers of teams deemed necessary to serve the area population of that particular facility.

These maintenance grants are paid on the

same basis as they are paid in the public service. Thus, the salaries that we allow for the community psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and psychiatric nurses are the same as would be paid in the public service.

The matter of equipment is agreed upon between the hospital establishing the service and ourselves, and would be on a realistic and reasonable scale. We do not subsidize lavish and probably questionable equipment, but we certainly do subsidize to the extent possible under our grant system the type of equipment required by the treatment team for whatever phase of the work they want to undertake. It may be recreational, occupational therapy, or physiotherapy. If it were physiotherapy we would not likely give grants toward that, because that would come through the regular hospital grants. But whatever type of therapy, and whatever equipment they need for the type of therapy they intend to undertake will be supported within the scale of allowable grants.

Mr. Thompson: I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell me how—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Pardon me. May I add that indirect operating costs come, of course, within the scope of the Ontario hospital services insurance plan. Although the province provides the funds for that, the federal government, of course, does not support that at all.

Mr. Thompson: I wonder if the Minister could tell me in general in these outpatient clinics of hospitals—do you take an interest in the referral service in the community? I can think of two cases where, because of my own knowledge of this service, I was able to advise people to go there. They had never heard of it. I might add as well, that I feel there is a sort of forbidding aspect to the building and the location, despite the very dedicated and worthwhile work that is done. I know that in one case of someone going, there was a feeling of dread on the part of this person, because people who were more severely ill were lodged upstairs. Therefore, from just a very slight superficial acquaintance with this problem, it seemed to me that as I looked at this patient who was going in there with the fear of perhaps being taken upstairs, I do not know if there was any foundation for this. The person saw bars on windows upstairs, and it gave a fright to her, an apprehension about having to go into this particular location. This would seem to me to back up the idea of having these out in the community rather than located in the hospital. There seems to be either a traditional or historical fear on the part of some people who have suffered from mental illness, of going into a hospital, even though it is for day care.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really do not know where on earth they would find bars. In fact, I have got a lot of old iron to sell. One of the first things I did in the hospitals was take the bars off all the windows, except where it would pose a personal hazard to patients or staff alike because of the way the structure was built.

Now, we do take an interest in the referral service and all other aspects, but we have not had this right until we asked for it this year by law and the bill is before this House yet. The Mental Health Act will give my mental health division authority to co-ordinate the services in the same way the hospital services commission now has to co-ordinate all general hospital services.

However, we have distributed many thousands, and we do distribute many thousands of this booklet, "Directory of psychiatric services," which lists every service all over Ontario. This is distributed widely to anyone who wants it, but certainly to those who need it. It is available to all doctors, all social service agencies, all municipalities, all hospitals, schools, voluntary health associations. In fact, when there is a question about this, I think one of the best centres to call in a community is the mental health association, or the association for mental retardation. They are aware of the location of all of our clinics and all of our services.

I do not know if we should place as much stress upon the dread of people going into the psychiatric clinic as some of us do. Actually, you know, if we watch patients who are going into the hospital for any disability, I think we would see very much the same reaction. I believe we tend to feel that the mentally ill patient has greater dreads than he has, when probably the dreads are part of his illness. I have got to be careful what I say, because I am surrounded by psychiatrists, and the first thing I know, they will be committing me to one of our own institutions if I go too far. At least, I would get a rest, Mr. Chairman.

However, in the patient who is ill, particularly one who has not experienced much illness, it is awfully hard for a doctor to make a sound diagnosis or carry out a good examination because of the very obvious fear reaction that the patient exhibits. I do not know if this is any more marked in the mentally disturbed patient than it is in the physically ill patient. I question very much

if this fear is real, and whatever fear did exist at one time was probably caused more by the stigma which was attached to mental illness but which is disappearing slowly, but I think surely. There is still an aversion in the minds of humanity to mental illness, but then, of course, there is an aversion in the minds of nearly all of us to any kind of illness. Many of us do not believe that it can happen to us. But it does. I think that statistics prove that one out of ten can expect to be stricken with some kind of mental illness during their life.

In fact, my psychiatrists tells me my statistics are all wrong. They say it is one out of two. Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I very much question if the fear of going into hospital is as great as might seem. Furthermore, in seeing the psychiatric patient for the first time, he deserves and must have thorough physical examination, and this might well call for the use of diagnostic tools that are not available in the clinic separated from the hospital, without providing a great duplication of services. It is for this reason that I say the hospital is the focal point of a comunity's health complex; not responsible for all of the services, but it is the focal point, because in it there must be facilities, skills and equipment that are essential in the diagnosis and/or treatment of every kind of ills.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister having established that he is not in need of a psychiatrist, but I am—I presume—you said it is one out of two! But I ask you this, sir, assuming that I was in need of psychiatric care, and I am sure there are some that think I am, but what is the approach by which you go down to this clinic? I am thinking particularly of a couple of calls I have had in this kind of situation. Can anyone just walk in there who feels a sense of insecurity and anxiety, or do they have to go through or be referred by an agency? If some could afford to pay for a psychiatrist, would the clinic not take them? Is there some sort of means test? Or is it just free for anyone who wants to use the service?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The best approach, of course, in any health disturbance, is through the family physician. But in a big centre, or even in small centres, there are some people who do not have a connection with a family physician. This is the most desirable method because the family physician should be in a position to determine, first of all, what the patient is suffering from, and where is the proper place to send the patient.

However, the patient can go of his own volition to the clinic. If he goes to an outpatient service or a service at all that is supported by the government, there is no charge, for the professional services. If the patient has to be admitted, there is still no charge. Of course the hospital ticket is accepted as payment of the charge for a hospital bed, but if he has not got that, this is still covered under the provincial service. But again, I have to emphasize, the best method of referral is through the physician, and that is what I tried to say this afternoon, or was it last evening, that while it appears that more than 50 per cent of the referrals to mental health facilities come from physicians, we think that this is the correct way.

One hardly expects the layman to be able to diagnose mental illness. While they may fear or suspect mental instability, whether it is to the point that it is pathological, or whether it needs the skilled care of a psychiatrist, it is not always easy to tell. I do think that this is the right and proper way for the patient to get the care that he needs and should have.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister of Health, at any point in the statistics or analysis which his department makes of mental matters, do they analyze the economic background of the people who come to the various Ontario Hospitals in the outpatient services?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not think this is done as a routine measure. It is done on a special sudy basis in certain clinics. I did ask for the numbers who were seen in the outpatient clinics; there were 18,000 outpatients seen in the provincial clinics last year, and 11,000 seen in the community clinics, so that this is a total of 29,000 patients seen in the outpatient clinics.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, do you have any of those special studies available? Have they turned up any interesting pattern depending on the background?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not have them here, but I will certainly seek them in the department and make them available to the hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate them. There is one small topic which I want to raise with the hon. Minister before this vote passes, and one which I think becomes a matter of very real concern now that we have launched OMSIP as of

July 1. It is simply this: OMSIP, as every hon. member knows, opens vast areas to the use of psychotherapy in the province of Ontario. I believe the limitation on the number of hours that could be used by any individual or family was lifted in the amendment to The Medical Services Act. That being the case, it may be that large numbers of people in the province, who have hitherto not ever taken advantage of psychotherapy or even thought of consulting a psychiatrist, may now begin to pursue such avenues. Many of these people, Mr. Chairman, will, of course, be the subsidized groups and to some extent the indigent groups. The remarks I want to make to the hon. Minister and leave with him perhaps to ponder on, stem from my conviction and I think the conviction of others, that psychiatry is essentially a middle-class vehicle. The tools of psychiatry and the instruments of psychiatry are essentially middle-class tools and middle-class instruments devised for a middle-class environment. This, I think, is of real consequence when one recognizes that you are going to have a public medical care plan with large numbers of people seeking psychiatric services who come from low-income and blue-collar and indigent groups. There was, and it may conceivably interest the House, a patient-by-patient study in Boston—the Boston mental health survey. It was found that four out of every five patients in private psychiatric treatment were college educated, that the majority were women and most between the ages of 20 and 45. Among the patients who were residents of the city, 70 per cent lived in a section of the city which has only seven per cent of the total population.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Bourgeois.

Mr. S. Lewis: Bourgeois; precisely. A perfect word. A bourgeois psychiatry. I did not think I would be indebted to the hon. member for Russell for that kind of thing. I have always considered bourgeois pejorative and I did not want to offend your sensibility, so I used middle-class.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: If the hon. member wants a Marxist analysis, I will be happy to give it. Essentially, Mr. Chairman, I think the patterns of four out of five, or indeed nine out of ten, patients in private care would primarily come from middle-class environments. I think it is fair to say that if in decades hence anthropologists look back at the practice of psychiatry in the 1960's in this country, they may view it as a cult rather than a community service, because it is, in fact, not community based, and that has serious repercussions. The truth is that the incredible revolution in psychiatry, so that an entire society has become aware of the tools and the possibilities of psychiatric cure, mean that we surely have to adapt our techniques, that they have become inappropriate. Again, I want to quote from persons who are pretty eminent in this field, Drs. Zubine and Burdock, who wrote in the *Public Health Journal*. I think it is worth putting on the record. They said:

> Most of our techniques for diagnosis have been developed for middle-class or upper-class patients. We now have gone as far as we can in providing these social classes with the assessment techniques suited to their needs and therapy suited to their tastes. It is a tragedy that we are entirely unequipped to deal with the fifth of the nation caught in the throes of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is true to argue that it is alarmingly evident that the individual approach to psychiatry, and the individual application of psychotherapy is not as useful a tool for the population at large, yet it is precisely the mass of population who will be brought within the field of psychiatry by the government's new medical services insurance plan.

I would venture to predict, Mr. Chairman, that if an analysis was made of income background of the people you were moving out of the Ontario hospitals and into your homes for special care, you would find that of those who had been in an Ontario hospital in excess of ten years—or, because most people use the figure eight or nine out of ten, let me say 80 per cent of those who had been in Ontario hospitals for over ten years—would come from the low-income groups. But the people who had been released quickly or spontaneously would reflect the middle-class and upper-class emphasis of modern psychiatry.

Mr. Chairman, the attitude of the low-income earner and the blue-collar worker to psychiatry is still tinged with a certain fear and apprehension; fear of involuntary institutionalization, and fear of long-term containment. Indeed, this might be considered a matter of amusement, but it was, in fact, rather surprising that any of the studies I have read show things that low-income earners expect when they go to psychiatrists. Seventy per cent of them think that doctors will be interested in their digestive system.

78 per cent of them think that they will be asked to describe physical illnesses, 55 per cent think doctors will take their pulse and blood pressure and 45 per cent think that the doctors will tell them what food they should eat. These are low-income earners in a controlled group study in London in the United Kingdom, asked what they thought about seeking psychiatric care. One can see that changes are involved in the whole treatment process.

The point, very straightforwardly then, Mr. Chairman, is that I suggest that within this department—particularly within the personnel and management branch—a study should now be started as soon as is humanly possible to analyze all the treatment methods that are presently employed and see if they cannot be readjusted to suit low-income earners, blue-collar workers and the indigent population—many of the hundreds of thousands who will be brought within OMSIP and similar medical-care plans.

It is well known that the interpersonal communications, the verbal communications, the individual contacts between psychiatrists and clients, the expectations that the clients have, the expectations that the psychiatrists have, seriously break down with low-income people. There is some real value in shifting to things which low-income people are traditionally more willing to respond to, like role-playing techniques and use of games, and less use of testing and special experiments and filling out of forms, and so on. I think that is the first point, Mr. Chairman, that study should be undertaken right away in conjunction with the psychiatrists and see if the nature of psychotherapy cannot gradually be altered to cope with that 50 or 60 per cent of the population hitherto neglected.

The second aspect of this reorientation of psychiatry, I suggest necessary with the public medical-care plan is the question of involving helpers, aides and supporters who are not medically sophisticated—who, in fact, themselves come from the poorer classes, the underprivileged, the economically undernourished classes of society. They can help, if you will, bridge the gap between the sophisticated techniques of the psychiatrists and the unsophisticated responses of the low-income earner.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this has been a subject of some real study and concern in the United States, in particular by the national institute of labour education mental health programme, worked out in conjunction with the public health agencies and the mental health agencies. They described this helper by the fancy name of the indigenous non-professional. I want to read a paragraph from their study into the record, because I think it valid:

> The indigenous non-professional is poor, is from the neighbourhood, is often a member of a minority group. His family is poor; he is a peer of the client and shares a common background, language, ethnic origin, style and group of interest which it would be impossible and perhaps even undesirable for most professionals to maintain. These attributes alone make the worker more acceptable to the client and ward off the suspicion, distrust, obsequiousness or hostility which often characterizes the attitude of the poor towards the professionals.

I think that is an excellent description of the dilemma of the present psychiatric methods that frequently arouse hostility and fear and obsequiousness on the part of the low-income groups, and there is no possibility of applying an effective treatment orientation. So for that reason I think it is valid to bring in the volunteers and the helpers who could possibly supplement this programme. Again, there are experiments. I can think of the experiment written up not long ago in the city of Halifax, where several housewives, ranging in age from 40 to 67, with an average age of 47, none of whom had other than a high-school education, moved in to work in conjunction with the hospital facilities—the psychiatric wing—and established a contact with low-income groups that the professional personnel had simply been unable to achieve.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in a general reorientation of present psychiatry, I think there is some value in emphasizing the community centres again, because it has been demonstrated time and time again, that they frequently hold the answer.

One final quote in that regard from "The underutilization of mental health services by workers in low income groups," an article in the *American Journal of Psychiatry*, by Dr. Reisman. He says:

> Again, where major modifications have been made in the organization of mental health services, walk in clinics, community settings, etc., there has been a surprisingly large number of self referrals by blue-collar and low income persons. It appears then that when treatment technology is developed appropriate to their needs and style and expectations there is much greater acceptance than envisioned.

I would therefore urge, Mr. Chairman, that at this moment, at the juncture when medicine and public medicine in the province of

Ontario moves into the public field of prepaid medical care, that at that moment it is time to reanalyze the psychiatric techniques we have been using; try to wrench them away from their almost totally middle class orientation and shift. Then by means of imagination and creativity, shift the tools and the methods and the techniques to lower income and blue-collar workers. I appreciate it is a facile thing to say and very difficult to achieve, but some jurisdictions, I suggest, might think of it purposefully at the outset of a medical care plan, or, in fact, we will be seriously delimiting the programme we would wish to provide.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether the hon. Minister would have any observations, but I do urge a study upon him.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am quite certain that my staff have listened with interest to what the hon. member said. Much of what he has said, I, as a professional, would disagree with, because I think it is controversial. However, he can rest assured that I do not believe that in Ontario any of our services could be considered to be middle class oriented. Indeed, they are not class oriented at all. However, I have my views about them, and I am quite sure the hon. member has his, and I can appreciate his fear. But we will be able to develop out of our OMSIP programme perhaps the best computerized health statistics which will be available anywhere. We will very quickly gain experience in the types of people with whom we are dealing, the utilization of the programme, and all of the things that we need to know concerning these. I repeat, I am quite certain that my staff have had these things in mind, and I believe are just as familiar with the studies as I, myself, and doubtless in fact, more familiar with the studies than I, myself, would be.

Mr. Chairman, the score is now three to nothing. The other guys, I am advised, are Detroit. I ought to remember that.

Vote 713 agreed to.

On vote 714:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments on this. Much of what would normally be said on this vote has already been said during the second reading and the debate in committee of the whole House on earlier legislation, but the hon. Minister, about two days ago, rose in the House before the orders of the day and announced that there was going to be a new enrolment period, an extended enrolment period for OMSIP, running for two weeks till May 16.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that this ministerial announcement, which was never envisaged in the Act that we debated at such length and passed a few weeks ago in this Legislature, is indicative of the fact that the OMSIP programme is a failure in terms of its enrolment. The government is doing its very best to camouflage this failure. It is trying to hide it behind a great deal of window dressing, but the facts are just too cold and stark to be hidden by any amount of propaganda. In the first instance, when the government announced this programme, they envisaged 1,800,000 people—approximately 26 per cent of the people in the province of Ontario—eligible for enrolment in the plan. Somewhere along the line—I do not think this figure was given in the House, but apparently it was extracted by members of the fourth estate, in their many quizzings of the hon. Minister and departmental officials the figure of 1,200,000 was suggested as a minimum in order to have an administratively viable unit. Otherwise, it would be even more flagrantly inefficient and uneconomic than is inevitable in the kind of unit the hon. Minister has shaped in OMSIP.

There was a great deal of talk, for example, in the concluding week—as they hoped that this failure might be avoided by the closing date—when it was said that there was always, in an open period, a bulge with 80 per cent of enrolment coming in the last ten days. Well, as Peter Thurling said in an article in the *Telegram* earlier this week—or was it last week: "It looks as though the bulge has become a burst bubble," because the hon. Minister had to admit that he had enrolled only 800,000 people, which along with the 300,000 that were automatically enrolled because they were on various forms of categorical assistance, totalled 1,100,000 people. In other words, 100,000 short of that minimum figure to have an economically, or an administratively viable unit.

So now we are going to have a further two-week period, in the hope that you can reduce the proportion of this failure in enrolment. I would just remind you, Mr. Chairman, that when we were discussing the passage of this bill earlier in this session, the great emphasis was put on the fact that 60 per cent of the people in the province of Ontario who were in group plans were excluded. Under no circumstances — even though their incomes were such that they would be entitled to a subsidy from the government—under no circumstances could they

escape from this group plan unless they were permitted to do so, and in effect wreck the plan, which is not likely to happen in very many instances. In short, that 40 per cent of the people in the province of Ontario would be eligible for enrolment in OMSIP.

We have at the moment some 17 per cent, less than 17 per cent. Indeed, the 1,200,000 would be 17 per cent. So, in fact, we have about 14 or 15 per cent. To get to your minimum figure for an administratively viable unit, you would have 17 per cent, 1,200,000. To get to the total that the hon. Minister originally envisaged, 1,800,000 would give you only 26 per cent of the people. There is still another 14 per cent beyond that who presumably would be attracted by a plan that is as great as this government has been pretending.

However, Mr. Chairman, we all know it just has not happened. It has not happened, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that, according to all reports, at least $500,000 has been used on this extensive advertising, radio, TV and press campaign as this province has seen, and you still have not been able to achieve your minimum objective.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to thrash this straw any more vigorously; it speaks for itself. All I would suggest to the hon. Minister is this, that the evidence is becoming very conclusive that what the hon. Minister should do is pack it up as far as OMSIP is concerned. Of course, he will have to save face; indeed, I expect he anticipated that he might have to save face, or he anticipated that political and other events would force him to integrate with the federal plan. Unless he does that, he will not get this $100 million-plus subsidy from the federal government. But I think there is an even more conclusive reason why he should "pack it up", and that is there are people in the province of Ontario who are entitled to this who are simply not interested in coming into it in any such numbers as would justify a government's intervention and setting up a plan to provide full medical care.

The federal government has set down certain guidelines. We are all familiar with what they are—four of them. The hon. Minister has within OMSIP the nucleus of a proposal which can be expanded in conformity with the federal guidelines. I reiterate on behalf of the New Democratic Party what we said so often during the course of the debate on the Medicare bill earlier, that I think this government should indicate its intention to participate in the national plan. Until it does, it is not going to be able to qualify for that subsidy of $110 million or so and, Mr. Chairman, the final clincher is this: As we pointed out during the debate on the Medicare bill, if you do get that federal subsidy it will be possible to provide medicare in the province of Ontario for one-third of the premiums which the government is now charging.

I submit that because they are charging premiums that are higher than many groups are able to cope with, even with the subsidy, this is the reason why so many of them have not enrolled. That one-third would be $20 for a single person, $40 for a couple and $50 for a family, which would raise an extra $80 million. Along with the $70 million which the government is proposing to put into this plan and along with the federal subsidy, this would aggregate $260 million which is the amount of money required for full coverage even if one accepts the very high per capita figure of $40 per capita which the government has designated as necessary for medical insurance in the province of Ontario.

Now, I do not know what the hon. Minister can say by way of rationalizing the failure, but I submit that it is that kind of a failure. I hope that the pressures will be such that even though the hon. Minister is a stubborn Scot on occasion, that he will be persuaded to accept it and to move in the direction of the right kind of medicare for the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the hon. member without looking at him. I enjoy listening to him when I do not look at him, but the words of Robbie Burns came to my mind:

> O wad some Power the giftie gie us
> To see oorsels as ithers see us.

I hate to disappoint the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, but we have got our 1.2 million people—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I hate to disappoint the hon. member, but I would ask him to cast back in memory and to remember what I actually did say when the bill was introduced that:

> —according to DBS statistics, we believed there were 1.8 million people eligible in Ontario to come within the subsidizable group, but we had no way of knowing how many of those people were already covered by groups through their own arrangements.

Now, we believe that 1.2 million is a very excellent response, and it was achieved before the closing date of the original open enrolment period. As I stated in the House yesterday, it was the belief of the medical services insurance council, a belief which we shared, that many older people had been somewhat confused in trying to differentiate between the old age assistance and old age security. Those, you will recall, who were in receipt of old age assistance were given coverage automatically; those who qualified, but who were in receipt of old age security had to apply. Because of this confusion, and because of the fact that a percentage of applications were received and for various reasons were not complete, we had to return them. We felt it was only right that those people, all of those people, should have an opportunity to come into it, and it was for this reason that we extended the open enrolment period, as I stated in the House. It was not a ministerial decision, it was a governmental decision and, I think, a very sound one and, from all reports, one that has been greatly welcomed.

I, too, read what Peter Thurling said, but I have to say to him, as I have often said to the hon. member himself, that Peter is given to extravagant language at times. The balloon has not burst, we are not going to pack up and I would remind the people of Ontario that the hon. member does not seem to want to realize—and I know he knows it very well—that there is no federal plan, Mr. Chairman. There is no federal plan. There have been certain federal proposals, but we have been reading federal proposals since 1919 and I read the history books and find them recorded there.

The federal government has made certain proposals to us and we certainly have not cast them aside. According to the proposal, it does not come into vogue until July 1, 1967. OMSIP is operating now; we are paying bills for patients now, and we will pay bills for a great many more people beginning on July 1, 1966. If the programme that we have introduced lives only one year, then I am quite certain that it will have justified itself, quite apart from the fact that it will give us a great deal of experience provided we do move into some other programme.

Our programme is so constituted—and we have made no secret of this—that we can move swiftly and surely and smoothly, into any—

Mr. MacDonald: That is what I urged the hon Minister to do.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We might, we might. You never can tell. The hon. member is so persuasive that he will do everything possible, I know, and I have great difficulty sometimes in keeping from falling for his blandishments. So if he keeps on persuading me, you never can tell!

The essential thing, Mr. Chairman, is that this programme is already an undoubted success, and it is certainly worthwhile because it is going to provide benefits for the people of Ontario now!

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister, in a very coy sort of way, said that the federal government had various proposals. There have been six provinces which have indicated that they would accept those proposals. Where does Ontario stand? Where does the hon. Minister stand in connection with those proposals? Where does he stand? Will he give us a straight answer?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I will give the hon. leader of the Opposition a straight answer; there is no federal legislation. There is not one stroke on paper that has come before the House of Commons!

Mr. Thompson: Of course, they will not have legislation at this point. My question is where does the Minister stand in connection with their proposals? And why so coy about it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I never buy a pig in a poke.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. Minister in connection with the proposals; for example, the four conditions that the federal government has offered. Where does he stand on that? He never told the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have told them that we would let them know in good time.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. Minister should stop playing hide and seek with the federal government and anybody else who comes along. The fact of the matter is that he has been packing up so-called "medicare" plans at the rate of one per year for the past number of years.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This does not come within the vote on OMSIP.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I know that the hon. Minister does not want to be reminded of the doleful history of uncertainty, indecision and vacillation by this government. They came into this House in the session just before the last election with a bill which was the final conclusive answer to the problem—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please be seated. This matter has already been before the House. I suggest now that we go on with the discussion of vote 714.

Mr. Bryden: That is exactly what I am doing, Mr. Chairman. What we are discusing is the failure of the present plan which is now due to be passed up.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask for the member's co-operation in staying with this vote.

Mr. Bryden: That is exactly what I am doing, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about the failure of this plan and it should be in the context of the government's long record of failure in the field, which I am reviewing. I know that the Tories hate to hear this story, but nevertheless it is worth telling.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): How come you are always over there?

Mr. MacDonald: Well it is a wonder the hon. Minister is there.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest that the hon. Minister should not be so smug. There will be a day of reckoning in the not too distant future and the record of his government in this field is one of vacillation from beginning to end. They had a bill here before the last election which was represented quite falsely to the people as the answer to the problem and it was packed up as soon as the election was over. They set up a committee, the Hagey committee, to bring in a recommendation that they had predetermined they wanted, but the Hagey committee report was out of date before it was brought in.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I am sure the member is completely out of order in reviewing these previous debates on this matter. Here we have the medical services insurance division and we are now concerned with voting the amount of money which is set forth in the estimates. I suggest to the member that he co-operate in this matter and proceed, if he wishes to speak on vote 714, and not go over several debates that have already taken place in this House.

Mr. Bryden: I am not going over any debates that have taken place in this House. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly a novel ruling, you are not normally in the chair, but it is a novel ruling to say that we cannot review past events before we decide whether or not we are going to vote the money to the government for its present plans. I think its previous record is highly relevant to its present plans. We have a right to inquire as to whether or not the government is competent to spend the large amount of money for which it is asking; and one test in deciding that matter is its previous record and I say its previous record is one of failure.

However, I will spare the exposed nerves of the hon. members. They hate to be reminded of this dismal record. Every single time they told us they had the final answer, now they have come forward with a plan that is also a failure, it is failing. The hon. Minister has now managed, by dint of extreme propaganda measures, to persuade 1.2 million people to come into this plan including a good many people who get coverage for nothing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: And we have all along commended the hon. Minister for that much. The free coverage provided to people who are not able to pay is a good feature. A lot of it was being provided in any case, but our position always was that that group in the population should be given coverage without cost to themselves. We have always worked on the principle of ability to pay in all these years in which we have been advocating medical care insurance programmes in this House.

Though much of the plan is useful, the rest of it is a total failure and the main reason is that the rates are too high. The people who are not in groups in a great many instances simply cannot afford $150 a year for medical care insurance. If they are in groups and if they therefore can have their employer pay all or part of the cost it is a different matter, but we have now isolated a significant number of people who cannot qualify for groups, who cannot qualify for subsidy and are simply high and dry. They do not happen to be a majority of the population, but they are people. Their rights should be considered; they are entitled to medical care insurance as well as everyone else. This province could have been providing medical care insurance for those people as for all others—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I am sure the member would not wish to reflect on a previous vote of the House. I suggest perhaps he might go on with some other subject.

Mr. Bryden: Reflect on what previous vote of the House? I am talking about government policy. Not only do I want to reflect on it but it certainly—

Mr. Chairman: I beg your pardon, you are discussing a piece of legislation which has already been debated in this session and passed in this House. I suggest that we have had all those debates and now we need to discuss vote 714, if the member pleases.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you, in the simplest term possible, that what an agency is administering is relevant to its administration.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, no!

Mr. Bryden: It is not? I see. We talk about administrative agency in the abstract, unrelated to anything in the world.

This is the trouble, this government is getting so unrelated to everything in the world that it does not know what is going on and its plan is unrelated to the problems in the world except for one area that I mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that I ought to be permitted to proceed without any unnecessary obstruction. I am talking about this vote, I am entitled to talk about it and I will talk about it unless some gag law is applied here.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Well it ought to be.

Mr. Bryden: Here we have the Tory attitude. My friend the hon. member for Lambton West says it ought to be.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): This is the hon. member who talked last night about the other member—for Lambton West—being ridiculous. I do not know what he thinks he is.

Mr. MacDonald: This is not ridiculous, you are just embarrassed by—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I am quite willing to wait until the chatter over here quietens down. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the sensitivity of the Tories in this field—

Mr. Walker: One day the hon. member is one way, the next day he is the other.

Mr. Thompson: Could we ask that there might be order?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Will the member for Woodbine please proceed; but I would ask him to stay within the terms of this vote.

Mr. Bryden: That is what I will try to do, Mr. Chairman.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister of Health that there is no need for him to play hide and seek on this matter any more. We will give him whatever credit he wants for that area in which the present plan is doing some good, but we are concerned about expanding this administration to provide proper medical care insurance protection for all of the people. This province ought to have been able to do that by itself. We in this group have put forward plans to this House which were quite feasible and practical and would have permitted us to have had in operation in this province a complete medical care insurance plan for the past number of years, as has been the case in other provinces in this country.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): They changed the one in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Bryden: The plan is still there and it is a roaring success.

Several hon. members: Oh no, it is not.

Mr. Bryden: Under any government it will be in force because even though the Liberal Opposition of the day fought it bitterly, when they assumed the responsibility of power they kept it in force without any change at all.

Mr. Chairman: Let us get back to Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Why do you not suggest to these gentlemen that they stay with Ontario? They were the ones who raised the question of Saskatchewan.

The situation which the hon. Minister of Health now faces surely calls for a declaration by him on behalf of the government that he is prepared to accept the logic of events. He can no longer escape the clear needs of the situation and he should be prepared to proceed to complete universal coverage through the OMSIP administration. Let us forget about the private insurance companies with their group plans, let us think for a change of the needs of the people of Ontario and set up a universal plan with a single administration. It is particularly appropriate to do that now—

An hon. member: Yak, yak, yak!

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: You see, that is the intellectual level of the Tory Party. This is why we have every policy issue muffed in this province.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: As this one has been muffed.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I ask the member to continue with vote 714 please.

Mr. Bryden: It is particularly appropriate for the hon. Minister to make such a declaration at this time in view of the fact that the federal government has made it abundantly clear that it is now willing to contribute a large amount of money to this province—at least $100 million, more than $100 million—if this province will proceed with a proper plan. Now I am quite prepared to go along with the hon. Minister of Health when he suggests that the federal government itself has vacillated in this matter for so many years that it is almost impossible to remember how many, but the fact is that it has now been smoked out to the extent that it has laid down the broad outlines of the kind of plan it is willing to assist.

As the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, six provinces have now accepted its broad conditions. I would suggest that this government for once should get into the swim. It should not be bringing up the rear as it usually does, it should get out into the forefront.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: It should announce that it is ready to get in on such a plan and then put itself in the position where, if need be, it can negotiate with the federal government and have some influence in the further development of the plan. Maybe it is better that it is not putting itself in that position, because its attitude in the past on this subject has always been such that one could reasonably fear that any negotiation it might undertake would actually be to the detriment of the people and for the benefit of insurance companies.

It is more than likely from its past record that it would try to water down the terms of the federal proposal, but I am suggesting to it that it should now face up to reality, which it has been dodging for all these years, and say that it is ready to go ahead. Let it continue with the present programme until such time as a joint plan comes into effect, but let it be ready with the legislation to put the joint plan into effect as soon as the federal money becomes available. This will mean a significant—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. May I ask what vote we are on?

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 714.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Will the hon. member please get on 714? We are not debating a federal plan of health. We are asking for money to carry out a plan that we already have in effect in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister does not know the difference between a point of order and a sack of potatoes, so I will not bother discussing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do know the difference between a point of order and a sack of potatoes, and I know the difference between facts and wind, which we are listening to from the hon. member across the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That was a constructive intervention.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He made a constructive speech, too. He is one of your own members.

Mr. Chairman: I would again ask the cooperation of the member for Woodbine to discuss vote 714, which has to do with the voting of funds from this House for medical insurance.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, and a very substantial amount, for which I would like to see full value in return. We are not going to get that as the thing stands now but we could get it if the government were prepared now to go ahead, forget about all its temporizing and compromising of the past and use this administration as the nucleus for a proper medical care insurance programme in Ontario.

I am sure they will do it. Their past history indicates that. As I say, they scrap plans at the rate of one per year. So why do they not just go ahead now for once? Let them take time by the forelock and move ahead, instead of desperately hanging on to time's tail hoping they will not be left too far behind. This has been their record to date on medical

care insurance. It is a pity that they still have to be dragged forward, a reluctant stage at a time, to do what is obviously necessary.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? The vote for 714 is for $50 million. Will the Minister inform me what enrolment he anticipated when he calculated that $50 million?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I set the budget according to the total possible enrolment—1.8 million people.

Mr. MacDonald: And this is for three-quarters of a year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: It is quite possible, on the basis of the figures we have got now, we are voting you one-third more money than you will require.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have no idea yet. We have to make preparation for the total possible, Mr. Chairman—either that or seek Treasury board warrants as the programme develops. This House has objected to money being voted to departments on this basis, and I think this is good business. Therefore, we make provision for the total possible. If we do not spend the money, we will not get it from the consolidated revenue.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, surely the hon. Minister is now contradicting what he said a few minutes ago? He said that this figure of 1.8 million was actually in excess of the total possible.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no, Mr. Chairman. I did not say it was in excess. I might—

Mr. Bryden: You would achieve that—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I must rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I said according to DBS, and going by the income limits which would render people eligible for subsidy, there were 1.8 million of our population would qualify, and we made provision for that. But I stated at the time that we had no way, of knowing how many of those 1.8 million had already made provision by other means, under groups or in other ways, where they would not qualify or they would be disqualified. But we still have to make provision for the total possible.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. Surely the hon. Minister would recognize that there will be some who will not be eligible for the reasons that he has talked about, so that the 1.8 million is more than the total possible? Some sort of an estimate has to be made of the number that will not be eligible, even though they are eligible under the income terms only, but for other reasons are not eligible. They exist; the hon. Minister says so. We all know they exist, so that the figure actually is more than is required.

I do not know if I got the correct impression from the hon. Minister, but I understood him to say that this House objects to the use of the special warrant. I would say that this House does no such thing. We realize the necessity for the Treasury warrants. There may be certain matters in the accounting for those warrants that we object to, but we recognize that they are necessary. What we do object to, if I may put it before the hon. Minister, is any Minister coming in for a higher figure than he can possibly use. That is the sort of budgeting that we object to. What we would like to see is a reasonable, reasoned estimate of what he will likely require. It if turns out that that is not sufficient, then the warrant is the proper remedy. But the hon. Minister has come in and asked for a figure that, on his own explanation, is more than could possibly be spent. I do not think he should come to this House with a figure of that kind. I think that his justification of the $50 million is most inadequate. It now appears from the actual experience that he is asking us to vote him substantially more money than he is going to need.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is one other small point here that becomes clear in the process of this debate in trying to extract the figures from the hon. Minister. These 1.8 million people who are eligible for a subsidy, including the 300,000 who are going to be automatically enrolled and represent 26 per cent of the people. There is another 14 per cent of the people—almost another million people—who are at the moment not in group plans and who presumably are eligible to buy OMSIP. In other words, there are potentially 2.7 million people in the province of Ontario—

Mr. Kerr: —people in private plans.

Mr. MacDonald: —who are eligible.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You would like to raise the vote, then.

Mr. MacDonald: There are potentially 2.7 million people in the province of Ontario who can come in. All I am underlining, once

again, is that this government at the present time has something less than one-half.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You had better get a machine to figure it out.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps I should get a machine and I would be able to get the figures, because they would not be much further behind than the hon. Minister in his calculations.

But you have got 1.1 million people enrolled out of a potential of 2.7 million people who are eligible to come in to OMSIP. That is another indication of just how serious a failure your enrolment is in the present plan.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask some questions to try and find out why this has failed. The first question I would like to ask—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first question I would like to ask is, has the hon. Minister given a French translation in various areas of the province with respect to his promotion?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We advertised in French newspapers, Mr. Chairman, the same as we advertised in other ethnic press, but the applications and all other literature were printed in exactly the same way as is all the Ontario government's literature—in the English language.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the hon. Minister was considering putting some of the forms in French. Am I correct on that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, that is not correct, sir. I said we would develop an informational pamphlet in various languages, such as had been done by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. We have used four radio stations advertising in the French language and newspaper advertising in *l'Etoile de Cornwall, la Monitor l'Ecole, le Carillon, la Vie en Parien, l'Ami du Peuple* in Sudbury, London, Hawkesbury and Cornwall.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, may I say a word or two about this? I wonder if the hon. Minister knows that his righthand neighbour, the Minister of Public Welfare, has a lot of publications in the French language because he wants to get to those people? He wants to have some of those pamphlets understood by the people of that language. I do not think that it could have meant so much.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned in his remarks some time ago that 1.6 per cent of the population of this province of French descent could not speak or read the English language. I think that the hon. Minister should know that approximately 10 per cent of the entire population of this province are French-speaking. I think that it would have been very wise and not too costly on the part of the hon. Minister to print a few thousand of those application forms and pamphlets—

Mr. Edwards: They live here; why do they not learn English?

Mr. Thompson: A typical Tory remark!

Mr. Edwards: If I went to Quebec, I would expect to speak French.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the remarks of my hon. friend at the other end are included in *Hansard*—

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Racine: The hon. member for Perth has made remarks that will be very valuable in certain areas of this province at the next election—I can assure him of that.

I think that my hon. friends from Stormont and Glengarry and Prescott might be a little embarrassed by remarks of that kind. I think it would be valuable to repeat the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Perth, who said: "Why do they not learn the English language?" Is that right?

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member—

An hon. member: That is what we are discussing.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to pursue that problem just for a moment or two. I think this may be one of the reasons why in certain areas of the province applications have not come in, because some people have called me in my area and told me that they had difficulty in filling those application forms. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in considering the half-million or so dollars being spent to advertise the OMSIP plan we could have found, possibly, $3,000 or $4,000 to prepare application forms in the French language.

Mr. Thompson: I have wanted to pursue with the hon. Minister some of the reasons

for the failure of his plan and I would like to come to another point: Does he not think that people have an apprehension about portability with respect to his plan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I want to make eminently clear for all time before this House that there is no validity for saying that this plan is a failure. I hope that is eminently clear.

Mr. Bryden: It has just not got off the ground; let us put it that way.

An hon. member: What is the hon. member talking about?

Another hon. member: Frustration will not get him anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think this little group of frustrated socialists are afraid that the plan will succeed.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I repeat for the record, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, my question—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have not had an opportunity to answer the hon. gentleman's question yet, I am still on my feet waiting to do so.

I want to emphasize, to repeat for emphasis and to get it on the record without doubt, that there is nothing to show that this plan is a failure. It is a success!

Now the apprehension of people about portability does not exist. The programme is portable. We have let them know this and we have advertised this in clear and easily understood language; we have pointed out that it provides for out-of-the-province benefits. I cannot understand that there would be any apprehension.

There are certain apprehensions which are rather surprising. I have spoken about this in various parts of the province to large numbers of people, and do you know the most common apprehension, Mr. Chairman, is this is too good to be true.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if I could follow with my next point on this: Does the hon. Minister think that it is comprehensive enough for the people? I am trying to establish why he is not getting as many to join as he should in view of it being "too good to be true." Does the Minister think that it is comprehensive enough?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is no more comprehensive programme of physicians' services known to us being offered anywhere in Canada.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister think that because the plan is government-operated that this might be why people will not join it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we have covered three of the qualifications of the federal government — government-operated, portable and comprehensive. I ask the hon. Minister where he stands on universality, which was the other area of federal government qualifications. He has at least admitted on three of them that he is in agreement with them. Will he tell this House what his conditions are with respect to universality?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, when the time comes that it is necessary for me to make a statement on this matter I will be prepared to do so.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the time has come. As hon. Minister of Health surely there is a responsibility on his part. I cannot understand why he suddenly is so fearful and hesitant and apprehensive about giving his own opinion on anything. I always thought that he was a man who could stand on his own feet and tell us exactly where he stands, and here is a time when we want to hear from him. What is the hon. Minister's definition of universality?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this may be the time that the hon. member thinks I should take a stand, but I will give my opinion when I think it is time to take a stand and when I think it is time to give my opinion and I will not be found wanting at that time.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I think that we have established that in three areas the hon. Minister, from a point of view of principle, has no problem with the federal government qualifications—with the fact of government sponsorship, with the fact of portability and with the fact of comprehensive policies. So we now know, at least, that

where he is sticking and hiding is on the fact of universality.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, did you ask him about the health vote yet?

Mr. Chairman: I do not know.

An hon. member: I do not know whether there is one or not.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. Minister that the price of paying off the insurance companies in taking all the bad risks in Ontario has cost the people of Ontario $30 million. Would the Minister tell the House what the province of Ontario would have saved if they had gone in the federal plan?

An hon. member: What federal plan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there is no federal plan.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, six provinces have already decided to go on the federal plan at $17 per head, and 1.8 million people at $17 per head is $30 million. I suggest to the hon. Minister that the debt to the insurance companies by taking their bad risks is costing Ontario $30 million—and he can live with that one!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is no federal plan. Can I make it any more clear, any more simple, any more understood than that? There is no federal plan; the federal government is not prepared to give us $1, one cent, far less $17 per head. Furthermore, I point out to the hon. member, sir, the insurance carriers are not providing protection for those people who could not afford to buy it.

Again I repeat, what is the use of offering a man a loaf of bread at ten cents if he has not got the ten cents to buy it? This was the position in which these people whom we are protecting found themselves.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister how much extra will they be spending in advertising the fact they are going to extend the enrolment date to May 16?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot answer the question, Mr. Chairman, because I do not know what more we will be spending on advertising.

Mr. Trotter: Is the rumour we hear correct that half a million dollars has been spent so far on advertising?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this was no rumour, this was announced in the House.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister why students who have no taxable income are not eligible for free OMSIP?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No one has ever suggested, sir, that students with no taxable income are not eligible. Indeed we have emphasized this over and over and over again. Anyone who is 21 years of age, not a dependent, without taxable income, is eligible for free OMSIP.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, your own office issues one that definitely states that the student would have to be carried on his family plan or would have to pay a full single premium rate.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If he has no taxable income he does not have to pay any rate at all.

Mr. Newman: I have an application form which was filed with the department and returned for that specific reason.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Is the person over 21 years of age?

Mr. Newman: No, not over 21.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If he is up to 21 years of age he is automatically covered under the family policy.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on the family policy the parent must pay a separate premium for an individual as soon as they reach the age of 19, under almost all medical care programmes. Under this medical care programme you must be 21, apparently, before you qualify.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman. For instance, one of the biggest service plans only a short time ago announced that it was extending coverage for dependants up to the age of 21 years.

Mr. Newman: Well, I will have to differ with the hon. Minister. Here is the application.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the hon. Minister with regard to not including the chiropractors in the OMSIP plan—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have to say that this is quite out of order. All of this has been covered in our debates on the bill, it has nothing whatsoever to do with this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I have to differ with the hon. Minister in that I have a score of letters from chiropractors in my area who want to know why they cannot be included, because chiropractic is accepted as a health aid in Ontario, and British Columbia has included in Medicare—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Would the member please be seated? I would like to explain to him—

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the hon. Minister, then, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Would the member please be seated and I will explain to him that—

Mr. Sargent: I will think it over.

Mr. Chairman: During the debate on the bill, this matter was very fully discussed and actually there was a vote of the House. Therefore, I must rule that the member, if he has questions on this vote, should put them—

Mr. Sargent: I have a question on this. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, why are not grants paid for chiropractic when they are paid for physicians and medical men?

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 714 carry?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like an answer to my question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will answer the question in this way, that this type of service is not now covered in the legislation for OMSIP and, therefore, that is the simple answer.

Any further questions?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, why are there not courses in the universities for chiropractors?

Mr. Chairman: That has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. Sargent: We are voting $50 million here for health aid in OMSIP.

Mr. Chairman: What the member has mentioned is not concerned with this particular vote by reason of legislation.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I differ with you. This medical service insurance provision is for health aid in Ontario and the chiropractic practice is an accepted part of health aid in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member is a part of this House. The House has already voted on this question and I do not think I can permit the member to continue.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how many doctors, if any, and if so, from which parts of the province, have returned their data processing cards and refused to fill them out under the OMSIP plan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot give the number, but I am advised very few.

Mr. S. Lewis: What does very few mean?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will have to undertake to get the exact figure for the hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister does not know whether that means 20 or 40 or 100?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is under 200. We will get the exact number for the hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is under 200, which implies that it may be over 100 and the hon. Minister calls that very few?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, out of 8,000 or 8,500 doctors, it is.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, we may have a difference of opinion, but I would appreciate the figure, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the enrolments to date. What proportion of them are fully subsidized; what proportion are on the 50 per cent subsidy; and what proportion are not subsidized at all?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not have these figures broken down yet. After all, applications have been flooding in at the rate of over 20,000 per day of late, 25,000 per day last week, and it has been impossible to break these figures down to this degree, at the present time. The figures will be broken down before this House rises, and I will undertake to keep the House apprised of the progress.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister give us a breakdown of item No. 7, which is an item of $750,000 for what is described as maintenance in the data process branch of the division?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is rental for the data processing equipment, the supplies, the key-punching cards, all of the forms needed for the operation.

Mr. Bryden: Well, how much is being paid for rental of equipment?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: $12,000 per month.

Mr. Bryden: That would amount to $144,000 per year for rental of equipment. Now, that still leaves approximately $600,000 in the vote that the hon. Minister has not itemized. Now, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Ministers should be prepared to give these details as to large, round figures that they are asking for. When a Minister asks for a quarter of a million dollars, he should be ready to itemize what he wants it for. I do not think we should have to have interjections from the other side suggesting that it is unreasonable to ask for itemization. I would like this figure broken down by items with the amount of money applicable to each item.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. member accept my undertaking to provide this for him? Apparently we do not have the breakdown figures here.

Mr. Bryden: I cannot do anything other than accept the hon. Minister's undertaking, if he does not have the information here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, in the name of sweet reason, it is rather difficult to bring all of the records from a very large operation. And if we had any idea that we should break these amounts down any further, we would have had the figures for the hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this raises an issue that we have been dealing with occasionally at various times through these votes. I cannot understand, sir, how the Ministers can come in here without the most elementary information about their votes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well now, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would have to argue that this is not elementary information. After all, how is a Minister going to keep in his mind a breakdown of a vote entailing $262 million? This is really what the hon. member is asking in essence.

Mr. Bryden: I am not asking the hon. Minister to keep anything like that in his mind. He has a battery of about 20 assistants there. I should think they are capable of carrying papers that they undoubtedly have in their offices, and I think they should have the courtesy to this House to come in here with the material. I am certain that the Treasury board would not have approved this sum of $750,000, or any of the other sums listed in these estimates, unless you have made a submission to them, saying precisely what you wanted the money for. The questions I am asking merely require that your officials should look at their Treasury board submissions. I would have thought they would have that information right with them. It seems that many Ministers come into this House unwilling or unable to give what I say is the most elementary information one could ask for. How did you get to a $750,000 figure? If that is not elementary, then I cannot think of what is. I am certain that it was not just plucked out of the air as a nice round sum.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not be too sure.

Mr. Bryden: My hon. leader says "Do not be too sure." I feel pretty sure that Treasury board as it is now constituted would not go for that. I have been arguing, and I think with considerable justice—I am not the only one, other members have been arguing, even in committee some hon. members on the other side of the House, that is, in standing committees have argued—that some of these breakdowns should be provided right in this book, so that we do not have to ask the Ministers for the information. That is the case in a good many other jurisdictions. The information given here is quite sketchy, we only have large totals. Here is a vote for $50 million; $45 million admittedly consists of one class of payment, but the remaining $5 million consists of a variety of anticipated payments. The only breakdown we have for that $5 million is for salaries, travelling expenses and maintenance. When one goes through this book one really gets bored to tears reading the words "salaries, travelling expenses and maintenance." Maintenance, I take it, is just about everything that is not included in salaries or travelling expenses. It could just about as easily be called miscellaneous.

I think the Ministers should—or the Treasury, whoever is responsible for the preparation of the book—should give greater detail even in the book. But failing the greater detail there, then I think Ministers should expect to produce a breakdown of any of these figures when asked and without needing notice. There is no reason why the hon. Minister should have notice on this. All of the basic information that went into the preparation of these estimates, I am sure, can be put together in two or three loose-leaf books, the basic breakdowns which became the core of the submission to the Treasury board. I think it is regrettable for a Minister to come here unprepared to justify the figures he is asking for.

Mr. Sargent: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I want to second the remarks 100 per cent. This represents $50 million, it represents the budget of probably five major cities in this province. Those city councils will meet for months trying to cut their budgets down, and here we have $50 million submitted to us in about six lines of type. As the hon. member on my left tells the House, it is an insult for us to come up here and vote $50 million on six lines of type with no breakdown or summaries of any of these departments. I am trying to save the time of the House, but it is an insult to the people of Ontario to come in here repeatedly and be asked by this octopus government to vote $50 million in seven lines of type for $50 million. How in the world you expect the people of Ontario to vote for you when you are so dumb—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They do, they trust us.

Mr. Sargent: It is because they are not acquainted with the facts, Mr. Chairman. This is a sickening state of affairs when we have $50 million voted like that, with seven lines of type, with no breakdown.

Vote 714 agreed to.

On vote 715:

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, before going into this vote, first of all, the score is now 5-1 for Montreal; Montreal is doing better than I am.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Could the hon. Minister break that down?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not got it broken down. Mr. Chairman, I undertook at the outset to say something about vote 715 at the time the vote came up, rather than at the time I presented my first remarks.

I want to make a few remarks about the commission first of all. As has been intimated in the House and has been known to all hon. members, Dr. B. L. P. Brosseau, who was commissioner of hospitals, resigned, effective July 1, 1965 and this vacancy was subsequently filled by the appointment of Dr. J. S. W. Aldyce. Dr. J. B. Neilson, the chairman, has, as has also been announced in this House, submitted his resignation, which is to take effect June 30, 1966, and he will be succeeded by Mr. Stanley Martin, who has been for several years, as was announced in this House, executive director of the Ontario hospital association and one of the active persons in the establishment and operation of the former Blue Cross plan of hospital care.

Something about the financing of the plan: The costs of the hospital care insurance plan for the calendar year 1965 is estimated to have been approximately $347,140,567, 11.5 per cent over 1964. The figure is based on 11 months actual and one month projected, as compared with the prior year's audited figures which are as follows:

In 1964, we actually spent $305,739,960, but in the 1965 projected expenditures of $341,731,284, an increase of 11.8 per cent is estimated. The commission administrative expenses in 1964 were actually $5,464,835, and in 1965 these are projected to be $5,409,-283, or a decrease of one per cent.

The estimated expenditure and income for the calendar year 1965 compared with the projected figures for the calendar year 1966 are as follows. Now, these figures for 1965 are still perforce an estimate because all hospital returns have not yet been audited, or audited returns have not yet been received by the commission. The estimated figures for 1965: premium income is estimated at $147.8 million, the federal portion will be $167.1 million, the provincial total $176.9 million, for a total of $491.8 million.

The 1966 projected figure, the total is projected to be $550.03 million.

There is in the 1966 projected premium income a decrease of $0.9 million, and this decrease in amount of premium income is partially due to the extension of the age of dependants to age 21.

Utilization in public hospital care: The estimated number of inpatients treated in public hospitals in 1965 was 1,023,825, with total days of care totalling 12,486,204. There was an increase respectively over the previous year of 1.2 per cent and 2.7 per cent in cases in days.

The estimated average length of stay based on the tabulation runs covering patient discharges processed at the commission in the calendar year: the total and active average lengths of stay have remained constant, with convalescent showing a slight increase and the chronic stay continued to decrease.

The base figures for public active treatment hospital in 1964 and 1965 both were 10.4, and for convalescent hospitals the figures for 1964, 45.2; for 1965, 46.9. In public hospitals for chronically ill, 267.5 days; 1965, is estimated to be 256.3 days. The average length of stay in all public hospitals in 1964 and 1965 both, was 12.4 days.

Of the hospital bed situation in general, the hospital beds at December 31, 1965, the rate of bed situation in the province was: active treatment beds, 1965, 36,218 and the number per 1,000 population, 5.3. Convalescent care beds, 1965, 1,152, .2 beds per 1,000 population. Chronic care, 7,921, or 1.2 per 1,000 population—a total of 45,291 in 1965, 6.7 beds per 1,000 population of the three types of general hospital beds.

In 1965, the projects completed provided 1,083 beds and 206 nursery bassinets. The bed total in the province of 31,500 in 1959 has risen to 45,291 in 1965.

Now I would like the hon. member for Scarborough West to know that I am not going to disappoint him. He said in his opening remarks that I would tell the number of beds there are in Metropolitan Toronto, how many were built and how many are building and that is just exactly what I am going to do, Mr. Chairman, so I am sure he will be happy I have not disappointed him.

In Metropolitan Toronto, the change in 1965: there are two building projects completed, increasing the bed capacities of these hospitals. At St. Michael's, 183 beds were added, at Queensway, 140 beds were added, for a total of 323.

The total available on January 18, 1966: there were 12,594 hospital beds available in Metro Toronto, distributed as follows—active treatment, 9,149; psychiatric beds in general hospitals, 163; convalescent beds, 865; and chronic beds, 2,417, a total of 12,594.

The estimated active treatment bed need for 1970, 12,358 and the active treatment beds available December 31, 1965, 9,149. If no new beds were established, the deficit would therefore be 3,209.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to table, or put on the record, tables which outline this in detail. I will go over them rather quickly at this time, but they will be put on the record.

If all projects approved continue on schedule an additional 4,385 active treatment beds will be available by 1970, and in addition there will be an increase of 160 beds in other categories. This will be shown in the table.

Net gain in rated capacity by years from 1966 to 1970: Beds under construction in 1966, the years will follow successively, 822; 1967, 1,314.

Beds in advanced planning: In 1967—this means that they will come into being in 1967—261. In 1968, 152, a total of 413.

Beds in early planning: For 1967, 426; for 1968, 1,053; for 1969, 517; for a total of 1,996 or a grand total made up as follows: 1966, 822; 1967, 2,001; 1968, 1,205; 1969, 517; a grand total of 4,545.

The total cumulative bed gain in 1966 will be 822; in 1967 it will be 2,823 because there will be 110 other beds added.

The other beds would be mainly psychiatric beds. In 1968 the total will be 4,028, because here too there will be 110 other beds added; in 1969, 160 other beds will be added; in 1970, 160 other beds will be added, as the table will outline.

Mr. S. Lewis: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. May I ask the hon. Minister, I assume—I have been taking the figures down as he talked—I assume that the table will give the precise project and indicate the hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am just going to indicate them now.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, fine!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hospital beds under construction in Metropolitan Toronto: Wellesley, 454 new beds are being built; North York Branson, about 96 per cent complete, and I cannot tell you how many beds this will add for this particular hospital; North York general, Don Mills, the new hospital on Highway 401 and Leslie street, is well along and is on schedule; Scarborough general a major addition, construction commenced late in 1965; Scarborough Centenary, a new hospital at Ellesmere avenue north of Highland Creek, the steel work was completed in January of this year; the Donwood foundation, a new hospital near Sunnybrook hospital especially for the treatment of alcoholics and addicts to other substances, construction commenced late in 1965; and Sunnybrook hospital, the addition is presently being planned.

Hospital beds in advanced planning: In Metropolitan Toronto at Toronto Western

hospital two additional floors are being added over the west block; at Baycrest hospital beds to become available following completion of the Jewish home for the aged; at Central hospital plans are being developed which I believe will double the size of this hospital; and at women's college hospital working drawings are presently being developed.

Hospital beds in early planning in Metropolitan Toronto in the following hospitals: York general, 300 beds; new hospital in preliminary planning stage. Highway 400 at Finch avenue; Hillcrest, 90 beds estimated for new wing in preliminary planning stage; Bloorview, 20 beds, a small addition presently under active discussion. Shouldice surgery, 16 beds, an expansion of the Thornhill unit after which the Church street unit is to close; new Mount Sinai hospital, 325 beds, the preliminary plans are being developed; Princess Margaret, 55 beds, the preliminary plans are being developed; St. Michael's, 68 will come about from the renovation of older buildings; Etobicoke general, 465 beds, preliminary planning stage and the campaign is in progress; Northwestern general, 100 beds; Salvation Army Grace, 120 beds; the hospital for sick children is undergoing major expansion of services and further are being planned; Humber memorial, 185 beds; Lyndhurst Lodge, 50 beds.

Now Fenway general is listed here at 350, but they are, as the hon. member was obviously aware, they are having very great difficulty in land assembly and I would not put too much emphasis on this project at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this is by way of a lead-off, but for ten of the hospitals which the hon. Minister listed, which are part of the total he gave, there are no figures indicating the bed totals for those hospitals. Is the Fenway general 350 beds included in your total figure of 4,345 by 1970?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, it would be because—

Mr. S. Lewis: Despite the fact that you yourself have just disclaimed the probability?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The word has just come to me that there is some question about the possibility of this going forward on schedule.

So this is why, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. S. Lewis: So that is down to 4,000 right away then?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, there are other projects in the very active planning stage about which no mention has been made and I am quite certain that the 4,300 beds will be brought about, but I am warning the hon. members of the House that I do not want to have it cast back to me that I misled them on this matter. I am advising them that I have learned that there may be some question about the coming into being of this Fenway hospital.

Mr. S. Lewis: You have dropped 350 beds in five minutes, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I know, but there is another hospital approved and under active planning, a private hospital in Etobicoke about which no mention is made whatsoever, and it also has over 300 beds.

The percentage of the population insured is estimated, as of December 31, 1965, to be 6,715,508, representing approximately 99.2 per cent of the eligible population in Ontario.

It is erroneously believed that small employee groups are easily and frequently excluded from group coverage. Our records show this is not so. Out of a total of 28,300 groups there are 12,800 groups with fewer than 15 employees and 2,000 groups with fewer than six employees.

New regulations extending the dependency of children up to 21 years of age were brought into being on September 1, 1965, providing an extension of hospital insurance coverage on the family policy to all dependants up to 21 years of age who were unmarried and not in receipt of salary or wages.

The value of home care programmes has become more widely known in Ontario. There are now programmes of a hospital-based type in Toronto, Ottawa, Wellington county and Guelph. Interest has also been shown in many other places and today the commission has been approached by representatives from Hamilton, Windsor, London and St. Catharines, and as I stated in the House a few days ago, programmes in Windsor, London and Hamilton, have been given approval.

On November 10, 1965, the Metropolitan Toronto home care programme reported the current situation in Toronto. Eight of the larger active treatment hospitals were associated in the programme at the end of 1965; St. Michael's hospital and Queensway will join the plan in 1966.

In 1965-66, the budget was $295,000; in 1965-66 the first nine months had 653 patients enrolled out of a goal of 1,500. In 1966-67

the budget will be $470,000 and the goal of 1,800 to 2,000 patients. The average length of stay is approximately 24 days. The potential of the programme with only active treatment hospitals is over 2,000 hospital patients. There is a great potential for the home care programme in chronic care facilities.

The private physiotherapy programme was started in September of 1964 and in that year cost $128,065; there were 159 therapy facilities. The programme continued through 1965 and in that year cost $1,295,085.71; the number of facilities were 222 at the end of 1965. The estimated cost for 1966 was $2,094,000; the shareable cost, $1,860,000. Of that, the federal portion was $500,000 and the province paid $1,595,000.

For private physiotherapy highlights, 1965, there were 31,568 cases, accounting for a total number of visits of 346,916. The average visit per case was, therefore, 11; the average visits per month, approximately 30,000.

The survey of schools of nursing in the province of Ontario, part of the concerted effort to plan for the expansion and establishment of the schools of nursing to meet an objective of graduating 5,000 nurses per year by 1971, is continuing. To outline the programme and stress the need for province-wide co-operation during this year, a series of conferences was held in Ottawa, London and Toronto. They were addressed by myself and senior officials of the commission, the college of nurses, the university school of nursing and the Ontario hospital association.

Considerable discussion took place regarding the type of programme to be carried on in the diploma schools of nursing, particularly with the view of bringing uniformity to the education of registered nurses. The two-year course of education for registered nurses, which is currently advocated, was agreed upon as a desirable goal. To reach this goal, it was agreed that the target date for conversion to start such two-year programmes was 1975. It was stated as policy, in the meantime, that diploma schools of nursing would organize the two-plus-one programme —that is, two years education followed by a third year of clinical experience.

Before giving general support for two-year programmes, the government wished to study the effect this would have on recruitment and the relationship with other provincial policies concerning post-secondary education.

It was agreed that in the third year of the two-plus-one programme, the student nurse should receive $275 per month. The student would be responsible for maintenance during this period.

The development of the programme was first put under the direction of an ad hoc committee, comprised of representatives of the commission, the Ontario hospital association and the college of nurses. The committee set up a working party which has diligently pursued the plan with nursing schools across the province. These activities have now been turned over to the advisory council on nurse education and related matters, and the responsibility for the ongoing programme has been put in their hands.

Before the expanded training programme could be implemented, the committee was faced with the problem of providing the necessary additional instructional staff. If 5,000 students were to be graduated in 1971, approximately 600 additional teachers would be required by 1968. As a preliminary step, it was agreed to establish a short course to train senior nursing personnel as senior assistants; 25 were involved in the first class in August, 1965 and 21 in the second class in November, 1965. The training programme was under the direction of the college of nurses.

It was estimated that if 100 teaching assistants per year could be trained in this manner, it would meet the need for instructors while the universities were preparing to graduate increased numbers of the required qualified personnel.

At the moment, the policy is to provide one teaching assistant for every three prepared teachers. This ratio was established to provide a sound, continuing educational programme.

The universities had admitted greater numbers to post-basic courses during the year, and for the first time the University of Toronto was offering an evening course at the degree level. In the light of this accelerated interest, increased bursary systems will be provided during the coming year. I think that it is fitting that I point out that part of the $500,000 that this House has already voted me will go toward this programme.

I think it is also of interest to point out that there was more money available for bursaries than applicants in nursing education. This is the finding of the division of my department charged with this responsibility.

With regard to bursary assistance, 80 of the allotted bursaries had been used for nurse service, 34 of them at the degree level. The 110 bursaries allotted to nursing education were used as follows: five in the master's

programme; 45 in the one-year certificate course at university for diploma holders, and 60 in the bachelor programme.

A word or two about registered nurses: there are 65 schools of nursing in the province. The total number of students enrolled is 9,036 and the record shows that the total enrolment of students at the end of September, 1965, was 622 greater than at December 31, 1964. Of these, 409 were new students enrolled in basic programmes in excess of the number in such programmes as of September, 1964. The number of active registered nurses was 30,000, and the total number of registered nurses in Ontario was 48,898 as of December 31, 1965.

Regional schools of nursing will be an important feature of the expanded programme in the education of registered nurses. The curent situation is as follows. Twelve have been approved and 12 are preparing for approval. Because there appears confusion in the numbers applying to enter nursing and those accepted, the college did extensive studies in this matter and it was found that 10,000 applications were received, representing 6,000 individuals. There are, therefore, many multiple applications. Approximately 2,000 were not eligible for admission; 500 withdrew their applications. None was refused admittance except for valid reasons of academic preparation or for health reasons.

A revised programme of recruitment will be undertaken by the registered nurses association of Ontario, assisted by The Department of Health, a grant for which has already been passed by this House.

It might be good to point out here, having just noted those figures for the interest and information of the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, that for this reason we asked the advisory council on nurse education and related matters to look at the preparation of the student in the four-year secondary school course to see if the grade 12 graduates, or at least some of them, might not be capable of undertaking the diploma course in nursing. This is under active discussion with people in education with the advisory council, with the hospital services commission, some of the schools, and with the college of nurses. When it was learned that a large number of nurses trained in the Phillipines were interested in coming to Ontario, the department sent a mission of three nurses to interview prospective candidates on the spot so as to avoid confusion and possible disappointment. Some 237 were interviewed and their qualifications assessed; 175 are coming to the province and applying to write the college examinations.

In conjunction with the programme for increasing the number of graduate nurses, study is continuing regarding the assessment of the need for nursing assistants. This matter is being considered jointly by the college of nurses, the commission, and by the planning council on nurse education and related matters. Here are some statistics for registered nursing assistants—the total number registered in 1965 was 10,923. There are 44 training centres, 918 new registrants, and the number produced each year, on average, is 1,162.

The advisory council on nurse education and related matters met regularly during the past year and considered many aspects, particularly related to education of nurses. Among other things, it is currently studying the entrance requirements and the feasibility of recruiting in grade 12 of the arts and science programme of our secondary schools, as I have just noted.

As for provincial grants for hospital construction, the estimate for 1966-1967 is $17 million. Major projects in the Toronto area will draw heavy grants during the coming year. That figure does not include estimated grants of $8.3 million toward the cost of schools of nursing and nurses' residences. This, of course, will be drawn from the health resources fund.

In spite of submissions, federal grants remain at the same level as obtained in 1958, namely, $2,000 per bed and $2,000 per 300 square feet of certain service areas. This averages $2,700 per bed in a new project. We were able to have this level of grant extended from March, 1968, when the present agreement ends, to March, 1970, but the federal government was adamant in not increasing the level and not extending it further.

Additional grants approved in 1965: the grant per bed in nurses' residences was increased from $2,000 to $3,200 per bed, the same as obtains in a hospital.

Provincial loans for hospital construction: as of December 31, 1965, the commission had approved $16,373,000 and 26 loans under this programme; while negotiations are under way with 12 other hospitals for loans totalling approximately $9 million more.

One of the great problems that has faced us in this year in hospital construction has been the steadily spiralling costs. This, coupled with the fact that we were quite unable to get the federal government to change its pattern of grants and raise them as the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville suggested—and I might take the opportunity

here to urge him to speak to his federal colleague who has a great deal of influence, I know, in the upper echelons of the federal government; he might be able to succeed where I and my counterparts in the other provinces have failed with the federal government.

However, the policy of this government, of course, has steadily been to accept the fact that hospital construction should be a three-way partnership, shared equally by the federal government, the provincial government and the community resources. We have directed our grants and loans to that end and I am now happy indeed to announce to this House, sir, to you and through you to the House, that the government of Ontario is proposing a change in the pattern for hospital construction assistance. The new formula will require the local board to finance any land purchase and to pay one-third of the cost of new construction, renovation and basic equipment. The provincial government will finance the remaining two-thirds of the cost of construction, renovation and basic equipment and will use funds from a variety of sources for this purpose. The financial pattern developed for a particular institution will take into account grants from federal and provincial sources as well as assets available to the particular institution. The starting date for this new programme of increased construction support will be June 1, 1966, and we fully believe that this will give an additional stimulus to projects now under—

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The federal grants are going to be included in which part, the one-third—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In the two-thirds.

Mr. Trotter: In the two-thirds!

Mr. Bryden: How does it differ from what is being done now?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: At the present time the community resources are finding in the majority of cases well over 50 per cent.

Mr. Bryden: But even after allowing for your loans, is the essence of this that you are now providing in the form of grants money which you have recently been lending?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, this is not grants, we are not changing the grant structure, but we are undertaking to say to the board: "You find the land and one-third and the province will be responsible to find the other two-thirds."

Mr. Bryden: So there is no significant change in policy?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is a very great change in policy. We have been aiming towards this three-way partnership. The federal government and ourselves are offering two-thirds, but because I have lost the battle with Ottawa the province is picking up the difference between the statutory grants that now obtain and the two-thirds, and we will arrange that part of it—

Mr. Bryden: Will you be continuing any loan policy?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Our present thinking—and we have not worked out exactly how we will do this—but our present thinking is that the difference will be a loan. But instead of being $5,000 a bed it will be more of the order of $10,000 per bed.

I think it will be a good time now to point out—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, is this a loan-based plan rather than a grant, this two-thirds the hon. Minister is talking about?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We will continue the grants as they now obtain—

Mr. S. Lewis: And the rest, up to the two-thirds level to be made by a loan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh well, nice of the hon. Minister to omit that from the statement. You are asking the hospitals to borrow $10,000 instead of $5,000.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are not asking the hospital to borrow anything, we are offering a loan to the hospital.

An hon. member: He is already giving them $5,000 now.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Two-thirds of the financing is being found for the hospital.

Of course there is a change in policy, a very great change in policy. The hospitals will realize the change in policy.

I think it is a good time now to point out that it is our belief that the local councils might very well take under advisement a responsibility for finding the local third, or at least a very large share of it, so that the hospital boards will not be plagued with trying to raise funds by public subscription as they have had to do in the past.

Special grants for teaching hospitals were paid to seven such to assist them in expansion

of their training facilities and teaching areas. These grants amounted to a total of $5,550,000 and went to Hotel Dieu, Kingston, $565,000; Kingston general, $500,000; St. Joseph's, London, $550,000; the Ontario cancer institute, Toronto, $500,000; Toronto general hospital, $335,000; Wellesley hospital, $2.5 million; women's college hospital, $600,000.

The Metro hospital planning council recently established has been given the authority to examine, investigate and report on all hospital matters and subjects related thereto which council considers to be in the public interest, and in addition any matters referred to it by the Minister or the Ontario hospital services commission. The council has now commenced to function and Mr. Kenneth Andress has been appointed chairman. Immediate steps are being taken—and I believe they are now in the process—of appointing an executive director.

On the hospital computer system a number of inquiries have been received from hospitals in connection with recent publicity regarding hospital information systems using computers. It is the opinion of the commission that any widespread planning or adoption of such systems by hospitals in Ontario cannot be justified at the present time. It is believed, however, that computer systems will in time play an important role in our hospitals.

The commission believes that improvements in hospital operations can result from study of operational methods and that the use of mechanical electronic methods should be examined before any more complicated system is considered.

Employment relations: From reports which appear from time to time there seems to be some confusion as to the position and role of the Ontario hospital services commission in relations between hospital boards and their staff. There should be no misunderstanding on the part of hospital boards and administrators since the relationship has been clearly outlined to them on many occasions. The policy of the commission with respect to collective bargaining is that it does not interfere with hospital boards. It gives no instructions to negotiate on basis of fixed wage or salary percentage increases. The hospital boards are expected to bargain in good faith. In the matter of fringe benefits, Ontario hospital services commission approves sharing 50 per cent of hospital insurance, medical insurance, group life and certain other insurance, and the hospital out of its resources may pay as much more as it chooses.

Approved pension plans: The hospital services commission accepts as allowable the hospital's full contribution. If after bargaining an addition to the budget is required this is provided.

The Ontario hospital services commission never questions, never rejects nor does it attempt to modify the award of an arbitration board. I would say proof of this lies in the fact that in two cases when reference was made to the commission in the bargaining agreement, the commission insisted that this be deleted since it played no part in the bargaining whatsoever and should not have appeared in the agreement.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. It is in relation to the financial crisis confronting the Ottawa general hospital.

Now that institution has rendered a great service over a score of years and the constituents in my area are very much concerned because that is perhaps the chief hospital in use for major operations. Much criticism has been levelled in the newspapers on the Ontario hospital services commission and also on the hon. Minister in particular.

I would like to get the story, the facts. All I can say is we have two hospitals in the city of Cornwall, the general and the Hotel Dieu. I do know this: When they had a building programme they received their usual grants, both provincial and federal. Also, the city has made a contribution, an outright contribution. The united counties have made an outright contribution, the same to both institutions.

Now I do not know this for a fact because I am fairly closely associated with it, the sisters in that institution do not accept salaries, they turn it back into the hospital operation.

I would like to get a clear picture as to what the problems are, the full facts on how they are confronted with this. Is it the Ontario hospital services commission that is to blame? Are they given the same treatment as other institutions in the city of Ottawa? Because I think it is in the public interest to have these brought out in public.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that has caused us a very great deal of concern, not only over the past year but ever since the Ontario hospital services commission and the Ontario programme came into being. I think it is time that the whole story was brought out into the open.

I can answer the hon. member's question, are these hospitals given the same treatment as others, and in these particular cases the answer has to be no. They have been given much more generous treatment than any other hospitals in the province of Ontario.

I would like to point this out. The financial problems of not only the Ottawa general, but two other hospitals in Ottawa, and one in Cornwall, found themselves very much in the same kind of a problem when the programme came into being. They stem from the original development, which took place before the hospital plan came into operation in Ontario.

With respect to the Ottawa general, construction was started in 1948 and completed in 1955. The total cost was $10,747,000 and this cost was financed as follows: The hospital started its building programme with $114,600 in cash. They started a nearly $11 million programme with this very small amount of cash. There were government grants available at the time, of $2,454,000. The donations were $114,600. The loans from the sisters' order was $420,000 and there was a debenture issue of $6,578,000, for the total of $10,747,000.

Now the total cost, aside from government grants, was only $114,600, provided by local donation. The major portion of the financing was a public debenture issue by the order of the sisters, and the hospital ended up with a capital debt of about $7 million.

In St. Vincent's hospital the picture was almost the same. This hospital opened in 1955. It cost $7,110,746 to build and furnish, and the financing was as follows: The donations, that is the cash on hand at the outset of a $7 million programme, was $35,746. The government grants were $2,095,000. The loans from the sisters' order, $235,000. A debt payable to the architect, $382,000 and a debenture issue of $4,362,000.

The hospital, therefore, started its operation with a debt of about $5 million and the only payment being made from local sources being donations of $35,746.

The third hospital in Ottawa, Saint Louis de Montfort, was opened in 1952 to meet a need for hospital facilities in the east end of Ottawa. The total cost of the hospital was $4,257,000 and it started its programme with cash on hand of $21,400 donations. There were government grants of $675,000. Interest earned, $88,000. A debenture issue of $2,823,000 and a loan from the sisters' order of $649,000.

Now, when the hospital was planned, financial support from citizens of east Ottawa, we are advised—and we have this on record—was promised, but none was forthcoming, and the sisters were left to finance the hospital on their own. The hospital received, as I have stated, only $21,400 in donations, and started operation with a debt of about $3.5 million.

We were never too clear on exactly how these hospitals planned to retire their debts. If they were going to start building a hospital today, they would not get approval for the project on the basis of their financing alone. The clearest way I can put it, I think, the good sisters started their projects with too much faith and too little money. It was obvious that periods of 20 to 40 years would be required to retire the debt, involving refinancing of the debt as required. The principal funds available to these hospitals to handle debt were the contributions from the salaries of sisters on staff, but in the days prior to 1959, as I think all of us are aware, some hospitals did make a profit, although this was quite a feat. Indeed, this was one of the things that brought into being the Ontario hospital care insurance programme, indeed the whole programme across Canada. The fact is that the great majority of general hospitals were operating at a deficit every year.

I well recall in this city of Toronto, the city council used to provide something in excess of $1 million each year, just to meet the deficits from operating expenses in some of the large downtown hospitals. The hospital insurance programme was instituted in 1959. Of course, certain changes occurred in hospital financing, and as I have already stated, these projects could not be undertaken now with the financing such as they did at the time.

The Department of Health, I do not believe, was as closely involved in the matter of giving approval to the establishment of new hospitals in areas at that time, as of course we are now, because the grants were very small. They are much larger now.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this lays out in very clear detail the background history of this.

I stated when I began that these hospitals had not been treated the same as other hospitals in the province, because it was early noted that they were not able to meet the great debt load, and so special consideration was prepared for them. We retained a firm of accountants to look into the whole situation and to make recommendations to government as to how these hospitals had to be

assisted, and could be assisted. Over the years we have provided, by way of special grants, to Ottawa general hospital, $1,960,700; to St. Vincent's, $623,500; to St. Louis de Montfort, $1,399,700, for a total of $3,983,900. This is the sum that is voted by this House in supplementaray estimates, usually, and is set apart for unmanageable debts. It goes to those four hospitals, as I have pointed out.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister pushed them about this special grant—the special grant that he just referred to? Was it for special services, or was that for retirement of debt?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is for debt retirement, to handle their unmanageable debts. I think that is all I need to say; I think that will answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious that this question raised by the hon. member for Glengarry was not done without the awareness of the Minister.

An hon. member: It was well planned.

Mr. Racine: I have been warned, Mr. Chairman, that possibly I should not make any remarks about the Ottawa hospitals, and particularly about the Ottawa general hospital, but if I did so, somebody would reply to me. I think it is my duty as a resident of the locality where two of those hospitals are located, and as a member of the lay board of the third hospital, to make a few comments on this situation.

During the Easter recess, much to the surprise and dismay of the population of Ottawa, a news release in the Ottawa newspapers brought to light the impossible conditions existing in the Ottawa hospitals, particularly at the Ottawa general hospital. This press release, apparently authorized by a high official of The Department of Health or an official of the Ontario hospital services commission, contained a number of facts which were, to say the least, not entirely according to the true picture. This news item, appearing in the Ottawa *Citizen* said, among other things that:

> —the rivalry among hospitals, complicated by their difference in race and creed, had created a serious crisis.

It was also said that

> —the many problems of this institution had little chance of being solved under the present financial difficulties.

And also that

> —it was getting more and more difficult to obtain the services of doctors for this hospital.

Another part of the story was that of the threat by the doctors of the general hospital that:

> —if no help was forthcoming they would recommend the closing of the hospital.

The news release also mentioned that the doctors had told the authorities of The Department of Health that

> the hospital was so handicapped by the unmanageable debt, by mounting hospital costs and by overcrowding, that proper services could no longer be given. It was further stated that the authorities from The Department of Health had said that there was a serious conflict between the medical staff and the administrative staff of the hospital.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the official who gave that press release should be very severely reprimanded. The many falsehoods contained in the press release were strongly denied by all concerned. Even though some of these facts might have been true, I do not believe that the press was the place to air them, and furthermore, many of the problems now existing at the Ottawa general hospital are entirely the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Health of this province, who has been sitting on this problem for more than three years. I have—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the hon. member would be a little more specific? I am afraid that I do not know how it is my responsibility, but I would appreciate hearing from him.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I have here a lot of information that was given to the press that is public information, regarding the problem of the hospitals. It would seem that as far back as 1963, the hon. Minister and the commission had been told by the hospital of the problems that were existing. I think it might be useful to quote some of that correspondence, Mr. Chairman.

This was published in the local papers, and is to be considered as a summary of correspondence between the Ottawa general hospital and the Ontario hospital services commission. I would like to start with the first date mentioned here, November 19, 1963: On a visit of the Minister of Health and representatives of the Ontario hospital

services commission to the Ottawa general hospital:

> The hospital was given to understand that the Minister and the commission were agreed that the situation of the general hospital was urgent and some concrete plan for expanding facilities would be produced in the near future.

The comment at the end of that is: "To date, no positive result of any sort has followed."

On September 15, 1964:

> At the request of the Ontario hospital services commission, a brief was presented indicating the space and the facilities required for teaching needs, as opposed to patient service requirements at the Ottawa general hospital. To date, no action has followed.

On February 1, 1965:

> Ontario hospital services commission representatives, including Dr. Neilson, visited the hospital and were presented with a brief on the space requirement for patient service. The hospital was told that the needs were obviously urgent, that a concrete proposal would be made within the next three weeks and that, meanwhile, no alterations of any sort were to be undertaken at the hospital. To date, one year and three months later, no reply has been received, and meanwhile space that had been vacated by the nursing staff remains largely empty and unused, despite repeated protests to Toronto.

In May, 1965:

> Visit of the chairman of the lay advisory committee to Toronto to discuss with the commission the urgent problems related to the expansion of the hospital: Nothing concrete emerged from these discussions.

June 4, 1965:

> Dr. Neilson, at a meeting of the CHA in Ottawa, informed the hospital administrators that consultants from the commission would visit Ottawa that month, June, 1965, in order to determine what physical expansion was required.

To date, 10 months later—the following is a quotation from the hospital: We are still awaiting the visit of these consultants.

June 10, 1965: A letter from the chairman of the board of directors of the hospital to the chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission, indicating great concern with the attitude of the commission toward the capital debt of the general hospital. No answer received.

July 26: A letter to the commission asking for a reply to the letter of June 10. No answer received.

August 24, 1965: Further letter asking for a reply to the letter of June 10. Acknowledgment of the previous letter—well, we are making progress—but no answer on problems raised.

September 25, 1965: Following a request from the hospital, a meeting was held with representatives of the Ontario hospital services commission, including the chairman. The following three major items were discussed. Equipment—the urgent need for more equipment was appreciated and Dr. Neilson proposed that the hospital submit a five-year budget of financial requirements for capital equipment. This budget was sent in November, 1965, and no answer has been received to date.

Capital debt: The commission recognized the gravity of this problem and indicated their willingness to provide assistance and to consider as a basis any proposal the hospital might submit. Proposals were sent in October, 1965, and no answer has been received to date.

Expansion of hospital facilities: The commission stated that no action could be taken on this as they were awaiting precise details of the needs of the University of Ottawa at the general hospital. The university submitted these needs in December, and no answer has been received from the commission as yet.

On November 10, 1965: A letter to the commission from the hospital, concerning the refusal of the commission to pay for alterations in their radiology and dietary departments, and no answer as yet.

Mr. Chairman, I consider that the entire problem was brought about by the inaction on the part of the hon. Minister of Health. I think he and the Cabinet should assume the responsibility regarding the unmanageable debt of these hospitals. I do not have to name the three that he has mentioned. I understand, and this was told to me by one of the members of the commission, that in 1959 the commission had recommended to the government that they assume these debts entirely. Apparently this was rejected by the Treasury, and someone came up with a very simple solution. Use the hospital surplus, plus the sisters' salaries and an amount as mentioned by the hon. Minister a while ago to pay off the debt. The hon. Minister has told us that, and I think he would tell us, that the administrators of these several hospitals had accepted these proposals at the time. Little did they realize that this would leave them

with no money for major alterations, for equipment, or for future expansion. After two or three years, they found out that their position was untenable, and since 1962-63 they have tried to get their point of view understood by the commission.

After considerable discussion back and forth, the commission asked that an official request be made, to have the special grant formula changed. As I understand it, the request was submitted on October 5, 1965 and, as in the case of many of the other requests that I have mentioned, no answer has been received to this date.

May I ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, why should this situation have been allowed to deteriorate to that extent? Why wait for a crisis before taking a decision? I believe this is particularly unfair to the authorities of the Ottawa general hospital who have been giving hospital care to the public of Ottawa for 121 years; hospital care to people of all races, of all nationalities and religions, and not once during these years have they had a drive for funds from the public.

Now, in connection with that, Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary for me to say that public funds for hospitals in the Ottawa area are simply not obtainable. The only public funds that have been devoted to hospitals in the city of Ottawa have been for the civic hospital and the Riverside hospital. The city of Ottawa itself has never given any grants to those hospitals that I have mentioned, and particularly to the general hospital. I would like to say at this time that it is public knowledge that for many, many years, services were being rendered to welfare cases at the general hospital, which were not paid by the public Treasury, and I would like the Minister to inquire whether this is true. I know it is a fact, and this was done not only for years, it was done for decades.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest a solution to this problem. I believe there is only one solution. The solution is that the government should assume in its entirety the unmanageable debt of all the hospitals in that area, and in the province, if there are any other cases of that kind. Let them all have a fresh start. This would permit these hospitals who have performed a tremendous service to their locality, to go ahead with their plans for renovation and expansion.

Now, the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, did mention a while ago, that those hospitals would not be able to start on a programme of that kind today, if they did not have the money available. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this statement does not give credit for what has been accomplished by those hospitals, particularly by the hospitals mentioned, and some of the hospitals mentioned by my friend from Glengarry. When the orders that were running those hospitals were able to run their own affairs, without interference, they were able to manage, they were able to pay off their debts for many years, the debts incurred by the Sisters of the Cross, the Grey Nuns of the Cross. Their bonds were considered as a better investment than the bonds of the province of Ontario. They were able to handle their own affairs at that time, and I am sure that if things had been done properly, in the right way, at the time the hospital services commission was started, those problems would not exist today.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, that he make a recommendation to the Cabinet to that effect, and I am sure that with the settlement of this problem, of the problem of these unmanageable debts, that 90 per cent of the present problems of those hospitals would be solved.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, if I may, briefly, I would like to comment on this problem, and I would say that I am happy that the hon. member for Ottawa East has been very reasonable in his remarks.

Mr. Racine: I always am.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: In that this is a complicated affair, which to me, and I would suggest to him, and to the people of Ottawa, it has no political ingredients at all. We have here a situation in which no one can point the finger at anyone else. We have the sisters, the Grey Nuns, who are obviously as sincere as any group of people you could get, you have the city of Ottawa, which is extremely interested in supporting this organic functioning service to its people, and you have the province directly concerned with this, as part of a provincially operated system.

The problem, and the reason I am happy it is not a political one, is that what my friend suggests raises a great number of collateral problems. I would suggest it is not as simple as merely paying off the debt of three or four private hospitals. I do not think, as I stand here and look at hon. members on all sides of the House, of all parties, that it would be quite fair to ask my friends from the far parts of this province, and the taxpayers who support them, to, as it were, buy and pay for three or four privately owned hospitals and then turn them back to private groups,

whether they be the Grey Nuns, or any other group. This creates, I believe, the basic problem that we must face in finding the solution with regard to the financing of these hospitals.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for Russell would permit a question or a remark along those lines? I think, Mr. Chairman, that when the Ontario hospital services commission came into being, some of the debts of some hospitals in the province were taken over by the commission. Am I right in assuming that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I might continue, I still think we are bothered by this same point. And that is it is very difficult for any of us to ask for public funds to purchase the title of private properties. In saying that, I do not wish to say it in any less reasonable way than my hon. friend has presented his remarks. Here we have an organization that is operating because of four ingredients—the public charity, the potential help of the municipality, the present help of the province and the secondary help of the federal government. To me, there must be a solution. There is no question of pointing a finger and saying: "We are going to close a hospital." We have here a provincially operated scheme, and basically I think it is quite clear that when you have an essentially state-operated scheme you have to give the people what they pay for. I do not think the government has ever tried to avoid that basic premise. The people of Ottawa must have this service.

When I rose to speak, I was happy to say that I hoped this would not become political, because what we are dealing with here is a very delicate balance in trying to put together the charitable abilities of the people of Ottawa to help this hospital; the new interest which the mayor of Ottawa only within the last few weeks has expressed in relation to municipal help for the hospital; the province's past and continuing concern with getting the hospitals that we are speaking of off the ground; and the question mark that still hangs over the quantum of federal resources that we can look to.

Therefore, I would hope, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the hon. Minister, that this will be dealt with in a very calm and a very delicate way without anyone endeavouring to point the finger at any other person. On this basis, beginning with the sincerity and the hundred and more years of service of the Grey Nuns, I think the solution will certainly be found in Ottawa, knowing the temper of the city from which I come.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those remarks, and I can assure the hon. members who represent not only the ridings in Ottawa, but those in the Ottawa area because the area looks to Ottawa general and Ottawa civic, and probably the other hospitals in Ottawa for specialized care that can only be given to them there, I can assure the last hon. member who spoke that the matter will be dealt with in a reasoned, dispassionate manner.

I would like to make very clear to the hon. member for Ottawa East that the Minister has not been sitting on this problem and doing nothing about it, nor has the government. I only need to repeat that we have given this particular hospital nearly $2 million to help handle their unmanageable debt and it is being worked out. It has been provided for them on a basis arrived at by the head of a very well-known firm, the Woods-Gordon firm, whom we asked to make a study of all of those hospitals with unmanageable debts. And they, after consultation with the people concerned themselves and the hospital association—because they were very much concerned about this whole matter—computed the debt on the basis of amortization over 20 years, and it was on their recommendation that we provided the amounts for capital debt alleviation as have been made.

The visit which I made to the hospital—the hon. member apparently inferred, indeed he himself may believe that I went down to see the immediate problem—the visit I made to that hospital was part of a systematic tour of all teaching or university affiliated hospitals when we were developing our programme for health resources and for the establishment of a health resources fund. I was concerned about the needs and requirements of Ottawa general, to help or to ensure that it could fulfil its teaching function. Now, there have been some changes in this regard, as the hon. member and his colleagues from the Ottawa area are bound to know, with the interest of the university health sciences facility and the establishment of a university hospital. This, of course, makes a difference. It does not take away the teaching function of the Ottawa general, which all of us are aware has contributed a very great deal to the training and education of doctors since the medical school began. But it was for that reason I went to the Ottawa general hospital, as I did then to the civic.

But to say that we took over the debt of hospitals when the plan came into being is quite wrong, Mr. Chairman. We did not. We have paid off the unmanageable debt on five other hospitals, it was a smaller amount and in one or two cases these debts—

Mr. Racine: Well, that is what I said, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would just wait. We did not take over the debt. We treated the debt in those hospitals in exactly the same way as we are treating the Ottawa general and the other three hospitals. But their debt was smaller and it has been wiped out in the meantime. The other debts are ongoing, and they are likely to be ongoing for the remainder of a 20-year period unless we find that it is essential to change the formula, and this is presently under very active consideration. Now, is it as easy as the hon. member would point out, sir? I can assure you that if we were to pay off the total debt of these three hospitals in Ottawa, the mayor of Ottawa would be in my office or would be on the phone to me immediately demanding that the debt be paid off the Ottawa civic, the new hospital at Riverside and whatever other hospitals the city maintains. Then, of course, he would be justified in demanding this.

However, we have given assurance to the House that the plight of the sisters is understood, the work they have done is known and appreciated and we are doing whatever we can and will continue to do whatever we can to help them get through the difficulties. We do know that in a goodly part of the development they will be very generously supported through the health resources fund, because that part of the hospital which will be dedicated to teaching and research will be financed in total by the two levels of government. The rest of the hospital we will work out with them.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that the hospitals we have been discussing are actually not private hospitals, they are public hospitals because they have to accept patients who are being sent there. Even though you may say that after the debt is paid off, these hospitals will belong to these institutions, they will still be public institutions. I would like to add one remark to my remarks of a while ago. For any changes that are to be made, any new construction, any renovation, at the hospitals mentioned, the St. Vincent's, St. Louis de Montfort, and the general hospital, where does the hon. Minister suggest that the initial amount be obtained? Ottawa is a civil service city. The city of Ottawa has never granted any amounts to other hospitals but the two that I have mentioned. Now, where will the initial amount come from? I know this is a problem that maybe should not be put to the hon. Minister, but it is a problem, and it may be a problem in many other areas of the province.

Mr. Edwards: The federal government.

Mr. Racine: Well, there is a point there. If these hospitals were located in a place like Hamilton, with a population about similar, it might be possible to get the money from the large firms, large industries, in that area. But Ottawa has only one large industry, the federal government.

Mr. Edwards: Why not ask for the money from there?

Mr. Racine: Well, this might be a good suggestion, but at the present time I know that the money simply is not available, and I think this is one of the problems that should be studied by the commission and by the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 715 carry?

Mr. Trotter: No, it is a long way from being carried here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Thank you so much. I just want to welcome the hon. member for Humber back. I thought he might have been ill, but I am glad to see him here just as we get going on these estimates. It is good to see him. He is getting about $7,500 a year as a commissioner on this commission, so I think it is time he was here. It may be he is out to be Metro chairman, I do not know, but at least we are glad to see him here.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on a number of items under this estimate, and to deal shortly with this new arrangement for construction of hospitals.

At first, when I heard the hon. Minister make his announcement, I was quite enthusiastic. Then when I started to figure out what he was really giving, I was not quite so cheerful over the hospital situation here in the province of Ontario.

When I mention hospitals in Ontario, I

mean not only the active care hospitals, but chronic and convalescent care. Now, the attitude in building and constructing hospitals in this province that the present Minister has, has been in effect for some time. It is an attitude really of sitting and doing very, very little in coming to grips with the problem.

The remarks that were made or printed in the *Canadian Hospital Journal* back in December of 1964, somehow sum up what was the attitude then and what is the attitude now. And that attitude is more particularly having to do with the shortage of hospital space in the city of Toronto. Mind you, we have heard of the difficulty they are having in Ottawa, and they are having difficulties in other large urban centres in Ontario. But Toronto, let us face it, is the worst centre.

Essentially the shortage of hospitals in Toronto has not changed. We still see the scare headlines in the newspapers of Toronto, and in general those articles in the Toronto newspapers are quite accurate. I do not know if the shortage of 5,000 beds is true, as an article, I believe in the *Telegram* said, earlier in this year. Some of the estimates may be high. For example, it was in the Toronto *Telegram* on January 20, 1966: "5,000 want hospital beds." I hope it is not that bad. It is certainly, I believe, around 2,500. But here is the attitude.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, would this be a convenient time to interrupt the hon. member?

Mr. Trotter: I just wanted to get into the meat of the matter.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I thought, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member—all right, carry on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: No, no. It is far better to stop now. There is no point in starting all over again the next morning. It is a sensible time to quit, quite frankly.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I thought, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member would like to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. Trotter: No, no. It is a sensible time to quit.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated that the hon. members should be prepared for second readings and committee of the whole House, and I repeat that suggestion this evening. We will continue tomorrow with the estimates of this department, and if there is time we will go into these other matters and possibly Budget debate. I mention Budget debate, because I understand some of the Opposition members are not ready to proceed with that item.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, last night I asked the hon. Prime Minister whether there would be a Budget debate. I think I am correct on this; he said there would not be.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There would be?

Mr. Thompson: There would not be.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No. I said we would proceed with the estimates of The Department of Health and if there was any time we would go into these other matters, then I reminded the House the hon. members should be ready for Budget debate as well.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is not quite what you said, but—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, one correction. I understand that there were hon. members in the Opposition prepared to go on with the Budget debate, but it was the government side which was not prepared to go on with the Budget debate. This is just to keep the record straight.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, just to make the matter abundantly clear, we have a couple of P.C. speakers, the Liberals have a couple of speakers, the NDP has no speakers. Because there were not a lot of speakers, it was thought we would let the Budget debate go until next week.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.30 o'clock, p.m.

No. 97

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Question of Mr. Robarts re Tilco strike, Mr. MacDonald 3011

Questions of Mr. Cecile re battered baby syndrome, Mr. S. Lewis 3011

Questions of Mr. Stewart re production of market garden produce, Mr. Paterson 3012

Questions of Mr. Cecile re director of child welfare, Mr. Racine 3013

Questions of Mr. Yaremko re LCBO and LLBO employees association, Mr. Bryden 3014

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued 3014

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3051

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, members of the Forest peewee hockey team, Forest.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to announce that, in the west gallery, we have the Forest peewee class C hockey team and friends, who carried the Ontario championship. Out of 56 league, exhibition, and playoff games, they had 48 wins, two ties and six losses—the latter to senior teams. Out of 84 teams one of these boys was chosen as one of the top six all-star players.

The apples that are in the members' lounge adjacent to the Legislature are grown in this area and are there by the courtesy of this team; they hope that you will enjoy them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister. In February, the Prime Minister indicated that he would personally seek to have the Tilco strike settled in Peterborough. Would he report on progress to date?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): That question was asked of me on February 24, and on February 28 it was arranged that the hon. Minister of Labour would meet with representatives of both the union and the company. Mr. Dickie of conciliation services, and Mr. McGuire, conciliation officer, together with the Minister of Labour, met with both parties on February 28.

Mr. Dickie and Mr. McGuire were then assigned to the case to explore all the possibilities of settlement. To date there have been many meetings. There has also been a good deal of discussion and correspondence concerning the areas of dispute between the parties. Up to the present time, a basis of settlement has not been found.

I can only say that the efforts of these officials, in keeping in touch with the parties, continues; and everything that it is possible to do will be done in order to see if we cannot arrive at a settlement. But I would have to say that it is not one of the easier or simpler situations with which the officials of The Department of Labour are faced.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

1. Can the Minister explain the apparent violation of The Child Welfare Act in the non-reporting by the sick children's hospital in the battered baby syndrome case of Roy Laquerre?

2. Does the Minister intend to strengthen the reporting procedures under the Act?

3. How many battered baby cases have been reported to various authorities since the amendment to The Child Welfare Act came into effect?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there is presently a procedure between the hospital for sick children and the two children's aid societies in Toronto for the reporting of battered babies. After the child is brought to the hospital for sick children, if the admitting physician is suspicious that there has been foul play, and if the child is not to be admitted to the hospital for further care, before the child is discharged, either the children's aid or the police are notified.

If the child is admitted to care after further investigation, the case is reported to the children's aid if the authorities feel that that same is justified.

Reports are funnelled, through the administrative assistant in the hospital for sick children to specified persons in the children's aid societies. If, after investigation, the children's aid societies feel that a charge should

be laid, they will do so. If the child dies as a result of injuries, the case is reported to the coroner to take whatever legal action is required under authority of The Coroners Act.

In the case of Roy Laquerre, he was admitted at the end of the working day. The attending physician was suspicious, and the child was retained in hospital and died the next morning when a referral was made to the coroner.

Under section 41 of The Child Welfare Act, 1965, there is provision for any person, having information of ill treatment of a child to report the child's condition to a children's aid society or the Crown attorney. My department, at the moment, is in the process of formalizing this with a statutory form, in co-operation with the Attorney General's department.

In the meantime, such cases are reported from a children's aid society to the child welfare branch. It has always been possible, either through child welfare legislation or through the Criminal Code, to take action in these cases. The problem has always been to obtain supporting corroborative evidence which would stand up in court.

In answer to the third question, Mr. Speaker, no provincial total presently is available. Referrals have to be made to local children's aid societies or to Crown attorneys. An index is being set up to deal with these referrals in our child welfare branch and I would like to assure the hon. member for Scarborough West that, as soon as I have this, I will produce it.

Mr S. Lewis: I just want to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, because I gather that the thing is still in process. Would not the hon. Minister consider it to be a failure in reporting when young Laquerre was in the hospital on four separate occasions, prior to the final tragedy? Cannot something be done before the Attorney General's department is brought in to strengthen the reporting procedures—to correct the reporting procedures with the individual hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, I would not be prepared to make a public comment on this, but I see the point the hon. member mentions. We are looking at this now, but, as I stated before, this is one of the situations where it is so difficult to get the proper evidence to put forward. This matter, as I stated before, is now being discussed with the Attorney General's department and we will try to find out how better enforcement can be effected.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. There was a slight typographical error made in the question and I trust that the hon. Minister will bear with me.

Does the provincial government have a policy regarding the increase in production of vegetables or market garden produce, of improving varieties or strains of produce, and methods of mechanically harvesting these vegetables? If so, what is the policy?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the wording of the question, as now indicated by the hon. member, is quite different from the wording that was given to me in that I understood that he wanted information on marketing of these various vegetable crops—and that is what I had examined.

I would say this in reply to the question: It is merely a research programme and refers, as the member has suggested, to fresh vegetables. It is difficult to know whether or not one should be carrying out extensive research programmes for the increased production of these fresh vegetables, which I am sure the member's constituents will say today would appear to be in overproduction in that part of the country—because representations have been made to me by people from that part of the country within the last week, suggesting that the price of cucumbers and tomatoes was at such a deplorably low price that it was not meeting their cost of production.

If the hon. member suggests that our department should be spending research money to further increase the production that is already plaguing the market, then I think there has to be a second look taken at that kind of thing.

I would say our department is interested in the orderly marketing, not only of fresh fruit and vegetables, but all types of fruits and vegetables. In that regard, there are marketing plans that cover green and wax beans, lima beans, cabbage, carrots, sweet corn, cucumbers, green peas, pumpkins, squash, tomatoes and red beets, and asparagus. As a matter of fact the asparagus plan was the first one ever developed in the province of Ontario.

Insofar as fresh vegetables are concerned, it is apparently the wish of the growers, the producers, of these particular products that they move on a completely open market.

They do not want a marketing plan, or I assume they would have brought one in.

The department has facilitated the marketing of vegetables through a comprehensive grading and inspection programme and I would like to point out, with the establishment of the Ontario food terminal, here in west Toronto, a number of years ago, that that food terminal has proved so popular with the fresh fruit and vegetable people that attention is now being given to expanding the facilities there. It is being taxed to the limit to handle the produce that is coming there. The Ontario food council has been working with the fresh fruit and vegetable industry people in every way possible, in the marketing field. Our fruit and vegetable extension service is a special part of our extension branch, with activities for fruit and vegetable specialists working with the growers of these particular commodities.

With regard to mechanical harvesting, and I find this a most interesting subject, and one that can be dealt with at great length, our plant breeders have worked very closely with the industry scientists and have considerably improved the varieties and the types of vegetables to meet industry and trade requirements. Lately, there is increasing attention being paid to the possibilities of mechanical harvesting in certain of these vegetable crops. To do this, there has to be a particular type of plant grown; and it has to have the unique characteristics of having a fruit that will ripen evenly, so that the mechanical harvesting can take place.

Particular attention is being given to tomatoes and cucumbers in this particular regard. I understand there are some tomato harvesting machines operating in the United States, in California; and I would think that it is just a matter of time until we could get plants bred here, in the province of Ontario, to accommodate the climate that we have here, or that would fit into our climatic conditions, so that mechanical harvesting can take place. But here again, there is a very close working relationship between our plant breeders and the industry to develop these compact types of plants, the type of a fruit that will stand the mechanical harvesting.

This research work is being carried out at Guelph and at the Vineland experimental station, as well as in co-operation with the federal research people. We are hopeful that we will be able to find an agricultural engineering specialist who has an aptitude for engineering, particularly along horticultural lines; but I can tell you they are exceedingly hard to find. If we find one, it will be his responsibility to work more closely with the industry in developing, not only the proper plant, but the type of mechanical harvesting equipment that I feel is just around the corner in fruit and vegetable growing.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. Minister, and I feel that they are the answers I was looking for. But I would ask a supplementary question, if the Minister could answer it. Is the federal research lab doing the great bulk of the scientific work in increasing productivity and improving strains? And I hesitate to ask this, but would you suggest that they continue in these endeavours?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the agricultural research institute of the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, has been set up to co-ordinate all research activities within the province of Ontario—and on that research institute is the director of the federal agricultural research branch, so that we do not have duplication of research activities. I think the hon. member, like all members of the House, would be interested in making the best use of the facilities available, and would agree that if the federal government is in a specific field of research—and it may pertain to fresh vegetables—then they should be encouraged and allowed to continue in that field, whereas we might expand our research in some other endeavour.

There is complete co-ordination and co-operation between the federal research people and our own provincial research people. I cannot give specific figures as to who is doing what, but I can say it is being done on a co-ordinated basis and that encouragement is being given, not only in strengthening and improving the varieties we now have, but in the development of new strains and varieties which will meet the increasing demands for such types in the future.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare. What is the procedure which the director of child welfare follows with representatives from centres such as Warrendale, to discuss policy matters?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the usual procedure followed by the director of child welfare when situations arise concerning matters of policy related to children's aid societies, or children's institutions, which require clarification, is that the director of

the society or institution is requested to meet with the director of child welfare for preliminary discussion.

Following such discussion, further meetings involving members of the board of directors of the society or institution may take place, if this is indicated.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would accept a supplementary question? I wonder, is he aware of an interview that took place between the director of child welfare and the assistant director of Warrendale, which ended, apparently, in a very unsatisfactory manner?

Mr. MacDonald: An interview that did not take place!

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I know about the interview is having received a copy of a letter which was sent to other people.

My information is simply that the director of child welfare wanted to meet with the director of the institution and that was not possible because the gentleman was sick. It was stated at that time that a further date would be fixed to do that. As for anything else, I have no knowledge of it.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Woodbine asked three questions and I have the replies for him today.

I have been advised by the chairman of the liquor control board as follows: That the answer to question number one is "Yes"; the chairman of the membership committee of the liquor control board and liquor licence board employees association has brought to the attention of store managers that there are employees who have not joined the association. Since the association exists to represent the employees of the liquor licence board and the liquor control board throughout Ontario, it is logical that the employees association membership committee should exert whatever efforts they can to draw the attention of non-members to the advantages to be derived from membership. Store managers mentioned above are not considered by the board to be management in the normally accepted sense and are, in fact, eligible for membership in the association.

The answer to number two is "Yes"; it is perfectly logical for a store manager, being a member of the association, to endeavour to present his associates with the benefits which may be derived from such membership. This is understandable since the association attempts to have a membership that will fully represent all the employees.

The answer to question number three, as Mr. Shepherd puts it here, is "No"; and he continues:

> Management personnel in the liquor control board and liquor licence board do not attempt to persuade employees to join the association and management personnel are not eligible for regular membership in the association.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Do the store managers exercise any sort of disciplinary powers over the employees, either directly or by power to make recommendations, which would put them in a position to exercise undue influence on them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the only way I can answer that is to reiterate the position of the two boards, that store managers mentioned above are not considered by the board to be management in the normally accepted sense.

Mr. Bryden: They are employers' agents though and this is just a company union.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 32nd order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

(*continued*)

On vote 715:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned last night I had begun to speak on this matter. I just want to say, in order to start off at this point, that I wish to make a few remarks about the shortage of hospitals throughout the province of Ontario, and more particularly in the areas in and surrounding Metropolitan Toronto.

We heard last night from members of the Ottawa district and I am going to leave the problems of the Ottawa district to the Ottawa members. But there is, basically, a lack of an overall policy in our approach to the construction of hospitals here in the province of Ontario. When the hon. Minister made his announcements about there being new assistance for the construction of hospitals in Ontario, I was quite pleased; but then, after he continued to speak, he let us know that

this two-thirds cost the province was going to carry was going to be—at least in part, and we do not know how much in part—the amount of increased loans.

I would like to deal with that in a few moments, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to first put before this House some of the figures of the shortage of hospital bed space here in the city of Toronto. There is no doubt, in Metropolitan Toronto as a whole, on the active treatment beds there is at least a shortage of 2,100, if not more. The estimates including chronic care and convalescent care, have gone up as high as 5,000 beds, which is a tragic situation here in the province.

But basically, I think, we have had a failure on the part of the OHSC and on the part of the government over a long period of time to come to grips with the problem and to come out with an overall plan. Now, I realize that the Ontario hospital services commission is in a certain rigid state where it can only grant funds or encourage hospital construction if there is a certain amount of funds available and produced by the local hospital boards. We have seen this instance in Scarborough where the OHSC said, "No, you cannot build," but then at the last minute the Minister had the power to reverse that situation. Even though the Ontario hospital services commission is in a sort of straitjacket, I do not believe that over the period of years it has been in existence it has used the necessary drive and energy to bring about any changes in our hospital plans. I know in the *Journal* of the Canadian hospital association, going back to December, 1964, it quoted on one occasion what the chairman of the commission had to say about the hospital situation in Metropolitan Toronto. I just read this briefly in part:

> Metro Toronto's hospital bed shortage squabble erupted briefly again last month.

That was in November of 1964.

> Newspaper surveys revealed that 7,000 people, 1,000 of them classed as urgent cases, were on the waiting lists of nine major Toronto hospitals with no immediate let-up in sight.

They approach the chairman of the commission; this is what happens:

> Asked to comment by local newspapers, Ontario hospital services commission chairman Dr. John Nielson said he was satisfied that nobody in Toronto was being denied emergency treatment. Hospitals cannot operate without waiting lists of some kind, he said. I do not think the problem is driving anyone particularly crazy.

Well now, I would say that would give you some idea of the attitude of the OHSC. This certainly has not helped the situation. Despite the fact I quite frankly admit that the OHSC for problems of financing and getting approvals of hospital construction is within very stringent regulations, certainly their attitude would lead one to believe that there was no problem at all: "It is not driving anyone crazy."

Well, before I am through, Mr. Chairman, I am going to point out it is disturbing a great many people, and it is not only driving people crazy, it is in effect, I would say, causing deaths of a number of people who live in Metropolitan Toronto.

When the hon. Minister of Health was asked to comment—this is back near the end of 1964—his comment was this:

> Inspiration was not the government's job, countered Health Minister Matthew Dymond, getting into the fray.

And then it goes on how he blamed the shortage on inaction by Toronto hospital boards.

> I warned them—

that is the local authorities:

> —in 1959 that they were going to have a bed shortage unless they did something about it, he said. We pay pay grants and we pay for hospital care but the initiative for new hospital construction has to come from the hospital boards.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the financing of hospital construction here in the province and more particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, because in the instance of Scarborough we saw where they were anxious to do some building, but of course, the local area just did not have the amount of capital available to suit the regulations of OHSC. We simply as a government, as a Department of Health, are going to have to face up to the tragic problem over all of Metropolitan Toronto.

Now I just want to read a few figures that are up to date affecting the hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto. It does not include every hospital in Metropolitan Toronto, otherwise we would be here for a great length of time, but it is symptomatic. When we bear in mind that the overall shortage, which I repeat is over 2,000 active treatment beds, and then approximately 3,000 shortage in

the way of chronic and convalescent beds, what is important to bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, is that this shortage of chronic and convalescent care beds is causing the taxpayer—and I do not care if the taxpayer is at the federal, provincial or local level, it is costing him money. Because we all know that it is far cheaper to care for people in the chronic and convalescent beds than in the active treatment beds. As long as we allow this tremendous shortage in the chronic and convalescent care field, we are just going to increase the jam-up and the cost of the active treatment care beds.

Let us go down some of the list of these hospitals: the Queensway general hospital, they have 335 beds. I think the hon. Minister said they had 323 last night, my figures were 335. They book an average of 11 elective cases per day, there is a backlog of medical cases back to April 14 and there is a backlog of surgical cases waiting since April 15.

Branson memorial hospital, they have 163 beds. On their waiting list are between 50 and 60 medical cases, and surgical approximately between 40 and 50. They take five elective cases each day, regular and surgical adults. In medical cases they take the emergency or urgent cases that come in. There is a waiting list of five in the pediatrics division. Of course we know in this hospital, at Branson memorial, there is to be an extension to the hospital in a month or so and they will have a total, we hope, of 498 beds. Perhaps it will improve there.

In the Toronto general hospital they have 480 beds. They have a waiting list of 1,393, and that includes the urgent, elective and everything; and that is the grand total, 1,393.

St. Michael's hospital: The number of beds are 904 for adults and there are 120 bassinets. There are 206 urgent bookings for private patients, and the clinic outpatients who are being treated as outpatients, but who should be in hospital according to St. Michael's, consists of 124 females and 169 male patients waiting. Some of these are urgent; the rest are semi-urgent.

There are about eight beds available for men daily and eight beds available daily for women patients. This again is in St. Michael's hospital.

Occasionally they have a bed vacant overnight but not very often. These are frequently used for emergency cases. There are usually patients in the halls. This past week—well, that would be now about ten days ago —this past week there have been two or three patients in the halls. In the spring of the year it is not quite so congested. In the winter months there are about four or five patients in the halls.

At the Humber memorial hospital there are 323 beds and this is their waiting list about a week ago: 13 very urgent cases, and this was put in capital letters; six pediatric cases that were semi-urgent; 18 psychiatric cases that were urgent; 12 male surgeries, semi-urgent; 37 female medical, semi-urgent; 22 male medical, semi-urgent; and 11 female surgeries.

In other words, they had about 119 patients that were either urgent or semi-urgent; and again I emphasize that there are 13 that are considered very urgent. Now those are a few of them.

I might mention that at St. Joseph's hospital they usually have from five to 15 cots in the halls every night because of the crowded conditions at that hospital. They will take people in emergency cases even if they have to, as I said, put them in the halls. But in that case, at St. Joseph's, there are from five to 15 in the halls.

Now I turn to the most shocking aspect of the case in Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. Minister is well aware of it and I think it should be emphasized to show how serious and how tragic a situation can develop if action is not taken, if we are not aware of what our needs are going to be and if we do not plan ahead.

In 1960 a committee was set up to investigate the need in Metropolitan Toronto for hospital beds. It finally made its report and the need was obvious. But in many cases it is not necessary to appoint a committee to find out that the danger of a hospital bed shortage can amount to a case of tragedy where the scarcity becomes one of drastic proportions. For example, they say that the active bed average per population should be about five beds per 1,000 population.

In Scarborough with their population of about 340,000 people, they have got 1.1 active treatment beds instead of five per 1,000 population. It is obvious that the Scarborough area is in one awful mess because of the lack of hospital construction. There has been agitation for some time to build a hospital and certainly the doctors in that area have gone to great lengths to see that something be done; but as of right now this is the situation in the Scarborough general hospital.

There are more than 400 patients on the

urgent waiting list and more than 1,200 on the elective list. The elective list is the list of private patients that doctors are trying to get in, but there are 400 patients on the urgent list in Scarborough. Urgent patients are forced to wait from a few days to several weeks, and according to officials at the hospital some have to wait several months before admission.

Elective patients have a waiting period ranging from a few weeks to several months. One official said that the situation has been worsening over the past three years and says that the waiting list is particularly bad in view of the fact that the hospital admits more patients than any other hospital in Ontario. It has the lowest patient staying period in the province.

A lot of people criticize the doctors and hospitals and say, "Oh, they figure they can get their hospital care free because they have insurance and they stay in hospital as long as they can." The average length of stay per person in Ontario, I believe, is ten days. Here in this hospital the average patient stays there six days.

Last year the average length of time a patient stayed in the hospital in Scarborough was 7.1 days. Again, there has been a drastic reduction in the length of time that a patient stays in the hospital and it would appear that the doctors are sending their patients home sooner than they should go. We do not know, but it seems amazing that the doctors are forced, in order to keep the bed space available for urgent cases, literally to see their patients get the bum's rush.

It is like a sausage machine churning out patients. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, when I take my dog to the veterinary hospital, he has a far better chance of staying as long as he needs to stay and I am glad that I will not be a patient up in Scarborough.

It is certainly not the administration's fault at the hospital at Scarborough—

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. No patient is getting the bum's rush out of the Scarborough general hospital.

Mr. Trotter: That is argumentative!

Mr. Chairman: The member may have a difference of opinion and he will have an opportunity to express it.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had some knowledge of the situation I would bow to his comments, but I think he has no knowledge of what goes on in the Scarborough general hospital.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member for Parkdale to avoid repetition if he will.

Mr. Trotter: Well, some of this stuff needs emphasizing and again, just to make a comparison, where the average patient in the province of Ontario stays in our hospitals ten days, at Toronto Scarborough it is six days, last year it was 7.1. Obviously the time is less and less. Why? The reason is that right now there are 400 patients on the urgent waiting list; there are 1,200 on the elective list, a total of 1,600 people waiting to get into Scarborough general hospital. So is it any wonder that a group of doctors visited the hon. Minister of Health not so long ago and raised proper blazes with him!

It is a shame that the medical profession, and any of those in the health field, were not raising considerable more trouble with the Minister of Health before this time, because here we have a situation where over a two-year period, the Ontario hospital services commission says to Scarborough, "No, you cannot build, you do not have proper financial backing." And they were probably quite correct in sticking to the tight rulings of the regulations, but then almost within 24 hours after going to the Minister of Health, the Minister reverses the OHSC, and even increases the number of beds that had been originally planned.

Now, what we need in the province of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, is more action of that kind by the Minister of Health to see to it that these areas get proper facilities.

I want to, again, emphasize that it has been in this Toronto area, a serious worry, not only to the doctors and to the patients but to the families of the patients, who we know are pretty desperate.

Dr. Morton Shulman, the prominent coroner here in Metropolitan Toronto, when he is investigating these deaths or making comments on people who have died as a result of not getting to the hospitals, has said more are bound to die when you have that waiting list, particularly when you have a patient ill with cancer or heart disease. In other words, he says, more are bound to die.

One doctor claimed you have to be—I will quote him directly; Dr. Donald Rice of the college of general practice said this:

> Most hospitals are introducing methods where they can get people in and out as quickly as is decent. These days you practically have to be dead to get in.

Now, that is from a prominent doctor in this area. This shortage in the suburbs, not only causes great concern in the suburbs but puts a tremendous pressure on hospitals centrally located, like the Toronto general hospital. Just to give you two instances of how this shortage of hospitals on the outskirts of Metro affects the downtown area:

> General practitioners who either have no admitting privileges or are so low on the waiting list tell patients to take ambulances to major downtown hospitals in the hope that they will be admitted.

Well, now that information, Mr. Chairman, comes from an article by Sheila Gormley, writing in the Toronto *Telegram* last February 28. And she quotes a Forest Hill doctor:

> If I cannot find a bed any other way I tell my patients to take an ambulance to the Toronto general. We must resort to this method.

Well, no wonder; there is a waiting list at the Toronto general of over 1,300 people. When I say 1,300, that includes not only the urgent and semi-urgent but also includes elective cases. But all of them, Mr. Chairman, are patients to whom their doctors say you need hospital care. I would assume the number of people who have joined our hospital scheme, and the vast majority of them are insured, feel that they are entitled to proper hospital care.

Basically, this business of hospital care, Mr. Chairman—and this is where I seriously disagree with the hon. Minister—is the problem of the provincial government. Constitutionally, health is the responsibility of the province. And for us to sit back, in this day and age, and tell the local community to go out and just raise the money, either from taxing the local ratepayer who is now already overtaxed, or by trying to raise it from public subscription, is just plain silly.

I know, a couple of years ago, I think it was about three years ago, we on this side of the House were belabouring this point with the hon. Minister of Health about the shortage of hospitals and the shortage of nurses. We went into facts and figures, using at that time as an illustration, the Toronto western hospital; how it was really ridiculous to try to go to the general public for funds, that most of the so-called general public, when it was broken down, was the large corporations. And if these large corporations are to contribute—and they should—it is far better that they be taxed rather than certain ones being hit all the time in charity drives. If the chairman of the board of a large corporation is interested in hospitals, you will get more money from his company. Or if he is the soft-hearted type, you will get more from a certain company. And if you have those people in your area you have a better chance of getting a local hospital.

This is too much of a hit-and-miss situation. As the hon. member for Scarborough West said the other day, if you want schools or highways, you do not go out looking for public subscription. It comes out of the general fund—well, it comes out of your consolidated revenue. And, just as the provincial government has to face up to the fact that they are going to be responsible for hospitals, it is also, I think, in this changing world we live in, in large measure a responsibility of the federal government. But certainly the responsibility is shifting away from the municipality; it is shifting away from these charity drives. It should shift completely away from these charity drives onto the shoulders of the provincial and the federal government.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Simcoe East gives one of those stupid Tory remarks of his. We have been mentioning this point in this House for five or six years and still we see shocking tragic lists at Scarborough, with 400 urgent cases waiting to get in. We see a government sitting on its backside, doing very little, coming up as they did last night and giving us that phony excuse that they were supplying two-thirds of the support of hospitals; and when we break it down, that includes the federal payment, and it includes now what we call extra loans. Well, I want to deal with this extra loan bit and find out just how much you are really helping to find bed space in the province of Ontario. For again your proposal has given—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the rules do prohibit repetition. I think the comments from this side are entirely in order. The hon. member has been saying the same thing for days.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for London South has stood in his place in connection with a ruling he announced, and I would point out to the member for Parkdale that, under the same rule that was

brought forward to the House yesterday evening on page 26, I suggest the member avoid repetition.

Mr. Trotter: I will not repeat myself, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to point out to you on this that I challenge you, or any other member, to go back to *Hansard* over the years and read my speeches; and in each particular speech there is very little repetition. I am seldom guilty of that. I suggest you better read what goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps some of this is bothering your conscience, and it plays back on you like a broken record. I would like to deal somewhat with the financing of hospitals here in the province of Ontario; how the money is raised and what percentage is actually spent by the provincial government and how it affects the whole setup here in the province.

The hon. Minister last night told us that they would be expecting a local board to raise one-third of the cost of construction plus the cost of land. Well, that cost of land is an item that should be considered. If the local board is in a smaller community, the land can be fairly cheap. It is still possible, I think, up in the area of Highway 401 and Finch, to buy a good piece of land, which would probably be enough for a hospital, for $100,000. If you were trying to buy land down in central Toronto, around the Toronto general hospital, it would cost a local board $32 a square foot, which is a tremendous amount of money. So the cost of land must surely be considered, especially if you were trying to purchase real estate in Metropolitan Toronto.

The hon. Minister says that the provincial government will supply the other two-thirds; this would include the grants they get from the federal government and also include the $5,000 loans they get per bed —and we understand these loans are going to be increased. This is what is confusing: We do not know how much. My contention is that the grants to the hospitals should be paid outright, because if you are just going to make this extra money available in the form of loans, all you are doing is taxing the facilities of any new hospital to carry on.

This extra money that they have to pay out in the form of interest is going to come out of the hospital's money it receives or makes on private bed care and semi-private care. Any discretionary funds that a hospital might have, might make from its extra services, is certainly required by any hospital—I do not care if it is in a small community or a large centre—in order to supply the extra services. A hospital that is trying to improve itself, that is trying to become one of the best in its area, is obviously going to require—the public today are demanding—more and more in the way of extra services. And these hospitals can only supply them if they can make some money on private bed care and on semi-private care; but, by having to pay this extra interest, it is going to make it extremely difficult for new hospitals to get started.

Again, I emphasize that it will be hardest on the hospitals that need it most. It is certainly difficult for a hospital in downtown Toronto to raise money, even today. We all know, from the campaign of the sick children's hospital, that they did not reach the amount of money they wanted. Here is one of the best organized, most popular hospitals, probably in Canada, and it cannot reach its goal—it falls a couple of million dollars short of its goal. If that type of hospital cannot get money out of the public, I do not know who can. Because, let us remember, the sick children's hospital has all the best connections. Many of the wealthy families here in this area, chairmen of the boards of various large corporations, are close to that hospital, just as they are close to the Toronto general hospital.

These downtown hospitals have the best talent, the best voluntary talent, at their fingertips; but if you go out into the suburbs, Mr. Chairman, it is not quite so easy to get your very top men on your voluntary campaign. I am not saying that there are not any. I am just saying that it is far easier for the big hospitals, the long-established hospitals, to have these most important connections. Because whenever you see anybody heading up a campaign, it is usually one of the members of the Toronto blue-blood families, with money behind them, and with all the connections that are needed in raising money in a big way. It is not that easy to do it in smaller areas that are just growing.

Mind you, in the smaller communities that have been established a long time, like Belleville, they can go out and raise money. Of course, in that case they even could get it out of the Belleville city council. But it is easy, relatively easy, for a well-established community, with some wealthy families in it, to raise money for charitable purposes. But it is getting harder and harder all the time, and it is going to be virtually impossible—as was evidenced in one hospital out in Etobicoke that, so far, according to newspaper

reports, has spent more on the campaign, or about as much on the campaign, as it has been able to raise.

Now, this situation may correct itself—

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, a correction. That was an initial report. The Etobicoke general hospital's financial campaign is going along very well. They are shooting for 1,000 beds—which is not an outhouse, I can assure you. May I also tell the hon. member for Parkdale that, for both hospitals in the township of Etobicoke, the land was donated free by the local municipality.

Mr. Trotter: Well, all these things help. But it is still quite evident that they have had difficulty getting going. I am giving them credit for what they have done. It is not easy, and anyone working in that to raise that money—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: What is easy?

Mr. Trotter: Well, it is far harder than it used to be in the old days, when hospitalization was not as expensive and there was not the demand upon either the public purse or, more particularly, on the corporate purse and on the private individual's purse.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Excuse me for interrupting. Do you realize that the federal government in Ottawa has not increased its grants since 1958?

Mr. Trotter: That is right. When the federal government started out in 1948, it said it was going to supply one-third. This was the plan. Last year it supplied 12 per cent, and certainly it should be faulted for this.

I am not trying to offer any excuses for the federal government. The trouble is, the two bodies of government, the provincial and federal, who should really come to grips with this problem, are avoiding it. They are trying to say, "Let the community worry about it. Let the local board worry about it."

And it is virtually impossible today to meet this problem as we should.

By introducing this new loan system, or increasing it, as the hon. Minister says, all he is doing is giving a façade that he is doing something for the hospitals. But, in the end, he is only going to increase their debt burden and we are going to have more and more situations like we have in Ottawa.

The great problem with the Ottawa general hospital, as we heard last night, is their debt structure. By offering more loans, all you are doing is increasing the debt structure, particularly of the newer hospitals, and also increasing their operating costs in interest payments.

Now, admittedly, sir, the interest payments, are low, and it is lower than the market, but you are still taking money away from the hospitals that could be used for supplying extra services. You are, I would say, springing a booby-trap in the whole financial system of any new hospital that starts up under this façade that the Minister offered to us last night.

We simply are not, even today, keeping up with our increase in population. Between the years 1960 to 1964, our active treatment beds increased 17.86 per cent. The population of Ontario in that five-year period, from 1960-64, increased over 22 per cent. We were behind when we started, and we are falling behind all the time, particularly in areas where the increase in population has not been just 22 per cent but in some cases, in that period of time, over 100 per cent.

These areas which have become urbanized, like Scarborough, like North York, simply have a problem that cannot be met and be borne by the local property taxpayer. To try to put the main burden, as it has been, on the local taxpayer, through his local taxes, or through charity drives, is simply ignoring the main problem.

Last year, the local boards raised slightly under 60 per cent from either local taxes or from charity drives. I am sorry, that took place in 1964; and in 1965, it is going to be over 60 per cent. The hon. Minister's loan scheme might help somewhat. I hope he goes into more detail; but essentially, when it comes to raising taxes, or the local board having to pay interest, he is not meeting the problem whatsoever.

For example, if we take a base year, and go by the figure of 100 for 1949-50, set up by the Southam construction cost building index, in 1960, when the OHSC was getting underway, the index was already up to 152. Today your cost index, that is in August of 1965, was over 190.

So you can see, Mr. Chairman, that your costs here are going up at a great and a tremendous rate.

I would like to just point out, Mr. Chairman, as to the number of beds per population here in the province of Ontario, and to just briefly touch on the—I did mention that the active treatment beds, I think, in a period of five years, had only increased 17.86 per cent, and our population 22.2 per cent. I may

be repeating myself on that, Mr. Chairman, but I think that this again is the crux of the matter, that these waiting lists are going to continue, unless we have a very drastic change in our policy.

One of the ways to relieve the stress and the strain on your active treatment hospitals, is to increase chronic care hospitals. The Minister, I remember on one occasion, said that the rate of 1.5 beds per thousand population may be too low; it bears looking into. I had hoped he might have something to say on that and I hoped that our chronic bed care per population would be increased. But our aim now is supposed to be 1.5.

The truth of it is today, even when the Minister gives his very conservative estimate of 1.5, it is actually 1.2. There was one instance, between 1963 and 1964, when there was a natural decrease in the number of chronic beds here in the province of Ontario. In 1963 we had over 7,700 and in 1964 it dropped to 6,900. We need a great drive, and a great building programme, in the field of chronic care, if we are going to do anything in order to relieve what is a most serious situation.

I have one question, particularly that I want to ask the hon. Minster; but there is one other point, and this I will follow up with some questions.

A few years ago it cost about $5,000 to build an active treatment bed. Today it is supposed to be in the neighbourhood of $20,000 for an active treatment bed; yet it is now much higher, if you talk to the people in the hospital association here in Ontario. They say it is much higher; it is closer to $30,000; and that costs are going up so rapidly that you have to keep looking at the situation every few months, that the figure of $20,000 really has no bearing in modern-day costs.

If you keep in mind these increasing costs, Mr. Chairman, even under the hon. Minister's suggestion of increased loans, it means more and more debt, more and more interest payments by the local hospital board, and here again, it is a situation that we are just digging ourselves in.

I have two questions for the Minister: Is there any plan for an increase in the chronic care hospitals, in order to bring it up into the rate of 1.5 per 1000? Also, could the hon. Minister give me some idea of what he thinks it costs to construct the hospital on the rate of an active bed? Is it $20,000 or is it $30,000?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The answer to the first question is, "Not at the present time." The hon. member, in discussing chronic care beds, of course, has not taken into account the impact of the home care programme, which is steadily expanding, and which of course takes the place of the chronic care beds in certain areas.

I did not get the second question, I am sorry.

Mr. Trotter: Could the hon. Minister give me some idea of what an active treatment hospital bed costs today?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It depends on the location of the hospital; it depends on the type of bed; but from $18,000 to $27,000 a bed.

I would like to make a few comments on some of the things the hon. member said. First of all, we have never stated anything to the contrary, but there is a scarcity of active treatment beds in Metropolitan Toronto; and again I emphasized it last evening.

The figure is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2,000 beds, but I also specifically stated that these beds are presently going up. When they will be in operation, I do not know. Again I pointed out, as I emphasized on other occasions, that there is no such thing as an instant hospital. As soon as this government increased its grants and provided low-cost loans, projects which were in early planning were brought forward, were started to build, and this has provided the solution to the problem. But it will take time to build the hospitals. It has been fortunate that, in spite of the tremendous boom in construction, hospital construction has not appeared to suffer; that all the projects are going forward completely on schedule, and going forward quite rapidly.

I am quite at a loss to know where he got the figure—at least 3,000 beds short in convalescent and chronic care. Indeed, this is one thing that cannot be found in the report of the Calvin committee. They stated, and I cannot quote the exact words, but it was to the effect that the situation, insofar as convalescent and chronic care beds is concerned, was satisfactory in this area.

Now the waiting lists, of course, are trotted out every time. Once again, as I have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, statistics are not always just exactly what they seem to be. It is very difficult to know how many of these people, quoted on the waiting list of any individual hospital, do not have their name on the waiting list of many other hospitals.

For instance, I read recently a report of a hospital with a very large number on its

waiting list—I think the number was something of the order of 1,100—but over 800 of them were tonsillectomies, which are purely elective and can only be done at the time when all infection is completely quiet. It is usually done at a time, or arranged for a time, that suits the convenience of the patient; this, of course, is what obtains in the case of nearly all elective cases.

The hon. member spoke about the average provincial stay, and then cited the stay in Scarborough as evidence that the patients were being pushed out. I am quite certain, if I know the doctors in Scarborough, they will take umbrage at that statement. I think I know them. I have gotten to know them over the last little while. I think they are to be commended; and it is passing strange to me that, with all the advances in medicine, and I have no hesitation in saying this, I have said it publicly to my peers many times, with all of the advances in medicine, with all our boasted accomplishments, it is passing strange to me that the average hospital stay should be increasing anyway.

My report yesterday showed that it is not increasing. It remained last year the same as it was the year before. But to say that this is the reason, that the shortage of beds is the reason, for the short patient stay, is quite ridiculous, and certainly would not be accepted by any medical man.

Indeed, I have two doctors in Metro Toronto hospital planning council and one of them said quite openly that he is certain 30 per cent of the beds in Metropolitan Toronto are wrongly occupied. A hospital administrator who sits on the same board was a little more cautious in his estimate, and he said 15 per cent. But even if it is the lower figure, then I think, Mr. Chairman, this would put a very different aspect on the whole problem of bed shortages.

But again I repeat, sir—and you will pardon me for repeating—there has never been any attempt on the part of this government to hide the fact that there is a shortage in Metro Toronto, but that active steps were underway to meet with it.

Then he quoted a group of doctors who visited me from Scarborough and raised blue blazes. Well again, I have to plead ignorance of this. I have not seen them. I have not heard them. I have not met them. Either they or the hon. member were dreaming, I do not know which, but I have not met them. Two doctors from Scarborough came to see me on two occasions, and on neither occasion did they raise blue blazes. One couple came to see me here in the anteroom, another came to my home one Saturday afternoon; and on both occasions, we had a very pleasant, and I think constructive, informative visit. I appreciated meeting them, and got a far greater insight into their problems; and I think they got a better insight into mine.

Now, he quoted Dr. Rice, a prominent physician. Dr. Rice is, or was, a prominent physician, but he never practised medicine in Ontario; and, if he were speaking from experience, I presume he was speaking about Halifax or Nova Scotia.

About this matter of the increased support for hospitals that was announced last night. It means just exactly what we said. We will ask the local board to find one-third of the cost. The province of Ontario has undertaken, as policy, to find the remaining two-thirds. It is anticipated at the present time that the balance remaining of that two-thirds, after the federal and provincial statutory grants are removed, will be in the form of a loan.

The detail of how that loan is to be repaid is presently being worked out by the Treasury and the hospital services commission, and my department. It is not necessary to reach that field at the present time, because it will be at least two years before any of the money will qualify for repayment. But I give you the assurance of the government, Mr. Chairman, at this time, that whatever the final method, or whatever the final detail may be, we say to you and to hospital boards across the province that they will not be required to raise any money at the local level to pay off any part of this two-thirds. The government of Ontario has undertaken responsibility to find that and provide it for them.

This is unequivocal. There can be no doubt, and there is no doubt, and will be no doubt in the minds of hospital boards. They understand what we are doing and I am quite certain hon. members will, too. We are not taking away moneys that can be used for any essential service. And I want to make eminently clear too that the cost of all essential services is met in the per diem budget.

I would like to point out too, and the hon. member talked about us taking away the preferred income, that Ontario is more generous in this regard than any other province in Canada. Most of the provinces allow the hospitals to keep a part of it, but I believe 10 per cent is the next best; and we allow ours to keep 25 per cent. The hospital that has no loan is presently allowed to keep 50 per cent; the hospital that has a loan

is allowed to keep 25 per cent of the differential income.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I shudder to think of the problems you are going to face in enforcing a rule which prohibits repetition in this House, but I rise at the moment with considerable peace of mind that I am not going to cause you any trouble. I have a rather important issue which I would like to raise in relationship to hospital services in the province of Ontario and I solicit the undivided attention of the hon. member for London South because I think he would be interested in it.

I refer to the growing preoccupation among many people with regard to the high cost, the mounting costs, of hospital services in the province of Ontario at the present time. When Dr. Nielson was before the standing committee on February 22, he provided a statistical chart covering the first eight years of operation of the OHSC, and that chart revealed, you will be interested to know, Mr. Chairman, that in 1959, the first year of operations, the total cost was $161 million. By 1965, the expenditure had more than doubled to $347 million. But the projected costs for this year are up to $394 million, an increase of $47 million, the largest single increase in the history of the hospital plan.

Dr. Nielson predicted that costs would continue to rise in this fashion, with the prospect of them levelling off somewhere between $475 million and $500 million. I am a little puzzled as to why one can conclude they might level off there, but I think I am correct in saying that that is Dr. Nielson's suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, no one will deny that figures of this size merit some pretty careful scrutiny. Certainly Dr. Nielson expressed a kind of fatalistic acceptance of the continued rise. But, Mr. Chairman, can nothing be done about such increases? Are we the helpless victims of a continued rise in hospitalization costs? Is there nothing that can be done to hold costs in check, without lowering the service to our people?

I suggest that there are things that can be done, not only to hold these costs in check but even reverse the trend, and I want to present two or three proposals to the hon. Minister of Health. I feel, after the comments of the hon. member for Parkdale, that some of the proposals that I am going to make will hit at problems which he has been tackling from another direction altogether.

The first proposal is one that was discussed in the standing committee. It was pointed out that the average cost for an active treatment hospital in Ontario had risen to $28 per day. But the comparable costs for chronic hospital care is half of that, $14 per day. And the average cost for nursing home-care is half again, about $7 per day.

Mr. Chairman, some simple calculations flow from these figures. Every day that a patient is kept in an active treatment hospital, after his condition has improved to the point that he could be removed to a chronic hospital, the unnecessary expenditure is $14; or, where nursing home care would be adequate, the unnecessary expenditure is $21. Now surely it is economic folly of the highest order not to build more of the less expensive chronic hospital or nursing home accommodation so that our overtaxed active treatment hospital beds can be made available for those who need them? Failure to do so would not only contribute unnecessarily to the overall hospital bill of the province, but keep the pressure on for building new active treatment hospitals at costs which now range up to some $30,000 per bed—when some of this expansion might be rendered unnecessary through the use of less costly facilities.

For example, now that adequate standards are to be established in nursing homes through licensing, we will shortly be in a position to authorize more accommodation in them with coverage being met from the OHSC as an alternative to active treatment hospitals. Dr. Neilson informed the standing committee that the commission's hesitancy in extending this practice to more nursing homes stemmed chiefly from the uneasiness with regard to the lack of established standards. When the nursing home situation has been regularized, if private operators do not emerge in great enough numbers to meet the need, then I repeat the proposal this party has made earlier in this session: that the government should fill the gap with publicly owned and operated nursing homes.

Another source of immediate relief to the hospital utilization pressures is the more rapid extension of our home care programme. If home care were available across the province, instead of being limited to a number of areas, adequate services could be provided to thousands of patients without the $28-a-day outlay involved in active treatment beds.

To sum up in this aspect, Mr. Chairman, a vigorous government programme for developing sufficient nursing home facilities and

home care services would represent a dollar saved for every dollar spent—indeed, two or three dollars saved for every dollar spent in the instance of home care. Today these unnecessary expenditures are reflected in the mounting subsidy which the government must pour into our hospital insurance plan, or in the inevitable increase in OHSC premiums which will follow the next provincial election.

The second way in which rising hospital costs can be held or reversed is one which my colleague, the hon. member for Scarborough West, has detailed in an unprecedented way in this Legislature—through the imaginative development of a public health programme. Actually, our emphasis until now has not been on a health care programme but rather a sickness and accident programme. We treat the ailment after it has developed, at very great cost, instead of establishing the many preventive measures, at much less cost, which will catch the health problem at an early stage or prevent it altogether.

The millions of dollars spent on a multiphased mass screening of our population, along the lines pioneered by Dr. Dale in Wellington county, will save tens of millions of dollars in later hospitalization. Furthermore, the facilities of our highly expensive active treatment hospitals are being unnecessarily used for diagnostic, X-ray and lab purposes that could be met more conveniently, and at less cost, through a modern public health programme.

The full ramifications of this have been explored, Mr. Chairman, so I will let the case rest there. It can be summed up this way: Hospitals, with their high operational costs, should be a place of last resort. Very often they are a place of first resort, simply because we have not developed a public health care programme where the emphasis would be on early detection and prevention.

This brings me to my third proposal, admittedly the most difficult, admittedly long-term, but ultimately the most effective for checking the rising costs of hospitalization while at the same time providing more effective health care for our people. That is the development of the prepaid group practice of medicine rather than the traditional solo practice. Broadly speaking, Mr. Chairman, medicine is organized on essentially the same basis as it was 100 years ago, except that specialists provide a growing proportion of physicians' services.

The traditional role of the family doctor has almost disappeared. Continuity of family care has become a myth. For a growing proportion of our people, the doctor-patient relationship simply does not exist. It is remarkable to note that, more than a generation ago, in 1932, in the United States, some 50 leaders in the field of medical practice, public health, the social sciences, and the public, aided by an expert research staff, published the report of the so-called committee on the costs of medical care. Now that committee had three major recommendations:

1. That medical services, both preventive and therapeutic, should be furnished largely by organized groups of physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists and other associated personnel organized preferably around a hospital, for rendering complete home, office and hospital care;

2. That the costs of medical care be placed on a group prepayment basis through the use of insurance, through the use of taxation, or both;

3. That the study, evaluation and coordination of medical services be considered important functions of every state and local community; that agencies be formed to exercise these functions; and that local coordination of rural and urban services receive special attention.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that 17 years after that committee published its report, the President of the United States appointed a commission on the health needs of the nation to re-examine the whole problem. It covered the same ground and arrived at virtually identical findings and recommendations.

In 1944, because of inaction, both within the medical profession and government circles, the New York academy of medicine appointed an independent committee of physicians and distinguished lay leaders to restudy the programme once again. After labouring conscientiously for three years, and again issuing a series of fact-finding publications, the final report in 1947 of the academy's committee on medicine in a changing order endorsed group prepayment for comprehensive medical care provided by medical group practice.

Despite this repeated statement of goals, the American genius for organizing various skills and services in industry has not been reflected in the business of medicine. Essentially the business of medicine operates on the same principles as back in the horse-and-buggy days.

As Dr. George Baehr, former president of the New York academy of medicine, stated

last year at the centre of health administration studies in the graduate school of business, University of Chicago, and I am quoting:

> The vision of the future has thus far proved to be a mirage, except for some programmes of organized prepaid comprehensive medical care in scattered areas of the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the implications of these scattered experiments are far-reaching for hospital costs.

I want to take a brief look at them and indicate the extent to which their results have been dramatically confirmed in an Ontario setting, through the operation of the Sault Ste. Marie and district group health association. Here—I submit, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister—lies an answer to the rising cost problem which we simply cannot ignore.

Let me cite, first, the basic statistics of three American experiments. An independent study of the experience of three labour unions in the New York area was made by the health information foundation. Members of these unions were given a choice between two kinds of comprehensive health insurance coverage for physicians' services outside as well as in the hospital. One plan paid individual physicians of the patients' choice on a fee-for-service basis; the other provided services through 31 medical groups prepaid monthly by a capitation payment for each person enrolled in the group.

Under the fee-for-service system of paying individual physicians, the annual hospital admission rate was found to be 110 per thousand enrollees, and the average number of days in hospital per 1,000 was 870. Among persons receiving comprehensive medical care under prepaid group practice, the annual hospital admission rate was 63 instead of 110, and the days in the hospital averaged only 410 per 1,000, as compared with 870 in each year. In short, Mr. Chairman, the hospital utilization rate was less than half.

A similar study was done by Professor I. S. Falk of Yale University, for members of the united steelworkers of America. Once again, some of their families were insured for medical care by individual physicians under fee-for-service medical indemnity plan and their experience was compared with those who have prepaid comprehensive medical care from the Kaiser foundation medical groups on the west coast. The contrast is significant. The annual hospital admission rate for those enrolled under the group plan was 95 per 1,000 persons, as compared with 135 per 1,000 population among those enrolled on the fee-for-service indemnity plan.

Those who received comprehensive coverage from group practice average only 570 days in hospital per 1,000 enrollees, as compared with 1,032 days for those steelworkers and their dependants covered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield indemnity plan; and 1,167 days per 1,000 for those insured by commercial insurance companies with indemnity practice. In short, 570 days in the group coverage as compared with either 1,032 or 1,167 for the traditional plans—approximately one-half the rate, again, of hospital utilization.

The third American experiment was that with the federal employees health benefits programme, which was studied by the medical care section of the American public health association. The Blue Cross-Blue Shield annual hospital admission rate was 104 per 1,000 insured persons and the average time spent annually in hospital was 882 days per 1,000. In sharp contrast, the population which received medical care in and out of hospitals, through group practices in various parts of continental United States, had an annual hospital admission rate of 58 per 1,000 persons covered; and an annual average length of stay in hospital was 460 days per 1,000 persons. In short, the hospital utilization under group practice was 460 as compared with 882, just a little over one-half.

The difference of approximately 50 per cent in hospital utilization, under the two systems of medical care and payments for physicians' services, derived in part from the number of surgical operations performed on federal employees and their families under the two different systems of medical care. And I come back, Mr. Chairman, to the problem I raised with the hon. Minister earlier in his estimates, about the evidence in many places of excessive surgery. Here is the record, in the instance of this federal employees' plan:

The number of surgical operations performed per 1,000 persons are: All surgical operations — under Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, 70; under group practice plans, 39. Tonsillectomies and adenoidectomies—under Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, 10.6; under group practice plans, 4. Female surgery—excluding D and C—under Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, 8.2; under group practice plans, 5.4. Appendectomies—under Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, 2.6; under group practice plans, 1.4.

May I emphasize once again, Mr. Chairman, before leaving these American experiments that the data which I have presented

was compiled by responsible, objective, independent researchers. These are facts, not opinions; they are carefully documented and well-substantiated studies which can be found, as a matter of fact, in many reputable medical journals.

Let us come back to Ontario. We have our first experiment in comprehensive group practice medical care in the Soo plan initiated by the united steelworkers of America. Today that group practice plan covers one-quarter of the population of Sault Ste. Marie and district—as a matter of fact, it is about 20,000 out of a district population of about 75,000.

The first year of the plan covered the period from September, 1963, to September, 1964. Comparative statistics are now becoming available and, Mr. Chairman, they are absolutely startling, to say the least. The annual hospital admission rate per 1,000, for the one-quarter of the Soo and district population covered under the group plan, was 95.

The figure for the community as a whole, including those who were in the group plan, because they could not separate it out at the hospital level, was 136; or rather I should say they did not separate it out at the hospital level.

The average length of stay in the hospital was 7.7 days for those under group coverage, compared with 11.2 days for the community as a whole, including those under group coverage. The figure for all Ontario, in approximately the same period, was 9.9.

Under the Soo plan, if you take those two things together—hospital admissions and the length of stay under the Soo plan—the annual hospital utilization rate per 1,000 population covered was 680, compared, Mr. Chairman to 1,400 for the general population in the community, including those under the group coverage. In other words, for the rest of the general population in the Soo district, it was up in the range of 1,700 to 1,800, so the overall figure was brought down to about 1,400 because of the group coverage patients.

How does this compare with the province as a whole, Mr. Chairman? The latest published figures for Ontario hospital utilization are for 1962—and they stood at 1,765 per 1,000, population. If the trend of the immediately previous years is used for a projection of that provincial figure forward to September, 1963—to September, 1964—namely, the period of the first year of operation for the Soo project, the comparable provincial figure for hospital utilization is in the range of 1,850 per 1,000 population.

Mr. Chairman, two startling conclusions emerge from these figures. While Ontario hospitalization figures are not out of line with experience throughout the rest of Canada, the interesting thing is that they are 50 per cent higher than the comparable figures arising from traditional medical practice in the various American communities which I mentioned above—in contrasting figures between the traditional and the group practice. The American figures were in the range of up to 1,200 compared with Ontario's in the range of 1,800. While some of this higher utilization rate in Ontario can be explained by the widely dispersed nature of our population, that is not the whole answer. We have every reason to stop and consider our high hospital utilization and the serious financial outlay that it is creating.

But, Mr. Chairman, even more startling is the achievement of a utilization rate of 680 by the Soo group plan, which reveals how unnecessarily high is our province-wide hospitalization utilization rate. It is almost unbelievable that the Soo group plan, in its first year of operation, should not only have matched the record of longer established group practice in the United States, but cut the hospital utilization rate a little more than one-third of the local community and of the province as a whole.

But if you find it unbelievable, Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that the figures are official. I have checked and double-checked them with the medical people and the administrative officers of the Soo clinic, and they are shortly going to be available in published form to anybody who cares to study them.

Mr. Chairman, it is obviously too early to draw hard-and-fast conclusions from the Soo experience with regard to potential reduction in hospital costs through group practice across the province, but a hospital utilization rate of 680 per 1,000 persons, as compared with about 1,850 persons throughout the whole Ontario population, is such a staggering achievement that its implications for cutting our hospital bill should be explored.

Clearly this figure cannot be projected across the province as a whole, with its widely scattered rural and northern populations. But I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that in the 80 per cent of the urban population that is designated as urban, there is no basic reason why the same achievement is not possible. Even if the provincial hospital-

ization figures were reduced by only one-half, as in the various American group medical projects, instead of by nearly two-thirds, as in the Soo plan's first year, I remind you that that would represent a saving of nearly $200 million.

Certainly, even with less dramatic achievements, it is realistic to assume that group medical practice would cut our hospital costs by well over $100 million, to say nothing of the savings in capital outlay in the immediate future for new hospitals, to which we are now being driven because of our extraordinarily high utilization rate.

May I pause here, for example, to comment on the line of argument of my friend from Parkdale, who in effect was saying that we have simply got to go out and build more hospitals. A study of these figures suggests that we maybe do not have to go out and build more hospitals. If we were to tackle and solve the problem of hospital utilization, we would not have to build more hospitals; indeed, we might fulfil much more than the hon. Minister could dream, the prediction of one of the administrators that 30 per cent of our hospital beds now are wrongly occupied.

In face of this kind of potential saving, surely it is our responsibility to consider ways and means of encouraging group practice? The advantages are many, beyond reducing our hospital bills. I shall not go into detail, because it is not relevant, Mr. Chairman, on the vote, but just let me list them quickly so that they can be in the context of the hon. members' thinking.

First, the evidence is conclusive that the quality of medical services improves markedly under group practice. Second, for the doctors, working on a team with colleagues who are specialists, creates an atmosphere which is professionally more attractive, in addition to providing higher net incomes, greater personal security, and more humane working conditions in terms of hours and regular vacations. Third, group practice provides an opportunity for more medical research, because the clinic can afford modern equipment for processing data, and a group provides the kind of controlled situation in which changes in conditions can be measured.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, the family doctor's status is elevated. His key importance in the medical team group assures him of financial rewards and a professional standing comparable to that of the specialist. In fact, he becomes the group's specialist in family counselling. He restores the old doctor-patient relationship, for he is not bypassed by patients on the way to the specialists in the group.

Hon. members will recognize that all of these are important advantages which merit extended debate on another occasion. But on this vote for a hospital plan, let us recognize that group medical practice offers the prospect, now solidly documented, of reducing hospital costs through lower utilization.

How then can group practice be more widely developed? One of the main obstacles up until now, it must be admitted, has been the attitude of the medical profession; but in the United States, the American medical association no longer disapproves of prepaid group practice. In 1959, the judicial council of the AMA ruled that participation in prepaid group practice, under a non-profit health insurance plan, is not unethical. Unfortunately, for a time, some 26 state legislatures were persuaded by the medical lobby to enact laws prohibiting the establishment of prepaid group practice; but two of them, Illinois and Ohio, have repealed their laws. And in New Jersey the highest court in the state has ruled the law to be unconstitutional and contrary to the public interest.

In Canada, Mr. Chairman, there is no formal opposition to group practice by the medical association, but I would be less than honest if I did not emphasize that informal pressures are still exerted. For example, while all the doctors practising at the Soo health clinic are members of the Ontario medical association, it is a little sad to note that none of them is permitted to become a member of the local medical society.

Generally speaking, however, the attitude of the medical profession has softened markedly from its original position of open hostility to group practice. In the United States, group practice has quadrupled in the last 12 years. Of all the doctors in the United States, ten per cent are practising within the structure of groups, and a recent poll of medical students indicated only 26 per cent wanted a completely independent practice, while over 60 per cent indicated a preference for some type of group or partnership practice.

Mr. Chairman, no one would advocate an effort to force doctors into group practice, but it is within our power at the legislative level to offer a range of incentives which would hasten a voluntary move in that direction; and I want to suggest three areas

in which this can be done to the hon. Minister and I would like his comment:

1. The Hall commission report recommended that the NHA should make funds available for the capital outlay in establishng group health clinics. I submit that this recommendation should be acted upon. I would urge the provincial government to raise the matter with Ottawa and, if it is deemed necessary, to enter into a partnership with Ottawa in the provision of long-term loans required so that the full burden of the initial outlay will not fall so heavily on the families involved and thereby become a financial "dis-incentive" to establishing a group practice.

2. There is a significant range of ancillary services which can be provided either in the hospitals or in a group health clinic. These include diagnostic services, X-rays and laboratory tests, or emergency services. The tendency is to drive those seeking these services into the hospital, where payment is covered by the OHSC. There is no logical reason why these services should not be given by a group health clinic with payment from the OHSC and thereby reduce the burden on hospital facilities.

3. Since preventive health services are an effective way to cut overall health care costs, and since preventive medicine is heavily featured in group medical practice, grants could be given to groups of medical teams for specific services. Indeed, there is already emerging a close co-ordination between group practice clinics and public health personnel because of their common efforts in this important field. Jointly, they offer a major way of checking and reversing the rising trend in hospital utilization rates.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose that this list of proposals is exhausted. Obviously, this is an area that merits some careful study, but what I have suggested represents the kind of economic incentive that can be legitimately considered to encourage group practice.

I invite the hon. Minister's comments, but I do so in the context of a situation in which I submit that the government cannot stand idly by in face of potential savings that could amount to $100 million and/or a higher quality of health care for our people.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have appreciated this submision by the hon. member and there is certainly no intention or desire on our part to brush it lightly aside.

I am surprised that he thought that Dr. Neilson took a fatalistic view of this. Dr. Neilson must have a better poker face than I thought he had. I know that this has caused all the members of the commission a very great deal of concern and I know that they have been applying themselves in extra measure to seeking solutions to the problem.

There are some questions that arise from a reading of the paper presented by the member, and probably in his research he came across these questions, but I recognize that you cannot cover all of the possibilities in the scope of the paper, extensive though it is, that the hon. member has done.

There is no intention to deny this and there is no intention to deny the validity and the authenticity of the figures. I have followed some of these studies myself, but the question that rises in my mind rises in the minds of some other commentators and that is: Is there strict comparability between the two types of practice referred to?

The question I have in my mind, in the case of the Blue Cross-Blue Shield programme, for instance, with the high utilization, the higher number of days for hospitalization for instance, the altogether greater number of services as compared with the group practice is: Is there not some selectivity in the group practice?

I recognize that, in the group practice, particularly when they are industrial groups such as the Soo in Ontario, the pensioners, too, are covered. They continue to have coverage, but the relative number of high-cost users to the low-cost users is much greater than in a community experience project. Do I make myself clear? If you take the whole spectrum of the community, as the Blue Cross-Blue Shield at least theoretically does, there would be a far greater percentage of high-cost users to low-cost users than there would be in the Soo group, for instance. This might not make a great difference; yet, on the other hand, it could. The fact does remain that there is no disagreement with the hon. member's contention that the quality of practice in a group, from almost every standpoint, is far more attractive than solo.

Indeed, I was quite surprised at the hon. member for Scarborough West who believed —and I hope that he still does not believe— but I was surprised at him suggesting that group practice was a good thing. I have never practised any other way. I have never practised solo and I would not practise solo for a multitude of selfish reasons, quite apart from the fact that I think it is a better way to practise medicine.

There is little to be gained, Mr. Chairman, in me going on and pointing out the questions that arise in my mind. I understand clearly what the hon. member is getting at. Once again we find ourselves on common ground. We believe that, out of our OMSIP —which I am terribly disappointed to know he thinks is a failure; we hope that it is a greater success than even I imagine. But out of it and the hospital plan working together —and, as I pointed out, we will have, I think, the best system of computer statistics available. Out of these two projects we will be able to see how we can bring these things more closely together in the direction that the hon. member has indicated in his complete and very thoroughgoing paper.

There are many interesting overtones or sidelights to it, but I think they bear deeper study, as the member said. They will get study because I assure you that we are tremendously concerned about the spiralling costs.

The hon. member did point out, of course, that Ontario's rise is not out of line with that of the whole of Canada. Indeed, I think we have valid reason to believe that we are striking the plateau, unless the second six months of this year differ greatly from the first four. The increase in Ontario was far less over the previous year than it was for the whole of Canada where it rose from $48.57 per capita to $54.02 per capita. Ontario's increase was not nearly as great as that and Ontario is not out of line with the rest of Canada.

Again, just to say that we are the best in Canada is no reason to say that we cannot be better. Every possible avenue is being explored and will continue to be explored to the end that we reduce our per diem or our per patient stay. We thereby will naturally reduce our costs all over because the beds that are now available will provide accommodation for far more patients.

The member has pointed out very clearly, and I hope that every hon. member of this House, sir, got the significance of his statement, concerning the lowered average per patient stay in the United States. The United States has always and still consistently holds that it does not need the number of beds per thousand population that we in Ontario seem to believe we do. In spite of the fact that we maintain, provide and are aiming for a higher proportion of beds per thousand population here in Ontario, many in this House and in our province still cry out for more beds. I agree with the hon. member completely: it is not more beds, it is better utilization of the beds we have. This is a co-operative undertaking which we shall continue to do everything in our power to bring about.

Mr. MacDonald: It is rather strange and almost unprecedented that the hon. Minister admits to a fair degree of common ground and agreement. On the one basic comment that he has made, namely, that there may well be a selectivity in these various groups that has taken place, let us concede that there may be. But I am sure the Minister would agree that even if there is a degree of selectivity—and I can provide a good deal of evidence to suggest that there is not necessarily any significant degree—then it certainly still does not, I think, destroy the margin of saving in hospital utilization.

For example, I have argued that one reason why you cannot project the figures from an industrial area like Sault Ste. Marie across the whole province is because you have a widely scattered rural and northern population. It is interesting to note that one of the Kaiser plans in southern California that has achieved this kind of a record does not have a significant proportion of the enrollees in widely scattered areas, but they put small clinics out so that the needs of these people can be met. When you take the groups in New York city or the federal employees groups which are scattered all over the continental United States, I would think that you would get a pretty accurate cross-section in terms of selectivity. So even if one concedes a minor degree to the hon. Minister's point, I do not think it is a point that in any sense invalidates the general argument that I have advanced.

However, if the hon. Minister says he and the commission are concerned about this, or are giving it a lot of attention, I am wondering why we do not get some evidence of action along the lines that I have suggested. For example, if one misuse of our hospital beds for active treatment is by people who are just wrongly in those hospital beds, and this takes place because we have no chronic hospital care or home care, then why was the hon. Minister's reply, for example, to the hon. member for Parkdale that he has no plans for an extension of the chronic hospital ratio of beds per population in the coming year? And why do we not have a marked extension of the home care programme, because as the Minister countered, the two of them in effect will meet the same need. Why have we no evidence of a real effort to expand in the chronic

hospital and/or home care programme? I repeat, for every time you have a person taken out of an active treatment hospital when he need not be there, you are saving $14 if he is in a chronic hospital and $21 if he is getting home care. You add that up for a few thousand people and you certainly get into some of these spiralling figures in the hospital costs.

If the hon. Minister is concerned, why is he not moving more in the field that will provide immediate relief?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member did not grasp the significance of my remarks. The answer I made to the hon. member for Parkdale had relation to Metropolitan Toronto. But I did announce in the House that there was an extension of chronic care facilities, and particularly home care programmes. On the basis of our statistics, there are adequate numbers of chronic care beds to serve the needs of Metropolitan Toronto, when supplemented by the home care programme which can expand as far and as fast as the people operating it want to expand it. But across the province, there is arrangement for further chronic care facilities and new home care plans which are being looked upon very favourably and considered very favourably.

I failed to answer some points that the member particularly asked me to comment upon in his summation, the three points that he outlined in summation. The matter of national housing administration loans: As far as I know, there is no scarcity of money available—mortgage money available—to establish this accommodation for group practice. There is no difficulty there. Nor is there any difficulty in equipping them. Fortunately, doctors' credit seems to be pretty good and they have not, as far as I know, met any difficulty in raising the funds to establish these facilities.

Second, of course, the medical services insurance programme will provide for the lab services and the physicians' services. And if the lab services are provided within the clinic, within the group practice, this is fine. This is, indeed, better than having them go to a hospital for it. My endorsation of group practice, of course, has already been made fairly clear. I would agree that there is far more likelihood of the public health team being brought into a group which by desire and inclination tends to flow together as a group. It is more than likely that they would collaborate more with their colleagues in public health than perhaps the individual independent practitioner.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on the issue of an extension of the home care programme, as indeed with relation to the whole programme of a public health programme that my colleague has dealt with at such length, I would just repeat once again, it is all very well for the hon. Minister to rise and say that this is available to anybody across the province of Ontario. But perhaps that observation of the hon. member for Parkdale when he quoted the Minister as saying that it was not his function to provide inspiration if this is desirable, if this is going to provide a reduction in costs that you were disturbed about, then whether you call it inspiration or whatever you call it, I think there is an immediate need for leadership on the part of the Minister and his department. If things are desirable, then let us take some initiative, whether it be prodding, the carrot, inspiration or what you will, to extend the desirable much more quickly than it is at the present time. I repeat, it not only means better health care for our people, but it gets at the whole root of this spiralling of hospital costs.

Now, to come to the latter point that the Minister commented on on my three specific proposals. I think the point that the Minister is ignoring is that it is that while doctors have good credit, the money is available at rates which are high and which become a built-in factor in the cost of establishing the clinic, and this has to be borne by the people who are going to be sustaining the clinic. Therefore it is a financial disincentive. I just remind the Minister, as he is undoubtedly aware, that the Hall commission report, notwithstanding the good credit of doctors, made such a recommendation. Indeed, this was one of the few recommendations that they made with regard to group practice, and after their careful studies they suggested that the NHA programme should be extended to provide loans at lower rates so that you would have as rapid an establishment of these clinics as possible.

The hon. Minister, fortunately, has indicated a strong support for group practice. So we have no disagreement here and this is most encouraging. But what about the other proposal that I made? If certain services that are now being met in a hospital and are being paid for out of OHSC, such as X-ray and lab and diagnostic services—let me just pause and dwell on that. I am sure

the hon. Minister would agree that one of the reasons why we have such a high hospital utilization rate is that many patients are put into a hospital for diagnostic purposes, whereas if you had a clinic they would not have to go into the hospital. Often too this lengthens the length of the stay that they are going to have there.

What problem is there at the moment, if we are in agreement, in encouraging the extension of group practice? What problem is there in an immediate change of our regulations so that the provision of these services, whether it be X-ray, lab, diagnostic services or even emergency services, would be covered if they went into a hospital but are not covered in a group health clinic? Would it not be money well spent for the OHSC to say they will meet these costs under whatever degree of supervision and checking on them they feel would be necessary?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is part of the programme of medical services insurance. Practically every group that is covered by comprehensive insurance programmes, has provision for lab services. It does not require them to go into hospital. Indeed, if they go into hospital, the benefits accruing under their medical services insurance do not obtain. They are only good when they are provided outside the hospital setting. Our own programme, of course, goes even further than most of them, because it provides all necessary services without limitation.

Now, the matter of interest. As far as I understand, national housing loans are available now. I do not know; I never did ascertain whether Mr. Justice Hall meant that he felt NHA should provide even lower-cost money than is provided to anyone else who benefits under that plan, but as far as I know, CMHC money anyway is available to build clinics, because I know people who have gotten advantage of it.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question regarding laundry facilities in hospitals. It is my understanding that there is a plan for hospitals to establish central laundry systems and institutional laundries in Toronto, Hamilton, and certain other urban centres in the province. There is some question, Mr. Chairman, whether or not such institutional systems are to be financed or encouraged by OHSC and The Department of Health, particularly where it is contended by commercial launderers that such central laundries will eventually result in higher costs to the hospitals concerned and to the public purse. Possibly the hon. Minister would like to comment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the only urban centres where I know that central hospital laundries are proposed—indeed, one I believe is now under construction—are in Toronto and North Bay. This matter was gone into very thoroughly. The hon. member referred to institutional laundries. This has been the pattern, actually. It has been the traditional practice that the hospital provided its own laundry and when the programme came into being—I think it was in 1959—when the government first extended its grants, it extended the provincial grant to provide capital construction support of laundry facilities for a hospital. The federal government does not support that. The provincial government has, since May or August, 1959, provided grants for construction of laundries on the same basis as they provided service space grants for other areas of the hospital.

Now, the Toronto laundries, the downtown hospitals and the peripheral group of hospitals, have been carrying on studies and discussions for a long time on this matter. Extensive studies have been done, and extensive counter studies have been done by the launderers and dry cleaners association. Each one has its views, and as I said in another context yesterday, one is at that pole and one is at this pole, and apparently never the twain shall meet. The authors of both studies are adamant in their belief that their results are correct. We have taken the conclusions and recommendations of the group that studied the matter for the hospitals, because they were completely objective. They had nothing to gain whatsoever; they were hired to do a job, they were experts in the field, they did the job very thoroughly and they documented their studies.

The other group were also experts in the field, hired by the people whose business this was, and they are just as sure their figures are correct. The government, contrary to a wrongly held opinion by many people, is not involved in providing capital grants for this central laundry, or any central laundry in any way, shape or form. The cost of the building and equipment will be built into the cost of the product. A factor is built into the price of the laundry that will pay off the cost of construction and the interest on the money during the time the building is being paid off. All of these things have been included in the studies and findings of the group which undertook this project on behalf of the hospitals. I think, Mr. Chairman, the important thing that swayed me, at least my

thinking, was the statement of the hospitals that if they were not given approval of this undertaking then each one of them would build an institutional laundry, to which the province of Ontario would have to give certain statutory grants. We weighed all the arguments, pro and con, we counted all the costs, and we found that it was economically better, more advantageous apparently, to agree to the establishment of a central laundry.

We did not have to give approval. The hospital is responsible for getting its laundry. If the price for that laundry goes out of bounds, to any marked degree, then of course we will ask the hospital to explain it and to set about finding a more economic way of having their laundry done; but there has been no reason yet to expect that because the laundry is not in operation. But they have given us a quite firm undertaking that their estimates will be correct; and we are taking this just as much on faith, of course, as we would be taking on faith the contention of the launderers and dry cleaners association when they submitted their figures. I wonder if that answers the hon. member's question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Kerr: I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the hospitals have had any complaint about the service they were getting from commercial launderers? Is this the basic reason behind the central laundries?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, I must say that I did not pursue that, because I only got into it to try to use my good offices to resolve the differences and get the car on the rails. Off the record, some of the hospitals did tell me they were dissatisfied with the service. This was what moved them to state that if they did not have a central laundry which was controlled by an independent board, then they would make application to build a laundry for each of their hospitals—to which, I repeat, we would have had to give capital grants.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House to return to something that was discussed about half an hour ago. I cannot let this occasion go by without telling the complete story about the Scarborough general hospital, which was portayed in a rather scathing form by the hon. member for Parkdale—who did not complete the story and tell what is being done in Scarborough.

Of course we have all known that there has been a critical situation. I think that tribute should be paid to the medical doctors in the Scarborough area who became aware of this, and aware of their social responsibility to draw this to the attention of the community, which they did. Along with others, the attention which was drawn to this by them was accepted, and Scarborough made plans to increase the hospital. I think that we would all agree with what the hon. Minister of Public Works stated during his estimates, "You do not plan $10 million projects overnight." And the Scarborough general addition is nearly $10 million; the Scarborough Centenary hospital contract is around $14 million.

These have taken nearly two years of planning, before a shovel could actually be put in the ground; but very detailed planning has been going on and both of these projects are now underway. Specifically, I would like to say that, insofar as the Scarborough general hospital is concerned, because of the urgency which all of us recognize, Scarborough has undertaken to stage the opening of the new building so that sections will be opened before the complete building is finished—and I think that this is the significant thing—to meet the shortage.

The way the project is going now, the new emergency with three operating rooms, which is desperately needed, will be opened early next spring, probably around March, 1967, if everything goes as it is going now. At the same time, four floors in the tower will be opened. These will provide about 36 surgical beds, which can be used in co-ordination with the new emergency area. Then there will also be opened 32 gynecological beds, 46 pediatric beds, 18 ear-nose-and-throat beds, and 14 intensive care beds, in the early spring of 1967. These before the whole project is finished. The rest of the project should be opened by the late fall of 1967, and the renovations completed by early 1968. This is all being done because we recognize the urgency of these beds being made available for Scarborough.

A similar programme of urgency is taking place at the Scarborough Centenary hospital, where 524 beds should be ready by late 1967. This is a completely new hospital. It will be one of the largest to have been built in one unit, at one time, in the province of Ontario.

In regard to the other point that was raised by the hon. member for Parkdale, I think that the hon. Minister has dealt with it fairly adequately so far, that is, in regard to the patient-days—the average stay that a patien has in a hospital bed. It has been stated that there is something wrong with Scarborough, because it has an average patient stay of 6.2

days, whereas the provincial average is ten or more days per patient.

Of course the leader of the NDP just stated that he was very happy with the experiment in the Soo, where they have reduced the length of stay down to 7.2 patient days, and I think that he has hit the nail on the head, as has the Minister, in that what we need is a better utilization of the beds we have available and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the impact of the shortage in Scarborough has caused the doctors and the other members of the hospital team to be more accurately aware of this utilization factor and this is one of the reasons that the length of time a patient occupies a bed, the average length of time, is perhaps shorter in the Scarborough general hospital.

I do not know how many other members have had the experience that I have had in other hospitals in this city, particularly downtown hospitals, where if their experience is taken, it is no wonder that we have a 10- or 11-day provincial average, where they will not admit people for Monday morning procedures on Sunday, but only on Friday night, because nobody wants to work over the weekend and the patients come in and stay practically like guests in a hotel over Saturday and Sunday, because the working arrangements with the staff are such that only the most serious emergency procedures are carried on over the weekend. I think that this is the kind of thing that has to be looked at in all our hospitals if we are to watch the rising costs and make better utilization of the beds that are available. These should be utilized seven days a week and there should not be a holiday over Saturday and Sunday as far as admissions and procedures are concerned.

I draw these facts to the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, and particularly I want to emphasize the fact that we have realized the situation in Scarborough and something positive is being done about it, and I might say in concluding that certainly something positive is being done by the three members of this party from the area of Scarborough. We have been constantly working in the community to rectify this situation.

My friend, the hon. member for Scarborough East is joint chairman of the fund-raising drive for the two hospitals in Scarborough. I have had the pleasure of serving on the Scarborough general hospital board and my friend, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre has been very active in all the behind-the-scenes planning to help remedy this situation in Scarborough.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Will the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville accede for a moment while I follow on this precise subject?

Mr. Newman: If it is on the same topic, it would be better to keep it all together, Mr. Chairman, and then I will follow.

Mr. S. Lewis: Apparently, as a member who has not entered the power élite in Scarborough, Mr. Chairman, who is dispossessed of the establishment practices and policies characteristic of that region, I want to say to the hon. Minister, through you, sir, that the primary need in Scarborough for several years has been a neglect on the part of the provincial government, not on the part of the community of Scarborough. I quite appreciate what the hon. member for Scarborough North just said. There is no doubt that the community in a state of unbelievable emergency rallied together and has made a heroic effort to correct the long-standing grievance, but there are three things that I think should be said about his remarks in relation to the hon. member for Parkdale:

1. That nothing that the hon. member for Parkdale pointed out about the situation that presently prevails at the Scarborough general was incorrect; it is perfectly accurate.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. member for Parkdale to prove that someone has been given the bum's rush out of that hospital because they are short of beds. Let us have the documented cases here.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. member for Parkdale, Mr. Chairman, pointed out that there were several hundred cases on the acute emergency operative list waiting at Scarborough general and some 800 people on the elective list and he said that he assumed —and I would make the same assumption— that people were given, to use the slightly less than glamorous term, the bum's rush. I would use the term in that it is conceivable in the context of the pressures in Scarborough

that some patients were moved hurriedly through the hospital process.

However, in terms of the people waiting for acute emergency operations, Mr. Chairman, and in terms of those waiting for elective surgery there is no doubt indeed. Anyone who reads letters to the *Globe and Mail* by Dr. McGooeye and other members of the Scarborough medical practice, recognizes that the situation in Scarborough has bordered on crisis for several years.

I do not know what we are arguing about. The hon. member for Scarborough North himself indicated that the community has had to rally to this crisis and I do not think that the hon. member for Parkdale should have his remarks invalidated because they are appropriate today, as he made them in the House.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the delay in this Scarborough situation, the needless delay in the Scarborough situation arises from the financial dilemma which has faced that community over several years, and I would point out that despite the hon. Minister's new programme, that financial dilemma has not been corrected, in any viable sense.

One of the things which disturbs us about this new programme is that the grant structure does not reflect the change in hospital bed costs. There will be some change in loans, but the province refuses to have its grant structure reflect that change, and a little piece of paper tucked in as an after-thought into a speech on the Ontario hospital services commission will not alter that fact.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in terms of Scarborough, we have been sorely suffering the hospital bed crisis, perhaps more accentuated than in any other community in the Metropolitan Toronto area for a considerable period of time. While it may be true that in 1967 or 1968 or 1970, dependent on public community drives, we may achieve some kind of adequate level of service, there is no possible way of estimating, Mr. Chairman, the incomparable suffering and hardship visited on thousands of prospective patients in Scarborough because of the inadequate financial arrangements of this government and the neglect of the past several years. Those are facts that are not possible to refute in this House.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, may I say another word on this subject? I would like to ask the hon. Minister one question; I would like him to answer, and I think he can: Was there ever any appreciable delay in the approval of the plans for either the Scarborough general or the Scarborough Centenary hospital that was occasioned by the provincial government?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer, Mr. Chairman, is no.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is not the point, Mr. Chairman, if I may say so; that is not the point at all. The point is that if there had been a proper grant structure in this province for the last 10 years instead of this nonsense that is upgraded year after year and which keeps the hospitals in a perpetual state of havoc in terms of their financing, then Scarborough would never have been in this position.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, is it not a rather peculiar thing that the whole of Ontario, except this one metropolitan area has managed to meet its hospital needs? One of the hon. members yesterday spoke about the city of Hamilton and that city, out of its own resources, has provided some $14 million to meet its hospital needs and did not come crying to the province but accepted the fiscal arrangements that were provided for the whole of Ontario. Surely, this in itself, is evidence that the programme has worked.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it was a well-known Tory by the name of F. G. Gardiner who blocked hospital expansion.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, F. G. Gardiner started the trouble and he admitted it!

Mr. MacDonald: He is a good Tory.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it is not always possible for all communities to be able to get into hospital construction to the extent that they would like to. Some communities have not been blessed with periods of peak employment, and as a result found themselves hard pressed to provide funds for other necessities in the community and, as a result, something did have to suffer.

I would like to urge the hon. Minister to proceed with all haste as far as the home care is concerned in my own community and I do that for the fact that there has been a request for additional hospital beds. The five hospitals that we have, IODE, Grace,

Hotel Dieu, Metropolitan general hospital and Riverview, all would like to add to their facilities. However, it is not always practical to add to the extent that they would like to. The municipality cannot financially afford it because of the grant structure. Now they have undertaken a series of surveys. About four years ago they had a local study of bed needs and just two years ago there was the Agnew-Peckham report. Among one of its recommendations it recommended regional planning councils. And now I understand there is an OHSC survey.

The report that I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister is the Agnew-Peckham report. Some of the statistics it carries are extremely interesting and it shows that better bed utilization, possibly, could be an answer to some of the needs in communities. This report involved the Metropolitan general hospital. They had asked for a 72-bed addition and before they were going to get involved in the addition they thought it was wise to have a consulting firm from the city of Toronto study the situation. Among the 27—I think it was 27—recommendations that they had suggested, the following statement is contained:

> The consultants cited first an example of the lack of facilities for chronically ill, custodial and convalescent patients in the city.

The next is quite important and quite interesting:

> The study over a number of months of 239 long-stay patients at Metropolitan shows the following results:
>
> (a) 100 were justifiably in the hospital.
>
> (b) 31 should properly be in chronic facilities.
>
> (c) 67 should be in convalescent facilities.
>
> (d) 13 should be in custodial facilities.
>
> (e) 28 should have been at home.

Now it is for the reason of such a study that we would like the Ontario hospital services actually to tell the community, does it need additional hospital beds?

Another thing that they would have to take into consideration, sir, is that this study was conducted well over two years ago before there was the great influx of people into the community. The population has increased quite markedly in the last two years and as a result maybe some of their studies are out of date and there is actually the need for more hospital beds.

The report states that by 1970, 173 additional beds would be needed, and that by 1970 there would be the need for a total of 340 chronic-illness treatment beds. This is an increase of 78 over what is now available. It also shows that even today 64 convalescent and rehabilitation beds are needed where the city has none. In 1970, it would be 74 that would be needed.

The convalescent patients could not be moved out of Riverview hospital. In fact, one of the press clippings mentions the fact that there was no room for 31 patients as they were readjusting the bed area at the Riverview hospital and found that 31 patients had no place to be put. Possibly the answer would be in not only better bed utilization but the implementation of a home care programme.

Could the Minister tell me at this time how soon he hopes to have a home care programme in operation in the city?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: When the local authority is ready to go, we are ready to go. We do not instigate the programme. We provide the wherewithal to help it start its programme.

Mr. Newman: Whom does the hon. Minister mean, Mr. Chairman, by the local authority?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, will the member wait until I answer the question? When they are prepared to go forward with a programme, they put the particulars before us, and if it is justified it will be approved and they will be told what is available to them. Then they will be ready to go.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the hon. Minister, whom does the Minister refer to by local authorities—one individual hospital, a council of hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It would depend entirely on how they have arranged the co-operation between the hospitals. In Metropolitan Toronto one man gave leadership to it or was retained by the hospitals interested, and he set up his own organization with the council and consultation was provided with the hospital services commission. But one hospital can start it and it grows from there.

Mr. Newman: Could the Victorian order of nurses make that request and would it be implemented?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, the Victorian order of nurses or any public body can provide the nucleus of the organization or

can become the total organization if this is satisfactory to the hospitals and they work out satisfactory agreements among themselves.

Mr. Newman: May I tell the hon. Minister that the Victorian order of nurses has already sent in a proposal to the Deputy Minister of Health concerning a home care programme and this was back in January?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, and that has been accepted.

Mr. Newman: It has been accepted?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, it has.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions. I wanted to get back to the cost of this hospital services commission again. I might say I was very interested in the remarks the hon. member for York South made this afternoon about the possibility of decreasing the costs. But would I not be correct in this when I ask the Minister whether, if there were more nursing home care and more chronic hospitals at the same time, this would not lessen the operating expenses of the present hospitals that we have in the province of Ontario, because they cost X number of dollars whether they are full or whether they are half full? Is this not correct?

Therefore when the member was talking about the possibility of lessening the cost by $100 million, in theory this could happen but in practice we certainly cannot lessen the cost there unless it be through lesser administration costs, a salary decrease or something. Would I be correct in that assumption?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think the member would be correct in the assumption, but to say just out of hand that more chronic, convalescent or nursing home beds will alter the picture of course, is not right. The whole programme is still based on medical necessity. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, in reading his statement, pointed out that in the review of their chronic care hospital, for instance, something like 28 patients, was it not, were domiciliary care patients and 14, if I recall the figure, should have been home.

Mr. Newman: May I read that again?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Please.

Mr. Newman: I think it is quite interesting. Out of 239 long-stay patients—this is at Metropolitan hospital — 100 were justifiably in the hospital, 31 should properly be in chronic facilities, 67 should be in convalescent facilities, 13 should be in custodial facilities and 28 should have been at home, according to the Agnew-Peckham report.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Those 28 patients alone are long-stay patients. That means they have been more than 60 days in hospital. Each bed or each 60 days would accommodate six active treatment patients on the average, so multiply that over the year at 85 per cent occupancy, and you have accommodated quite a number of patients on a waiting list.

The domiciliary care beds and the home care beds are not the responsibility of The Department of Health; this is a community responsibility and surely government has supported this widely. But I would point out very clearly—someone said during my estimates that Parkinson's law obtained, or I think he said Parkinson's disease; I hope none of us are suffering from Parkinson's disease—that Parkinson's law certainly does obtain and I was not referring to the hon. member for Scarborough West. The hon. member to whom I was referring is not here, Mr. Chairman.

If we build more nursing home beds and more convalescent or any kind of beds than we believe we need, I can assure you that they will be filled, and there is no surer way of contributing to spiralling costs than to build more beds than are needed. I still come back to my original thesis, which must be repeated constantly, that we have determined we need more beds per thousand population for our people than the jurisdiction to the south of us, which has a pretty good standard of health care, as do we.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I agree wholeheartedly with what the hon. Minister just said although there may be and undoubtedly there are areas in the province—for example, Metropolitan Toronto—where more beds are rightly needed

When the hon. member for York South was talking about groups and suggesting that when certain groups were involved in medical care it was less expensive, the cost was considerably less and they spent less time in the hospital, I wanted to ask the Minister: Is everybody who is covered by hospital insurance premiums in the province of Ontario—the 98 per cent, or whatever it is—not looked upon as a group? I mean, how

would it be cheaper if I belonged to some other group than this? I could not follow it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It can affect many things. He is not here to correct me, but I believe the hon. member was pointing out that there is at least suggestive evidence in these statistics that through prevention of disease in groups of this kind, the high cost of hospital stay, the high cost of illness and the high costs reflected in many ways, can be lessened. However, there is the possibility, as I pointed out, that the group practices to which he was referring may not reflect absolutely the experience in a group such as you refer to—the whole of the province covered by hospital insurance—and they have to be considered a group.

Suppose we were to take a group of young, basically healthy folk, working in an industry, or some particular setting, and study their health cost experience against a similar group from the standpoint of numbers. We might get a tremendous variation in the costs and provide the same quality of medical care and hospital care to both of them. But they would not be comparable groups.

If you took this young group from an industry and then you took a cross-section of the community, it is not at all likely you could consider that a comparable experiment. These experiments have to be controlled, and again I am pointing out very clearly, I am not sure what controls were used in these experiments. I would suggest that it is likely very good controls were observed, because these agencies are very reliable agencies and very well known, very well skilled in this field. But this does point up one area where there could be variation and one has to be quite careful when they are quoting statistics and summaries of experiments which have been broad and lengthy and have gone into very meticulous details.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, what controls does the hospital insurance commission have on doctors in putting patients into hospitals? For example, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has just stated that, according to a survey that was made in a certain hospital in Windsor, 28 people or something like that, should be at home. Does the hospital insurance commission check up on the medical profession for having people in hospitals that really should not be there?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that this happens regularly—that is, that there is a large percentage of people who should not be there—but we know perfectly well that in some instances doctors find it rather handy to have their patients in the hospital, because it is sort of an office, and they can see 20 or 30 patients in one morning there, instead of having to travel a few miles, particularly in rural Ontario.

So my question once more is, are doctors regulated at all, as to the patient's condition when they put them in the hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the most effective control that the commission exercises over the doctor, of course, is through the hospital board. Every long-stay patient must have a form completed on him and sent into the commission where it is subjected to professional scrutiny, but the most effective control is exercised at the hospital level, by an admission and discharge committee and legislation is presently before this House which will give the medical staff, the chief of staff, or chief of the service, the medical advisory committee, far more control over the practising physicians than ever before. It will give them even the right to intrude upon the practice being carried on by the doctor, and step in between the doctor and his patient if the need arises. This is the most effective control, but I do not think it is a matter of policing. I would be more inclined to feel that the doctor would be quite willing to send the patient home, if the patient had a home to go to. This is most commonly the problem. Many, many times I have had doctors say to me, I am ready to put the patient out, but where will I send him? If the community has not taken advantage of the resources that are available to provide residential facilities, domiciliary care facilities, then there is not very much the doctor can do, because he cannot turn a person out on the street.

Mr. Whicher: Where did he send them before the Ontario hospital services commission came into being?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, many of them lay in bed for months and months and months. Indeed, the old pattern was that many old folk used to go into the hospital at the beginning of the winter and stay there all winter.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I want to say one or two more things. I certainly appreciate what the hon. Minister has said, and I do hope that he will study what the hon. member for York South said about the possibility of having more nursing home care and chronic hospitals, but on the other hand, I hope that I am a realist. I think I agree with the chairman of the commission who said

that these costs were going to increase continually until they reach a plateau of X millions of dollars and I hope that he was correct, when he said that it will level off between $475 and $500 million, because I really have not got that much confidence in the way that we in the province of Ontario do business. I am not talking about the hospitals; I just mean the demands of the public are getting to be so great that I do not know where the levelling off will be. I hope that the chairman was correct when he says, in his opinion, that there will someday be a top figure and that it will not go any appreciable amount higher.

But I wanted to ask this. This has really got to be big business in Ontario now, even though it has only been going since 1959. May I ask the hon. Minister, as far as the business of running this commission is concerned, is it completely streamlined? Here we have a business of half a billion dollars a year. Do they use the most up-to-date IBM machines? Are the people—not the doctors, but the people who run the business end of the Ontario hospital services commission—are they the top men that you can get? I mean, are they compared to the top men at Massey-Ferguson, or General Motors or Chrysler Corporation, or the Bell Telephone Company, because this is big business, as you know? I am only asking this with the idea and hope that somewhere along the line we can call a halt to some of these costs.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot really answer the hon. member's question definitively. I personally believe they are. Of course, I do not know how good the people in Massey-Ferguson and Bell Telephone are. We have the best people we can recruit. I think the percentage of the expenditure devoted to administration is fairly good proof of the efficiency of the organization, 3.2 per cent. There are not very many organizations—I am quite certain Massey-Ferguson does not operate with two per cent administrative costs.

Mr. Whicher: May I ask if that two per cent is from the head office, or is that two per cent of all the hospital administration costs across the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the head office cost and the commission tells me we do not have the percentage administration costs of the separate hospitals broken down. But as far as the equipment is concerned, we certainly keep up to date. We have on order now the latest IBM machine; it is not even built yet. It is due for delivery in February, 1967. There are a few out now, but we are right up there with the leaders. Ours was one of the first ordered and is due to be installed. I think we keep up to date. We must keep up to date, or we cannot keep ahead of the flow of work.

Mr. Whicher: May I ask the hon. Minister what percentage of the cost of the hospital services commission is in the form of salaries? That is, nurses' salaries and personnel?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This, of course, is part of the expenses of the hospital, and 71 per cent of the total hospital budget goes to salaries and wages.

Mr. Whicher: What would the cost of capital be?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The capital, of course, is not part of the insurance programme; it is separate.

Mr. Whicher: Would it be six per cent?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh yes, the capital—

Mr. Whicher: I mean, the reason I ask—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The amount devoted to capital construction?

Mr. Whicher: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, yes, far more, we ourselves pay 29 per cent of the capital cost. The hospital at the present time is receiving—

Mr. Whicher: Oh, yes, but I mean on the overall picture.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, I see what the hon. member means. That, of course, is not included in the bill that was presented to this House, because the local board is finding a very large part of this.

Mr. Chairman: I would prefer to keep to the vote if I could.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is within the vote. Our capital funds are within the vote. Our share related to the total, of course, is of interest. The amount allowed for capital depreciation amounts to between six and seven per cent.

Mr. Whicher: Just about the same as education costs, as a matter of fact. Teachers' salaries are 70 per cent; in OHSC 71 per cent goes for employees and capital is about six per cent. Really then, the capital cost

is very small compared to the overall picture. This is why I say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not see how you are going to be able to stop these costs, because salaries are continually going to rise and 71 per cent of the whole cost of the commission is in salaries. I know that the Minister is worried about this cost, he has told us this many times; I know the commission is very, very worried; but, Mr. Chairman, my question is this: Does the hon. Minister think that with the services that are being given, if we do not cut somewhere, does the Minister think that ten years from now we can really afford this? I know I am speaking here as an individual, and that probably no one else here agrees with me, but I really am worried about these costs. If they continually spiral, with a population of six million people, which is not showing a great increase per annum at the present time, does the Minister think we can afford all these costs?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Perhaps I am an unforgivable optimist, but I believe we can afford them. I believe that the economic growth of our province, of our nation, is going to be such that we will be able to afford all these expenditures of social capital. Of course, I am one who believes that a nation cannot afford not to afford the expenditure of its social capital. This does not mean to say we just brush them off lightly and say it is inescapable, that we must meet it. It calls for the constant guarding against unnecessary or unwarranted expenditures. It calls on this field, of course, for constantly seeking to keep abreast of something that the hon. member himself suggested, the matter of modern devices, modern developments.

What is the computer going to do to hospital care? I do not know. Some of the results of experiments that we read of are very suggestive. Some of them, of course, are painted in very glowing colours and on more careful scrutiny do not measure up to what the conclusions appear to be at first blush.

But these are things that are constantly under study and under surveillance to the end that we will do everything possible to keep the costs within control. We cannot look to the alteration in salaries and wages, because naturally the hospitals now are just nicely into a competitive position and they are not going to lose that position. If we permitted that to happen, or if we encouraged that to happen or even countenanced its happening, the only reflection would be in care. There would be a deterioration of patient care, and that, of course, could not be tolerated.

Mr. Whicher: I have just one more question. How many employees are there now in the OHSC and of that number how many are employed in the head office?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: 720 at head office and 40 in the field.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I neglected to ask the Minister previously—when I mentioned the hospital situation in my own community—when we could expect the survey that is being carried on by the Ontario hospital services commission to be completed, because we certainly would like hospital planning on an orderly basis.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The commission plans to present a report in mid-May of this year to the Windsor hospital planning council.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister if there is any financial assistance given to a planning council in a community by the Ontario hospital services commission? I think a request was put into the Ontario hospital services commission for such assistance.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, there will be. The application has been received, I believe, and we will pick up approved costs of administration.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, the statement was made this afternoon that 30 per cent of the hospital beds were wrongly occupied. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville cited some figures which would indicate that a good many beds in our hospitals are occupied without a good reason. In other words, the reason is that there is nowhere else to put these people, indeed the hon. Minister himself indicated that this was so. He made that admission. The fact of the matter is that these people have nowhere to go simply because we are not utilizing to the fullest extent the already existing facilities we do have.

As far as I am concerned, there can be no real progress in this matter and in this area until one agency has the responsibility for co-ordinating the health facilities in this province. It would normally follow that the one agency of which I speak would be the Ontario hospital services commission because the machinery is already set up.

As far as the nursing home situation is concerned, we were talking about that this afternoon and it would seem to me to be a logical step that in view of the fact we are intending to license and to inspect the nursing homes across the province, we could extend OHSC coverage to nursing homes in the event that they were licensed and inspected. In this way we could at least alleviate in part the chronic bed situation in our hospitals.

It would seem to me that this would be one way in which we could utilize the facilities which are already in existence. I repeat once again this would be a logical step. I solicit the comments of the hon. Minister in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, when I quoted the figure of 30 per cent of our beds wrongly occupied, I was quoting the statement of another person. I was not giving a personal opinion. I want that to be clearly on the record.

The hon. member has always held that the nursing homes should be insured under the hospital services insurance programme. The hospital services insurance programme is for hospital care, and this has been clearly pointed out every year in this House, I think since 1959. This is by governmental agreement and until we can get agreement in this area it cannot be changed. There is nothing to be gained, therefore, by the hospital services commission taking responsibility for the nursing homes because it would only have to establish a cavalry of inspectors. This we do not believe is necessary.

As was stated in the legislation, nursing homes will be licensed by The Department of Health and inspected by the public health officers in the communities, whether they be counties, towns, cities or whatever. Until we can get agreement on this matter with the federal government, there can be no coverage for nursing homes under the Ontario hospital services insurance programme.

I am not in agreement myself that all nursing homes should be insured in this way. A great many nursing homes cater to the needs of patients who are considered domiciliary care patients. They are a welfare matter; they are provided for under welfare legislation. The reason for licensing is not to provide service but to ensure that the quality of service is up to a satisfactory standard and that the safety and care of the patient has been thoroughly considered, and to give us the right to step in if the need should arise and see that those regulations are enforced.

I do believe that there are numbers of patients at present in nursing homes who need some kind of support beyond that available to them. The person who needs the services of a nursing home for very long periods of time, even with a reasonably good income, cannot afford those and yet such a person cannot qualify by any stretch of the imagination under the means tests that are being used as yardsticks in welfare circles today in this enlightened age.

We are seeking ways of trying to get them included under the hospital insurance programme and we have a little more hope of success there, but I would be very cautious and not mislead the House into believing that there is no doubt that they will come in. There is very much doubt in my mind, but there is more hope that they might be included in the programme than all those living in nursing homes.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to make another comment. I am not suggesting for a moment that we license and extend OHSC to all nursing homes. I think there are, naturally, some regulations and standards to which we must adhere and I know of a number of nursing homes, certainly not too far from my own home, that are not fit or adequate for this kind of thing. But, on the other hand, there are a good many nursing homes in this province—

Mr. Chairman: I would tell the member for Huron-Bruce that I do not want to get into the entire discussion of nursing homes and the licensing of them. Please see that it is kept in connection with the Ontario hospital services vote.

Mr. Gaunt: I was just coming to the point of saying that we have made some progress in this matter in that in 1959 The Ontario Hospital Services Commission Act was brought into this Legislature and this provided that the province could designate certain nursing homes, in which case those nursing homes could take chronics out of the hospitals in an area that was particularly congested.

It seems to me that if this were done in 1959—and we have expressed the hope and we are going to go the licensing and inspection of nursing homes—then it would seem a logical move that, in order to take the pressure off many hospitals that are experiencing difficulty in this area, we could extend it to cover the chronically ill in licensed and inspected nursing homes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask the hon. Minister about the situation of chronic care beds in the Ottawa area. It would seem that a report that was published some time ago said that by 1969 the projected total bed needs in the chronic care type will be 410. On a statistical basis, a surplus of 317 chronic care beds will exist at that time, if all the beds of this type presently available continue in use.

At the end of this report it states again—this seems to be a repetition, but it states that:

> As pointed out above, a substantial statistical surplus of hospital beds of the chronic care type continued to exist in Ottawa. This surplus must be studied in relation to the overall community programme for care of the elderly. We would consider that this whole problem requires a separate study which the commission could arrange to carry out with the city and other interested agencies.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister, what is the present situation of this apparent surplus of chronic care hospital beds in the Ottawa area. In my own experience there is definitely not a surplus because there is a tremendous waiting list in both chronic hospitals in Ottawa, but I would like to have some comments from the hon. Minister regarding this situation at the present time; and I would like to know whether he still feels that there will be a large surplus of chronic care beds by 1969.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is a statistical surplus of chronic care beds in Ottawa, as the hon. member has stated. St. Vincent's has 476; Perley has 218 and Hartington private hospital has 32, a total of 726 beds. It would seem to me that Ottawa is very well supplied with chronic care facilities, but I believe there is a scarcity of welfare beds and this is probably the answer. Some patients are occupying chronic care beds who should be in domiciliary care facilities, but this would only be conjecture at this point; I do not know for certain.

Mr. Racine: This is why I was asking the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, because I know that there is a very long waiting list at both the major chronic care hospitals in Ottawa at the present time. I had several cases brought to my attention over the weekend where people were occupying beds in the Ottawa general hospital, who should be transferred to St. Vincent's, for instance, and this is why I could not figure out how we arrived at this surplus.

If there is an actual surplus, and some of the beds are occupied at the present time by people who should be somewhere else, is there not something that could be done to take those patients away from this chronic care hospital and put them in some other care?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the responsibility of the doctors who are looking after the patients who are in chronic care hospitals. If they no longer need to be there, it is their duty and responsibility to discharge them, but as I have already said, if the doctor knows that there is nowhere else to put the patient, he is not going to send the patient out on the street. When the patient has reached the end of his stay in hospital this really is the end of our responsibility at The Department of Health. I can only say to the hon. member that he is quite well aware of the facilities that are possible and that are available, the support that is available for domiciliary care facilities through other departments of government, and if the Ottawa area is short in this field of endeavour—did you not recently build a new home for the aged, or are you building it now?

Mr. Racine: There was a new home built to replace an older one in existence—St. Patrick's home, Mr. Chairman. Island Lodge is a different story, too, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is not a health facility, of course. Our responsibility ends at health and while we are not uninterested in domiciliary care or housing care, it really is not our responsibility and therefore I cannot talk about it, because I do not know.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I have another remark to make and I think it follows up on a question I had asked the hon. Minister last year about a better use of our present facilities. I had mentioned an article that I had come across, regarding an experiment that took place in New Jersey for a hospital which used its facilities on a seven-day basis.

There was a lengthy discussion at that time and, if I remember correctly, the Minister had said that this was an interesting experiment. If he does not mind, I could quote him:

> As far as the seven-day week is concerned, this is a matter that concerns a great many people in the hospital business.

> I have often said that people do not get sick on schedule. They cannot. But nevertheless we encourage the utilization of the hospital over seven days. Now, this is the responsibility of the board. We cannot order them to do it and they do not seem to find it possible to put in a seven-day schedule other than for emergencies, on Saturdays and Sundays, but this is the privilege and responsibility of the board and the only response it would get from us would be by encouragement.

I presume, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister has seen this article, which appeared in the *Modern Hospital* and is entitled, "Seven-day work week improved service." This New Jersey hospital reports on how seven-day availability of all services cut the budget and pleased physicians, nurses and technicians.

Mr. Chairman, this is a three-page statement and I do not intend to read it into the record, but if the Minister has not seen this report, or his advisers have not seen this report, I think it would be very useful to go through it. This hospital, which is not under hospital services commission, not only was able to make better use of its facilities, but was also able to increase its revenue considerably during long periods after they started this new experiment.

I know that possibly some of the local hospitals would not be interested in trying this kind of an experiment because any surplus funds that might come to the hospital from an experiment of this kind, they could not keep, according to the present rules and regulations of the commission, because any surplus funds would probably have to be turned back to the commission in the following year's budget. But I think it could be very interesting, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister were possibly to suggest to some hospitals, or one hospital and have a pilot project where this could be used. If it has been used in this New Jersey hospital, I am sure that it can be used perhaps in one or more of our own hospitals, and I think that this, along with the suggestions from the leader of the New Democratic Party, might solve a number of our problems at the present time.

Rather than think in terms of tens of millions of dollars for the construction of new hospitals, we might think in terms of using maybe a few million dollars that would be given to some of those hospitals, in order to improve their services, to make better use of their facilities; in the long run possibly this province would be much better off that way, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing chronic care hospitals at considerable length this afternoon, and I think quite appropriately. I do not think there is any dispute in the House as to the important role that such hospitals have to play in the total health picture. I do not think there is any dispute either that by the proper use of such hospitals the overall costs of providing the services of the hospital services commission can be kept down.

While we are on this subject, I would like to refer to a specific chronic care hospital, namely, Riverdale hospital in Toronto. As most of us know, this hospital was constructed entirely at the expense of the taxpayer, under the auspices of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. It had no sooner been constructed and had come into operation than the muncipality of Metro Toronto, following an old tradition of Ontario, immediately handed it over to a self-perpetuating oligarchy to administer.

This is what happens in hospital administration in this province. We set up hospital boards. We stick on one person from the labour council, and a couple of people from the city council, and otherwise the board is completely under the control of the business and medical oligarchy of the community. This is what has happened in Riverdale. There are certain advantages in this system, but there is one great disadvantage—that the boards become very unresponsive to the needs and thinking of the community. They are insulated against the world of people and the needs of those people.

I would like to say, to begin with, that Riverdale is a fine hospital. I am certainly not casting any reflections on it, and I think that in the main it is well run. It has certainly filled a vital need in this community. I will say as far as my own constituency is concerned, residents of that constituency have been admitted to the hospital, they have been well cared for there and the treatment they received was vital to their own welfare. So I am not suggesting that Riverdale has not played a real role in the community.

The only trouble is, I am wondering if it is playing the full role that it should. For one thing, there is still one floor of that hospital not operating. It is two years since the hospital was supposed to come into operation. I am beginning to wonder about an administration that cannot get out of second gear after two years and still has one whole floor unused.

Another problem that concerns me arises from the policy the hospital seems to follow with regard to the discharge of patients. I have no doubt the hon. Minister would tell me, and I would recognize, that this is a professional decision. A layman would undertake to comment on it only on the basis, I would think, of considerable observation. My observation makes me wonder sometimes if the administration of the hospital is not more concerned with keeping down the charges on the Ontario hospital services commission than with ensuring that the patients receive the kind of care that their condition calls for.

To illustrate my point, I want to cite a specific example of a case that I was recently concerned about relating to a lady in my constituency who is now 78 years of age. She lived most of her life in my constituency. She and her husband, who is now dead, brought up their family there. They never managed to acquire very much of this world's goods, but they always were law-abiding citizens, making their contributions to the community and paying their own way. About all the assets the lady has consist of the little house that she lives in, in the east end of Toronto near Coxwell avenue.

This lady was admitted to Riverdale in June, 1965. Before she went to Riverdale she had been in East general for about three weeks. On November 1, 1965, her family was notified by Dr. McCracken of Riverdale hospital that, and I am quoting a short passage from his letter, "She no longer requires care or treatment in hospital," and that benefits under the Ontario hospital services commission would terminate shortly.

The problem apparently was not pressure on accommodation at Riverdale, it was just the problem of the OHSC, because the letter went on to say that the lady could continue to stay in Riverdale on payment of the sum of $15.65 per day. This, of course, was completely beyond her means and completely beyond the means of her family, which is a working family, receiving a moderate income. The son naturally was concerned about this. It was impossible to take his mother back into the home. Her condition at the time and her present condition can be described as follows: She is partly paralyzed on the left side; she is totally incontinent; she is confused and partially blind; she requires help in eating and in all personal requirements, and she is completely confined to bed.

The son, faced with this problem, could not contemplate a payment of $15.65 per day, of course, so he looked around for nursing homes in which he might possibly be able to place his mother. But as soon as any nursing home found out about her condition, it completely lost interest in the case. None of them that he contacted considered itself properly equipped to give care to a person in this condition.

Ultimately on February 8, 1965, this lady was admitted to Lambert lodge, which as we know, is run by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto by its department of welfare and housing. We all know that the conditions of admission to Lambert lodge and similar homes are that the person concerned must sign over his or her old age pension and also provide a lien on any property that he or she owns. This lady signed over her old age pension and signed a lien on her home which is her only asset.

I do not think the family is complaining particularly about this method of recovering the cost of caring for the lady, but I can tell you that they were in an extremely difficult situation, one that would naturally cause considerable anxiety, while they were searching around for a place in which to put their mother. She could not possibly be cared for at home, the nursing homes would not take her, and Riverdale had said "out" and had cut off OHSC. It is fortunate that she was able to get into Lambert lodge.

I know from experience it is by no means easy to get old folks into that home. They have a long waiting list there, and there have been people I have tried to assist who have waited for a long, long time.

One thing I would say is that if Riverdale is so anxious to get these people off the rolls of the OHSC, I would think that they might give a little bit of assistance in finding alternative accommodation. I am not competent to judge whether or not this lady continued to require the care available in Riverdale or whether Lambert lodge is adequate, but if they were going to push her out, then I think that they should have given the family some reasonable assistance in finding alternative accommodation. They gave nothing at all as far as I can see.

So I am beginning to wonder just what the role of Riverdale is in the community. It is not a hospital that provides intensive care such as the general hospitals do. This lady, as soon as she passed the point where she required intensive care, was moved from Toronto east general to Riverdale. That is fine, no one would complain about that. How much care is required before you are pushed out? What constitutes chronic and

convalescent care, which I believe is the function that Riverdale attributes to itself? I think that it should begin to clarify its position in the community and state exactly how it fits into the total picture. Furthermore, I think it should fit itself into the total picture. I recognize that it stands somewhere between the intensive care hospitals on the one hand and the nursing homes and similar facilities on the other hand. Where it feels that a movement from one type of facility to another is justified, it should play a role in facilitating the transfer.

One of the difficulties, of course, Mr. Chairman, is that by and large we seem to be extremely short of all types of facilities in the Toronto area. One method resorted to in trying to solve the problem is to place a family in what is tantamount to an impossible situation. They are faced with a problem where they are, in effect, asked to care for a person who is very dear to them but who is simply beyond their capacity to care for. They are given very little assistance, unless they go their MPP or someone like that, in finding alternative accommodation. I do not know if the hon. Minister is in a position to give us any enlightenment on this point but if he is not, I think it is high time that Riverdale hospital itself began to relate itself to this community and to define its role in the community for the information of us all.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on the same question of Riverdale hospital, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a specific question and then comment myself about the state of Riverdale hospital.

Could the Minister tell us the authorized bed figures established by the hospital services commission for Riverdale hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The total bed space in the hospital is 808, but unfortunately the hospital was never completed, no administration area was provided and I do not know definitely how many beds should come off that for the space that is being used and will be necessary for administrative functions.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I understand, as the hon. member for Woodbine has said, that the whole of the third floor, which is 120 beds, is just not occupied at all and that a good part of the second floor has now over a period of time been encroached on for administrative purposes, which could very well be established elsewhere in the hospital or at least compacted into one part of the second floor. So we are talking, as I understand it, about a bed space in that hospital of anywhere from 120 to 175 beds.

I understand—and the only reason that has been given was given before the standing committee, for the inability to activate beds in that area of the hospital, is a shortage of nurses. Again I suggest that there should be some method by which nursing staff could be rotated through that hospital from the other metropolitan downtown hospitals in the central part of the city. My understanding is that the basic difficulty is the unwillingness of qualified nursing staff to serve in what I assume to be a somewhat depressing atmosphere of a chronic care and convalescent care hospital.

I understand again, Mr. Chairman, that there were about 1,400 patients admitted to Riverdale last year, of which some 275 were admitted directly from their homes. But the remaining admissions to that hospital were from other hospitals. For example, about 300 came from the East general hospital, about 200 from St. Michael's, about 200 from the Toronto general hospital and some 80-odd from the Princess Margaret hospital. Now, if the only reason—and it is the only reason that the chairman of the hospital services commission gave—is the shortage of nursing staff because of the difficulty of getting nurses to serve in that particular type of hospital, is it not possible to arrange with the East general and with St. Michael's and with the Toronto general hospital, a rotation system for nurses through the Riverdale hospital, so that any given nurse would only have an obligation to serve a tour of duty, say, of one month or six weeks or two months, whatever was a reasonable period and would not be faced with permanent employment in that hospital if she was unwilling to serve on a continuing basis?

I, too, Mr. Chairman, have a case, and I am certain other hon. members of this House have many cases along the same line as the hon. member for Woodbine has outlined to the House. My particular instance is a 96-year old man whose wife is in her late 80's. He has been in Riverdale hospital for some time and is now to be moved because medical opinion is that he does not now require care in a hospital setting. At that age there is a problem as to where he goes and the place where he was to be taken is one of the senior citizen homes. In the meantime, however, he is incurring the expense of a stay in Riverdale hospital and charges to date, that is from the first of the year to about April 14th, are now about $1,630, which, of course, is an exorbitant charge in relation

to this family's assets. The assets consist basically of the family home in which they have lived for about 50 years and about $3,000 in the bank account. I believe there is another home, or a second house owned by the family, but there is also a daugher in the family who requires constant care and is in her early 50s at this time.

The conditions under which this particular man will be admitted to a senior citizen's home is by assignment of seven-eighths of his old age security pension, a transfer of one-half of the $3,000 bank account and a lien on a one-half interest in the family home which they have owned for 50 years. I appreciate that this is not directly related to the hon. Minister's department, but it is a reflection of the exact situation in which many families are placed when they suddenly receive notice from the chronic care and convalescent hospitals, such as Riverdale. What are they going to do about someone undoubtedly dearly beloved, but for whom they just cannot take care at home?

In this particular instance, I do not know what the answer is. I assume that it would not have been a great stretch of a doctor's sense of what was required if he had stated that this man could have continued in Riverdale hospital, seeing that he is 96 years of age; and to a lay person visiting him he is not well. He is going to require care wherever he goes and it seems to me unfair in these circumstances that this man at his age should be faced now with the complete depletion of about one-half of what few resources he does have in the world.

I would agree with the hon. member for Woodbine that I think the position of this hospital, and its relation to nursing homes and the relation from nursing homes to senior citizens' homes in the case of elderly persons who are confined in this kind of a hospital, should provide more flexibility so that the person could be moved within the scale of hospital services available and within the scale of the needs which such persons must have. There should be some way in which these persons could continue to be covered under the hospital services insurance plan, because in this case, and in the case cited by my colleague from Woodbine, undoubtedly they are going to require, at almost any time, doctor's care and hospital care. Yet there seems to be no way in which provision can be made for that kind of care and treatment without them being charged what to me is an exorbitant charge.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who spoke last pointed out quite clearly that it is a medical decision. This is a hospital care insurance plan, and as I tried to point out a few moment ago, we cannot extend its provisions, because an agreement has been signed by the two governments and the care is provided on the basis of medical necessity.

The hon. member for Woodbine cited a case that was very interesting and yet very common, because many times we get doctors and hospital authorities alike in the same position as Dr. McCracken, not stating definitely, but leaving the inference that the Ontario hospital services commission is turning the patient out. No patient is admitted or discharged on the say-so of the hospital services commission. This is purely a medical decision and when the doctor discharges a patient from the chronic care facility, the commission allows 21 additional days, during which time every attempt should be made to make suitable provision for the patient.

Indeed, an approved cost of the operation of a chronic care facility is the department of social service. I do not know if they have such a department at Riverdale, but I would anticipate they have. If they have not, they ought to have and they know they can have it; they know it is an approved item on the budget. Almost the sole function of that department is to find adequate and suitable accommodation for patients who have to leave, and who have no provision for such accommodation, or can make no such provision in their own behalf.

I do not know what else the commission can do, other than, as I have already stated, that it is continuing to importune the federal government to become a little more flexible in its arrangements, insofar as these patients in a grey area are concerned. To say that one is bedridden, or hemoplegic, or even incontinent, and to cite these as reasons for needing to remain in a hospital is of course quite wrong, or it may be quite wrong. It is impossible to generalize without seeing the patient, but a great many patients can be nursed in a domiciliary care setting who are in that condition, or worse, but the decision is a professional one, and is only and can only be made by the profession. As long as we leave it in that way, I feel certain that this is the most fair and equitable way to treat the patient.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister comment about the beds in the hospital, which are not in use at the present time and whether or not the hospital services commission is concerned about this, because it

seems, with the shortage of hospital beds in the metropolitan area, that this requires urgent attention, if in fact there could be an additional 150 beds in that hospital, available for chronic and convalescent care?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The commission is not only concerned about it, I have been concerned about this hospital myself, as I stated in this House. It was a source of great surprise to me to learn that there was such a large hospital with so many vacant beds, and I, myself, have chased this board and this administration more than all other hospitals put together in the province, to make use of those beds.

The bed capacity is 700 beds, or estimated to be 700 beds after adequate space has been taken off to provide for an administrative area. There were in March, 653 patients; that would leave 47 vacant beds, usable for hospital care purposes.

Why they have difficulty in attracting nurses to Riverdale hospital is quite beyond me. No other chronic care facility in Metropolitan Toronto has experienced the difficulty that they have in Riverdale and I cannot get any satisfactory reason or explanation of this.

As I stated yesterday, we sent a mission to the Philippines to interview nurses so that we would speed up the transfer. Most of them have been engaged in chronic care facilities. Riverdale, I believe, has 40 of them, and as I say, we did this to help speed up the transfer of nurses from their home lands to Ontario, in order that we might do everything possible to help places of this kind.

I was given a hint a few days ago that the administration of the hospital is changing and I am very hopeful that this may bring about some change in the attitude and a change in performance.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in view of the discrepancies between the figures which I have and the figures which the hon. Minister gave, would he arrange to get an accurate statement of the hospital bed position in Riverdale hospital, because I understand quite clearly that the whole of the third floor is not occupied, and that is 120 beds? That is in direct contradiction to the 47 beds which the Minister's figures show.

This is not the time to enter into that argument, because I think there are very different ways of calculating figures for that whole hospital area, but surely the hon. Minister could undertake to give us the accurate figures for the vacancies in that hospital and the authorized figures for the Ontario hospital services commission.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member asked me if I would make an undertaking. I would, but before I do that, I do want to make clear that I did not state unequivocally that the rated bed capacity was 700 beds. The reports say that the chronic bed capacity cannot be accurately stated until it can be determined how many patients' rooms will ultimately be required for administrative purposes. It is estimated the chronic bed capacity of the hospital will be about 700 beds. That is the total capacity, and as I stated in March, 1966, there were 653 patients in residence.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 715 carried?

Mr. Newman: May I ask of the hon. Minister, the question I originally asked under vote 701, and that was concerning ambulance services? Is the Ontario hospital services considering covering the cost of ambulance services or undertaking the cost of ambulance services? I have the report on ambulance services as presented to us back on February 23, 1965, and one of the recommendations in there mentions this possibility.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hospital services commission is not considering this because it has not been given this responsibility, but I stated that I would have something definite to say about ambulances in the very near future in this House.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I understand the OHSC has a field man who visits Florida once a year to let the hospitals down there know that the OHSC will pay the hospital bills, if Ontario residents who are down there for the winter are insured under OHSC. I would like to know if this is so, and also if the hon. Minister has any idea how the Florida rates compare with the hospital rates here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, one of the staff is fortunate enough to be able to go to Florida for his vacation. He does, however, spend an extra week at the commission's insistence, for which the commission absorbs part of the expenses, in order that he can clear up difficulties. A very large number of our Ontario residents spend varied periods of time in Florida and being in the old age group they are frequently admitted to hospital. He does try to straighten out differences there in order that satisfaction is

provided for those hospitals—75 per cent of their rate but not more than 75 per cent of the Ontario rate. By and large, 75 per cent of the Ontario rate for comparable hospital services is the rate paid for all out-of-province care.

Mr. Trotter: Has the hon. Minister any idea of what the rate is down in Florida, that is, for the same service?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The average is about $25 a day, lower than Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to return to the question of hospital grants about which the hon. Minister made an announcement last night, but which has not been discussed to any extent since then as far as I can recall.

I had a little difficulty—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This has already been discussed this afternoon.

Mr. Bryden: "Discussed," the hon. Minister says. My hon. colleague behind me says it has been referred to. I was out of the House for a very short time this afternoon—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It has been fairly extensively covered.

Mr. Bryden: It has been mentioned, I understand, and I want to mention it a little further. In fact, the hon. Minister might even favour some of the comments I have to make. I have had some difficulty fathoming exactly what the hon. Minister's statement added up to, but it seems to me this: On the basis of the cost of hospital construction being $20,000 per bed the two levels of government—the high levels of government—have been covering about two-thirds of the cost of construction by way of either grants or loan. There is a relatively small grant from the federal government, and a much larger grant from this government. The difference between those two grants and approximately two-thirds of the cost is covered by loans from this government. As far as I can see, all that is happening now is that the government is really willing to increase its loans in order that two-thirds of the cost will still be covered from those two sources, as hospital costs go up. I think it is now pretty well established that you do not get very many hospitals any more at the cost of $20,000 per bed. The cost is above that. So the government is trying to fill the gap by increasing the loans available. The grants from the senior levels of government are not affected but loans are being increased. This certainly relieves the local communities to a considerable extent. We still have the problem of the local community having to raise one-third of an increasing cost plus the cost of the land. I am not going to go over that particular problem—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): This was all gone into last night for over an hour.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Simcoe East does not know what he is talking about. I heard the whole of the hon. Minister's statement last night, and there was no discussion of it last night. I asked one or two questions in the hope of getting clarification. I know that the hon. member for Simcoe East could not care less about getting clarification. The state he was in put a fog between him and the statement and he is still in a fog. But as far as I am concerned, I was interested in getting it clarified.

Mr. Chairman: The members of this House will recall that we discussed use of parliamentary language within the House and casting reflections upon members and so on. I would suggest to the member for Woodbine that we continue without making unnecessary references derogatory to any member of the House.

Mr. Bryden: If you will keep the other hon. members of the House in order, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to ignore them.

Mr. Chairman: I should mention to the member for Woodbine that we did discuss it earlier this afternoon but I want him to continue with his remarks if he will, please.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, well, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member leaves the House and then comes back and opens up a topic that has already been covered.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I admit that I had to leave the House for a certain period this afternoon. I do not apologize for my record of attendance, I will stack it up against—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: —that of anybody over there. I had to go out for a short time. I checked with my hon. colleagues, in whom I have complete confidence, as to whether or not this matter had been discussed. They told me it had been referred to; there had been some reference to it during the course of the afternoon. I feel it deserves more than a mere passing reference or a few passing references.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am willing to stay here as long as anybody wants. The hon. members would be wise to stay in order and let me complete what I have to say. This would take three or four minutes but with constant interruptions it will take a lot longer.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the members of the House to give their attention, please, to the member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: I really do not care whether they give their attention or not, Mr. Chairman, just as long as they stay silent for a moment or two.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had been saying that I am not going to go into the question again of imposing a third of the total cost, of an increasing cost it may be said, on the municipalities. I do think, however, that the grants from the senior levels of government are quite inadequate. And I would like to say that, in my opinion, the major responsibility in this area rests on the federal government, at least the major failure is attributable to the federal government. And I think it is important to stress that point in this House. The hon. Minister stated during his remarks last night that he had—I will not purport to quote him—but the effect of his words was that he had lost the battle with the federal government.

He did not make a big issue of it and I can understand that in his position it is probably not appropriate for him to do so, but to me those were tragic words. Knowing the hon. Minister, I am prepared to believe he probably put up a pretty strenuous battle and I doubt if he admits defeat readily and yet, for the moment at any rate, he has had to admit defeat. This is a disgraceful state of affairs. The federal government's grants amount to very little more than 10 per cent of the cost now, if any more, perhaps on the average a shade more.

About 20 years ago, when its policy of providing grants for hospital construction was initiated, it stated that it was prepared to contribute half the cost. It always had a little joker in its reference to half the cost, of course, it was always half the cost up to a certain limit and its limit was never very realistically related to total cost. For all I know, it may still have that form of words in its agreements, that it will provide half the cost up to a limit of $2,700. I do not know, but obviously it is not carrying its share of the total cost. I think that the hon. Minister's proposition, or what I understood to be his proposition, that the federal government should put up at least a third of the cost of hospital construction is a reasonable one. If we could get that point settled with the federal government, then I think we would have this problem of hospital construction pretty well licked.

Mr. Letherby: That is what we figure too.

Mr. Bryden: Well okay, so we can agree on that. I think it is very important that the full light of day should be shone on this situation in this House. I would like to say to the hon. Minister that we, in this group, appreciate the effort he has made in trying to get a more realistic attitude on the part of the federal government. We certainly support him. We do not think he will give up the fight. We certainly hope he will not. We realize he has to do the best he can in the meantime, but as far as we are concerned, we think it is high time the federal government came alive on this situation. I would like to suggest it should revert to its original policy of 20 years ago, or what it claimed to be its policy, that it would assume half of the cost. As a very minimum, it clearly ought to assume a third of the cost of hospital construction. In that way we can relieve the municipalities of pretty close to all of the responsibilities that have now been placed upon them.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I am a little upset at this time. I have just had a call from Ottawa and I think the things I have to say here are enough to upset the local member, and I think it should also upset the other hon. members on the other side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, this is in connection with the statement that I made yesterday, about the Ottawa hospital situation, and the Ottawa *Citizen* of today has a headline which reads: "Hospital row flares up." Now I do not think anything I said yesterday could be interpreted as a row.

I think the facts that I gave were just facts and they came from information that is usually very reliable. I have something to say in connection with a statement that is supposed to have been made by the chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission. I have a lot of respect for Dr. Neilson and I have considered Dr. Neilson as a friend, since I met him, and I am sure that perhaps some of those remarks that are attributed to him in today's *Citizen* are not

quite the truth. I am just hoping and I am wondering whether at this stage of the game, the statement should not have been made by the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Does it have anything to do with vote 715?

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I think I could say that I am speaking on a point of privilege, when I am speaking on the hospital situation. Mr. Chairman, I think this article—and I have not got the complete article, but it would seem that the chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission said that the sisters were trying to renege on contributing their salaries to pay off the hospital debt, despite the fact that they were sworn to a vow of poverty.

I do not know whether those are the words that were said and I do not think I need to go into a lengthy discourse on the vow of poverty that the sisters have to take. I do not think it is necessary, but I do not think that this is the kind of statement that should have been made, if in fact it has been made by the chairman of the commission.

Mr. Chairman: The last thing I want to do is to interrupt the member, or curtail the discussion, but so far nothing has been said with reference to vote 715.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, this is in connection with a statement I made yesterday, and this was in reply to that statement.

Mr. Chairman: No, I would ask the member to stay with the vote, please.

Mr. Racine: This is in connection with hospitals, on vote 715, Mr. Chairman. These remarks will be very short if you will allow me another two minutes, Mr. Chairman. I think this is the time to make the point and I would like to have a reply from the hon. Minister about that.

Another part of the statement said that French Catholics and English Protestants are continually fighting on the question of hospitals. I would like to deny this. This is definitely not the truth. Another part of the statement that was made by the chairman of the commission—is purported to have been made, allegedly has been made by the chairman of the commission—is that 20 to 25 per cent of the patients admitted to the general hospital come from the province of Quebec. To complete that statement, the question of religion that I mentioned in my remarks yesterday, was just a lot of hooey.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some remarks from the hon. Minister regarding that statement, and I would like to find out whether those remarks that have been attributed to the chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission have really been made by him.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, first of all this is completely out of order. This has nothing to do with—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The Minister of Health has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: First of all, this matter of privilege had nothing to do with vote 715, and I am shocked to think that the hon. member would believe tripe—and I cannot call it by any better name than tripe—of that kind reported in the paper. Dr. Neilson is in a position—

Mr. Racine: But I did not—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have the floor, Mr. Chairman. In the first place Dr. Neilson has not got the privilege or the opportunity to defend himself and he states categorically that he did not say any of these things—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is that all—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Hush, hush!

Mr. Singer: Hush, hush, yourself!

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege—on a point of order—I said I did not believe those statements—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If you did not believe them why did you repeat them?

Mr. Chairman: Well then, I am ruling you out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: You have no right to rule it out of order. We are discussing remarks attributed to the chairman of the hospital services commission and it is not out of order at all.

An hon. member: Why not challenge his ruling?

Mr. Singer: Yes, I will challenge his ruling and I now challenge it.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask you a question, sir, for clarification? Is it suggested it is out of order under the vote of the Ontario hospital services commission to discuss the administration of his office by the chairman of the commission? Is that being seriously suggested—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I certainly am, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: And do you believe it is out of order to do so, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: No, I ruled out of order comments that were reported to be in the press as of yesterday's or today's press. I do not think that you can expect the Minister of Health to be responsible for items that were reported to have appeared in the press.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: In fairness to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, may I point out to you that the reason he raised the matter, as was very clear to me, was to give the hon. Minister an opportunity to make a denial. Now, these statements have appeared—

Mr. Chairman: Which the Minister has done.

Mr. Bryden: But they appeared in a prominent journal and I think the hon. member was carrying out his responsibilities as a member to get the matter straightened out. This journal is read by many people, and I hope the denial will now be read by many people.

Mr. Chairman: Which the member has done and the Minister of Health has done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 715 carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, before this vote carries, the hon. Minister of Health undertook to make a statement in reply to the ten questions that I put to him on the situation of the foreign doctors being certified, under this vote.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, is it too much to ask that the vote carry? I will not renege on the statement, but it is almost six of the clock.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is part of the vote. I assumed the statement would be open for discussion. That would be under—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

I wonder would it be agreeable to the member if the statement is made previous to the orders of the day?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, only if the statement is open to complete discussion in this House, and it would not be under those circumstances. I point out to you, Mr Chairman, that it was the hon. Minister who undertook to make the statement on this vote. We asked him to make it much earlier.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did undertake it and I have no intention of backing down on that. It is to find proper time to do it, because it is the close of sitting. But I did undertake to the hon. member that while it rightly came under vote 701, it took time to get the information. I will have the information and so far as I am concerned I am quite content that it be discussed as fully as it warrants.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, we will do it tomorrow.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Opposition has to submit to comments from the Ministry that it is deliberately trying to obstruct. The issue that my hon. friend has raised is an extremely important issue, I think we are entitled to discuss it in this House. The proper time to discuss it is under this vote, and this vote should be held open until we can discuss it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The vote before this House is 715.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a short further point of order, within the last 48 hours letters have gone to the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Prime Minister and hon. leaders of the Opposition parties directly affecting this issue with new and relevant information. It should be discussed by this House and it was said it would be discussed under this vote. Therefore, this vote cannot now pass.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, are we to hold up this vote because someone comes in and says a letter was written from somebody? We could have this type of letter written every two days for the next six or eight weeks. What a ridiculous proposal for holding up the completion of the business of this House. I never heard anything so ridiculous.

Mr. Bryden: It is now past six o'clock. The rules clearly provide that when the hour of six o'clock is reached, if a motion is not made to adjourn the House, you must leave the chair to resume at eight. So I suggest that we now follow that rule.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 715 is before us.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, you now have to leave the chair. The rules are quite specific on this.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, we will accept this other step in the progressive going-on of obstructionist tactics.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We on the government side, I think, have done everything that might humanly be expected to make these debates as free and open as possible in order that anything that should be discussed on public business could be discussed here. But I think to anyone with any judgment at all, some of the procedures and some of the suggestions of these last few minutes are really completely out of order. If we continue this way it will serve to do nothing other than destroy what we have been trying to build up, and that is an orderly conduct of the business of the people of the province.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am entitled to rise on a point of order and I am rising on a point of order. I do not think that the hon. Prime Minister's pique against the rules of the House, which are clear and clearly understood, has any place in the orderly proceedings of this House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committe rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, **Mr. Speaker** in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: The committee of supply begs leave to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health informs me that this famous list of questions is available and we will return to the estimates of The Department of Health tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I regret I will not be able to be present tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, then, we will not return to the estimates of The Department of Health; that will wait until some time later.

I will call tomorrow second readings of orders 6 to 25, inclusive, excluding 7 and 8, 13 and 18. Following that, we will deal with the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.10 o'clock, p.m.

No. 98



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Statement re Polish millenium celebration, Mr. Yakabuski 3055

Question of Mr. Wishart re coroner at Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, Mr. Gisborn 3056

Question of Mr. MacNaughton re roads to resources, Mr. Newman 3056

Questions of Mr. Stewart re milk pricing, Mr. Gaunt 3057

Power Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading 3057

Regional development councils, bill respecting, Mr. Randall, second reading 3057

Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, on second reading 3087

Recess, 6 o'clock 3096

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, the history club of Meaford high school, Meaford, and in both galleries, Barrie district north collegiate, Barrie.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to bring to the attention of this House, because of my absence on Tuesday, May 3, I would like to add to what was so ably expressed by the hon. Provincial Secretary and the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, with regard to the Polish millennium celebrations.

Before I proceed, Mr. Speaker, I do have the pleasant privilege of welcoming to the gallery today, a lady who is the daughter of a former member of this Legislature; Mrs. Melville Campbell, of Renfrew, Ontario, is the daughter of J. A. Craig, who represented the riding of Lanark North from 1929 to 1934.

I have already said that the hon. Provincial Secretary and the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville ably expressed the feelings of the Polish community in this nation on the occasion of May 3, but I would like to add, and perhaps quote from, remarks that I made on Tuesday, May 3, in Wilno, Ontario, in connection with the Polish millennium celebration.

Poland received its name from the extensive plains which signifies the Polish word for plain or field, "pola," and until the 18th century it was one of the largest independent countries in Europe. Geographically, it belonged to eastern Europe, but culturally to the west. Until the 10th century, Poland lived quietly and created a national state which was a strong and secure political entity. With the unification of Germany on the west and Russia on the east, Prince Mieozko, as so ably described the other day, brought Christianity to Poland.

Although during the next ten centuries Poland was almost under continual onslaught, she never lost the faith. It was the unifying element which time and time again gave her people the strength to keep on fighting.

No nation on the face of this earth has had to endure such hardships and sufferings from her neighbours. At different times during her history she has been invaded by Turks from the south, Swedes from the north, Russians from the east and Germans from the west. Three times Poland was partitioned, and the dismemberment of her lands was considered one of the greatest crimes in history. No nation has had as many treaties broken and promises unfulfilled.

We in this generation are well aware of the aggression and suffering that the Polish people have had to endure in more recent years. Yet in a thousand years the spark of Christianity has never been extinguished. Even the Communists since World War II and at the present time have failed dismally in their attempts to put out the fires of Christianity in Poland. I am sure this millennium will give the Polish people new strength, and that Christianity will continue to be the element which binds these valiant people together.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday we were fittingly celebrating the anniversary that has made the Polish nation great.

I wanted to say, as perhaps was not outlined by previous speakers on this subject, that the purpose of these millennium celebrations is not only to celebrate the one thousandth anniversary of Christianity in Poland but also, with the ten million or more Poles living in different countries throughout the world, to acquaint the people of different racial backgrounds with the history of Poland and what Poland has done for Christianity over those years.

May I quote from the remarks with which I ended in Wilno on Tuesday:

> Canada is made up of many peoples of many racial backgrounds. Whatever their ancestry may be, they are proud of it,

whether they be English, Irish, Scottish, French, Polish or any other. They all have a special day in which they honour their past. We of Polish descent can be proud that we are the descendants of a great people known as the Poles. However, we must remember that we are Canadians first and we must work together with those of many other backgrounds in building here on this continent a great nation, a nation that history will record as being peaceful, dynamic and tolerant, the nation our forefathers visualized and laid the groundwork for. That nation is Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question to put to the hon. Minister of Health who is not in his seat. But with your permission, I will put the question and he may take it as notice and answer at the appropriate time.

Does the Minister intend to investigate the situation in the Hamilton Ontario Hospital as outlined in the Hamilton *Spectator* of May 3, regarding:

(a) The critical staff shortage;

(b) The number of sudden and accidental deaths;

(c) Occasional brutalities and cruel disciplining of difficult patients?

Mr. Speaker, I also have a question to put to the hon. Attorney General:

1. In the Attorney General's opinion, have all the procedures and functions of a full-time coroner at the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton been carried out in an efficient and effective manner?

2. Does the Attorney General intend to look into the procedures of the coroner's office at the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that notice of the question was given properly and in time, but due to the fact that I was engaged up until almost the opening of the House, I did not receive the question until just a few minutes before 2 o'clock, and I would ask that I might take it as notice and undertake to give the answer tomorrow.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General, and he may also check it out—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We are on our toes over here!

An hon. member: They sure are!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Gisborn: My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker is—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will take that as notice, too, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Supplementary notice!

Mr. Gisborn: Is the hon. Attorney General aware that Dr. Isaac B. Crack who has been the full-time coroner at the Ontario Hospital at Hamilton for many years is 91 years of age? Does the Attorney General feel that Dr. Crack is physically capable of carrying out the duties of the coroner at this hospital?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am aware of the age of the coroner, Mr. Speaker, and I can answer the supplementary question without taking it as notice. I think that the hon. member may be aware that in the amendments to The Coroners Act, which I introduced this year, there is now a retirement age for coroners effective as at the end of this year, or the beginning of next year.

An hon. member: What is the retirement age, 92?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in the House, I will give this question as notice, if you prefer.

Has the price of milk that is used to manufacture multimilk, been reduced—and there is a typographical error here; it should read, "from $5.29 per hundredweight." If so, what is the reason for the reduction and who made the decision to reduce the price, the commission or the board?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to reply to the question asked yesterday before the orders of the day by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

The question is: Would the Minister inform the House of the number of roads to resources that have been completed under the agreement with the federal government and their payment of $750,000 to the province during 1965-66, and what portion of the cost was borne by the province?

The answer is: From the inception of the work, five roads have been completed under the roads-to-resources agreement with the federal government. Two other roads are still in progress. The receipt of $750,000 from the federal government in 1965-66 relates to the following roads: Nakina northerly via Cavell to Terrier lake; the Claque Lake road; Pickle Crow northerly; Savant Lake south to Highway 17; Port Arthur north to Spruce River road.

Two of the above roads were completed in 1965-66; one was completed in 1964-65, and the remaining two are still in progress.

I ask the hon. member to note that the federal government refunds are not necessarily received in the same fiscal year that the expenditure is incurred. The province bears 50 per cent of the cost of sharable expenditure. When, by agreement, any portion of the total cost is borne by a natural resource industry, the balance only is shared equally by the two governments.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is now in the House, would he prefer that I read the question again?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it is necessary to read the question again when the Minister has the question before him, except that there is one preposition that should read "from" instead of "to"—"from $5.29 per hundredweight."

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): I thought probably it was a typographical error when I saw it.

In reply to the question, Mr. Speaker, at the hearing before the milk commission of Ontario, the processor of multimilk and the producers to that plant appealed against an increase in their price from $3.84 to $5.29, as established by the Ontario milk marketing board. The decision of the commission was to recommend to the milk marketing board that they amend their regulations by reducing the price from $5.29 to $4.85 per hundred, subject to a review of the selling price of multimilk and the operations of the processor during May and June.

The decision was based on a consideration of the pricing of the fluid milk that multimilk should not discriminate against either and that the position should be one resulting in an equally competitive position.

I am given to understand—and I have not had any official confirmation of this at all—that the milk marketing board has accepted the recommendation of the commission in making that reduction in price.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister mentioned the months of May and June. Am I to take it that this is a temporary thing that will be tried and then a final decision be made at the end of that time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot give a positive answer to that. I understand that the milk commission, in discussing with both the processors and the producers who ship to the plant, undertook that this price would be in effect for these two months and they would then have an opportunity to review the situation. But I do not want to give that as a final answer as I do not know if there will be any adjustment in price. I assume this is what has been satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly on a matter of personal privilege. There was a report this morning in the *Globe and Mail* and one in the Toronto *Daily Star* regarding the debates that took place in the House last night. The reports in the newspapers quoted someone as saying that I had exaggerated to the House as to the bed shortage at the Scarborough general hospital. I said in the House that there were 400 urgent cases, and someone attempted to correct me in the paper and estimated there were about 200.

I want to inform the House that I was not misleading the House; I doublechecked the figures with the head office of the Scarborough general hospital and I have been informed that I was correct. There is a 400 bed shortage for urgent cases and 1,200 on the elective list, so that I rise on this point so that hon. members of the House will know that I was not misinforming them last night.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE POWER COMMISSSION ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves second reading of Bill 63, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves second reading of Bill 89, An Act respecting regional development councils.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, forgive me; I was just a little startled. I thought that the hon. Minister would have something to say; that conceivably the Liberals would have something to say, but if neither of them have, I will proceed, because I have something to say.

This piece of legislation is potentially one of the most important pieces of legislation that could come before this Legislature. I wish I felt confident that this potentiality was going to be realized. Now, I want to be fair. I recall many years ago, in a debating club at Queen's University, where the young debaters were advised that if you want to deal effectively with the case of an opponent, you concede its strength, and having conceded whatever strength there is in it, and having set it aside, then you can concentrate on its deficiencies. I would like to acknowledge that there is in this regional development councils bill the framework for the kind of development which conceivably might some day make effective organizations for regional development across the province of Ontario, and in the course of my remarks I shall indicate where this progress has been made.

My doubts, however, stem from the fact that there is not only a general vagueness about the whole proposition that the government is presenting, there are still some yawning inadequacies in terms of the kind of machinery and statement of policy necessary if we are going to have effective regional development in the province of Ontario.

Let me deal first with the local machinery. The regional development councils bill simply changes the name of "association" to "council." In effect you have got the same body. The only other change being brought about through this bill is a small addition to the amount of money that will be available for the effective operation of these bodies.

Now is this going to solve the problem? In the past, Mr. Speaker, there has been a small amount of money spent, matching grants from the provincial government and from the local associations. The problem at the local association levels is that in effect they have had to scrounge by going around to the various municipalities, or to federations of the chambers of commerce to get the necessary money to operate. The result is that they have spent most of their time either collecting funds for survival, or an undue amount of time in their activities in putting out promotional literature, whose chief purpose was to capture the attention of some potential contributor to their budget.

This may have been some small contribution to regional development in the area, but I suggest that the major portion of it was simply to create the means for survival, that there was no real contribution to regional development.

In addition to this, there was a feeling on the part of the regional associations that they were being neglected by the central government here at Queen's Park. For example, I have in my hand the Krueger report, from which I have quoted earlier. This report was presented to the Ontario economic council a year or so ago, but the government never saw fit to make it available until those of us on the Opposition side had no alternative but to dig it out.

I would like to quote from page 73 of the Krueger report, the views of the various regional development associations, with respect to the government and its attitude towards their work. Quoting:

> At the introduction of the first regional development association, the province expressed interest in having associations submit recommendations and proposals pertaining to regional economic development needs. Apparently no particular procedure was set forth as to who was to receive such briefs—the Prime Minister, the Cabinet, individual Ministers or their deputies.
>
> In any event, during the early years, comprehensive briefs reviewing many local and regional problems and proposals for government action were presented regularly to the Cabinet and later to the Prime Minister. Although in some instances positive benefits were obtained from these presentations, in general the associations felt that the response from the provincial government was less than satisfactory. The province frequently considered the briefs to be too general, their tone too negative and the problems submitted too petty.
>
> In recent years the regional development associations have continued to submit briefs but less frequently, and more often relating to a specific need and addressed to a specific Minister. However, the regional development associations agree in feeling that these briefs are sometimes less than welcome and generally receive insufficient consideration and produce few tangible results.

There is an assessment from three academics who took a look at the experience of some ten years of the regional development associations and, in effect, report that these grassroot organizations, which were set up to

take the initiative, to give leadership at the local level, simply could not get a positive response from the provincial government.

Indeed, one could pick many examples. There is one I have cited in this House before of that famous occasion when the eastern Ontario development association was launched some ten years ago. They had six or eight Cabinet Ministers come down and they were presented with many weighty briefs with regard to the problems of industries withering away in eastern Ontario and of reforestation to put great economic wastelands back into forest cover that had been cut off by the timber barons of yesteryear.

As each of these briefs were presented—it was pointed out by Grattan O'Leary, who was the banquet speaker at the end of this first annual meeting—the response from each one of the Cabinet Ministers was no, no, no. In effect, Mr. O'Leary said, "What is the point of bringing down such an array of Queen's Park brass if, when you are presented with carefully worked out and substantiated assessments of problems in eastern Ontario, the automatic reaction is no?"

Now, that was ten years ago and it seems to me that the significance of the Krueger report is that this in essence was the negative response of the government throughout that whole ten-year period.

Whether or not the new era we have moved into is going to be characterized by any substantial change, time alone is going to tell. I was very interested in reading a speech of the hon. Minister to a meeting of the eastern Ontario development association within the past few days. It was so characteristic of the Minister; it was full of frothy enthusiasm, you could see him bubbling. He was the professional salesman who was really selling "a first" here and "a first there" and "firsts" elsewhere, with regard to the achievements of this government. But this has been going on for years. Twelve or 13 years ago, the then Prime Minister of the province went over to Great Britain and suddenly became infatuated with regional development and community development in Great Britain. He came back sold on the idea—to the point that legislation was brought in to launch development associations.

It has never been followed up with any substantive action. It has never been followed by anything other than repeat performances, in terms of propaganda slogans, and in terms of campaign promises that might be useful to get votes in the next election. Therefore, I register my serious doubts on the basis of past experience that now stretches back over some 12 or 13 years, as to whether or not there is any significant change in the government's approach and, as I shall continue in my remarks to underline, my doubts stem in part also from the inadequate machinery that has been established.

That brings me to the machinery.

When the Krueger report notes that the people who drew up these briefs down through the years did not know to whom they should present them, I would assume that one of the achievements of this new piece of legislation is that at least we are now going to have some central machinery.

Indeed, here is the greatest potential good in the new proposals the government has put forward. The government is going to establish a Cabinet committee. This Cabinet committee is going to be headed by the hon. Prime Minister. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if I may quote once again briefly from the Krueger report, you will note that what the government has done is, at least in this instance, taken a recommendation almost holus-bolus from the Krueger report. What Professor Krueger and his colleages drew attention to was that in 1960 or 1961, at the beginning of this administration under the present Prime Minister, there was established, either just before he took over, or certainly in the early months of his taking over, a Cabinet committee for conservation and land use. And he details in rather dramatic and almost amusing fashion the extent to which this committee just withered on the vine. Some achievements were made at the Deputy Ministers' level with the advisory group; they got to know each other better. It is rather interesting that in this government achievements are made when a committee is set up chiefly because the Deputy Ministers get to know each other better on their common problems. But that was all that was achieved.

And so, out of that experience, Professor Krueger proposed that:

> In order for such a Cabinet committee to succeed, it seems essential that the Prime Minister take the responsibility for ensuring that committee policies are implemented, even though this might require major modifications of individual departmental programmes. In this regard it is interesting to note that when the 1950 select committee on conservation recommended that an interim departmental conservation committee should be established, it stipulated that the Prime Minister should appoint a chief of conservation, having

> the status of a Deputy Minister, whose duties would be to bring about co-ordination and co-operation of all departments and agencies relating to conservation.

Now, we have no one in this Cabinet committee, at least in terms of name, who is going to have the status of a Deputy Minister. The person who potentially may emerge as the driving force, the full-time personnel, is going to be the secretary. And conceivably, if he is operating under the direction of a committee which is chaired by the Prime Minister, he might be able to achieve the purpose that was envisaged in the Krueger recommendation. But I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, it will depend completely on who the secretary is, both in terms of his capacity, in terms of his experience and in terms of his extraordinary wisdom. Backed by the hon. Prime Minister's authority, he may have to knock Cabinet heads together to get co-ordination.

Without going into great detail—I have done this many times before in the House—it has been pointed out by so many people that you have overlapping of responsibilities, you have conflicts of jurisdiction—these conceivably can be reconciled through this Cabinet committee chaired by the Prime Minister.

The secretary will have to work with meticulous care, bringing the departments together, and if perchance those departments clash, as they may well—for example, between The Department of Municipal Affairs and The Department of Economics and Development on things like regional development and community planning—then this secretary has to be that extraordinary individual who will come back to the Prime Minister and say, "There has to be action here to resolve this kind of conflict." I need say no more to emphasize that this person has to be a pretty extraordinary person. And I just wonder who it is going to be.

If I may make another point with reference to one person. I hear growing rumours around Queen's Park that the person may well be Ian Macdonald, who is now the chief economist. I have no criticism of Ian Macdonald, but I would make this one further comment: If the person who is put in as secretary of this Cabinet committee is shouldered with the range of responsibilities that Mr. Macdonald has as chairman of the confederation committee, as chief economist of the province, and many other aspects of the government's operations it will simply be impossible for him to fulfil the responsibilities of co-ordination and direction for this committee, even though the Prime Minister is heading it. Because the Prime Minister is a very busy man and will not have the time to be able to give detailed consideration.

The next question, which I alluded to a moment ago, is the need for co-ordination between departments. I was interested to note, with regard to a minor area of conflict of jurisdiction between branches of departments whose interest focused directly on this question of regional development, another recommendation of Professor Krueger and his colleagues on page 106 in the report. Let me read it:

> Our first recommendation is that the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs and the regional development division and municipal services division of The Department of Economics and Development be merged. All three of them are concerned with overall regional economic development. Only if these three are merged, so that there is one common policy regarding various aspects of economic development and regional planning, is there any likelihood of obtaining the unified regional development boards previously mentioned in an earlier recommendation.

My question to the hon. Prime Minister, to the hon. Minister, or whoever is speaking for this bill later, is: What has been done to resolve this conflict, or to achieve the very necessary co-ordination in this one area? I submit that there are many other instances where the same question can be asked, but perhaps the problem can be symbolized by this particular instance. Is there any action on the part of the government to bring these departments together, as Professor Krueger has indicated, in one particular ministry—whatever ministry the government decides?

It is an open secret among all who have taken an interest in this matter that there has been a real war behind the scenes between certain hon. Ministers, fighting to retain the empire they happen to hold at the present time. As long as this war continues, you are never going to have the degree of co-ordination which will make it possible to have effective regional development.

There is another problem, Mr. Speaker. I see no suggestion, either in the bill, which, of course, is just a mere skeleton, or in the comments made by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, that there is a solution emerg-

ing. One of the complaints of the last ten years has been that you could not get any real communication at the regional development association level between all of the various departments involved and which, everybody agreed, did have some concern and interest in the wide-ranging problem of regional development.

What in effect happened is that if a problem was raised, or if a brief was being presented, invariably the procedure was to have it come to Queen's Park. Conceivably at Queen's Park there would be communication with other departments, and then it would come back to the regional development association once again. In other words, everything had to go to Queen's Park and back, instead of working out a degree of co-ordination right at the local level. If there are plans in this connection, I submit to the hon. Minister concerned that it is time we had some details of these plans, because they are important to achieve your objectives.

Another of the objectives related to regional development councils is one on which I am very doubtful of the enthusiasm and conviction of the government. This is the proposition of attempting over the years that lie ahead to establish common administrative units for the various provincial departments throughout the province of Ontario. This has been spelled out rather vaguely as an objective in the Prime Minister's comments. I noticed that the Minister in his speech to the eastern Ontario development association specified this as one of the objectives of the government. But I can remember, for example, when we were debating in the House the question of regional jails throughout the province of Ontario, the hon. Minister of Highways engaged in a spirited intervention in which he said in effect, "What has my department got to do with anything that takes place in The Department of Reform Institutions?"

In other words, he was repudiating in advance the principle that you should attempt to establish unified administrative organizations across the province of Ontario. And if the government is serious on this, other than submitting to the pressure and the criticism of Opposition members and experts across the province, I think we have to have some clearer statement as to exactly what they have in mind.

For example, the Krueger report—and everybody else who has advocated this—has emphasized that you do not have to bring into a common and decentralized unit every single government department. There may conceivably be some department for which no particular purpose is going to be served, but I think the government owes it to the Opposition and to those who have been prodding for this kind of development down through the years, to indicate which government departments they think can achieve a degree of decentralization and, specifically, how that decentralization is going to integrate with the efforts for rational development in each of the areas.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, and I draw this to the attention of the House, in what appears to be a much more meaningful approach to this problem that is being taken in our sister province of Quebec. Within the last few months the government in the province of Quebec has announced the establishment of ten regional areas throughout the whole of the province. They are coming into this picture belatedly, but they are coming into it with the experience of a real economic development project in the Gaspé area, which was tackled with all of the imagination, detailed consideration, and with all of the application of experts from the various disciplines which characterize the kind of thing that took place in TVA a generation ago in the United States.

What they are now proposing to do is to extend that kind of a programme from the pilot project which was carried on in the Gaspé area, primarily on ARDA financing from the federal government, to all of the other regional development areas that have been established across the province. But when they established them, Mr. Speaker, let me draw to your attention exactly what they did.

First they took a careful analysis of the 1,500 municipalities in the province of Quebec and the delineated boundaries from these various municipalities that had some logic in terms of modern conditions, for economic development. In other words, they just did not accept the historic boundaries of counties and block these counties together and hope that somehow they would come up with some rational economic development area. They have analyzed it in terms of modern conditions, and delineated boundaries that are meaningful.

Second, Mr. Speaker—and this shows the kind of thing that makes me suspect this government has done nothing at all, despite their having been in the field for ten years—they made a detailed study of the regional sales territories of some 40 private enterprises, some 40 industries and manufacturing

concerns which operated across the whole of the province of Quebec, to discover the pattern of regional decentralization on the part of private enterprise, so that in establishing regional development associations they would be able to set up a machinery which co-ordinates the efforts of private enterprise as well as whatever the government is going to do.

This, I submit, is a rational imaginative approach to the problem. We have had no evidence at all that the government is doing this kind of thing here. In Quebec the economic advisory council and the provincial government analyzed each of the provincial departments, what their present procedures of decentralized administration happened to be, and how conceivably they could be co-ordinated into a rational pattern for common boundaries of decentralized administration. In short, they have done a careful research job in advance of marking out their boundaries. They have done a job, which this government may have done, but if they have, they certainly have not talked about it, and normally they do a lot of talking before there is any action, so I come to the conclusion that we have had no real preparatory effort.

Another of the releases by the Quebec government, when they announced this new approach, contains this significant paragraph:

> To establish a list of the regions of the province in order that it meet with social and economic realities of the milieu, the bureau of economic research concentrated its studies on existing administrative regions, growth centres and their zones of influence, sales of private enterprise, the regional divisions of intermediate bodies.

Mr. Speaker, without going into any further details, I would suggest to the hon. Minister that on second reading, if he wants to dispel some of the scepticism that has pretty universally emerged across the province of Ontario, with regard to the government's so-called design for development, on the introduction of these bills, he has got to answer some of these questions and to provide us with some meat instead of frothy propaganda statements.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are two final considerations that relate directly to the potential effectiveness of these regional development councils to which I want to turn. First, you cannot have effective action for regional development unless you have a statement of government policy that is something more than vague generalities.

I am sure if the hon. Prime Minister has looked at his clippings—after his statement some few weeks ago—on the design for development, he must have been impressed, as certainly I have been from the Opposition side of the House, that nobody has been overwhelmed with enthusiasm about its potentialities. Most of the interpretative comment was that this sounds like more of the same old thing we have had for the last ten years; there is no real substance evident yet. In effect, the friends of the government were requesting that they have more substance before they were going to be persuaded that the government was moving in any meaningful way.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, basically the problem here is that the government is moving into an area in which there is considerable conflict with the philosophy of a conservative party. I recall that when I raised some of these questions during consideration of the hon. Prime Minister's estimates, and first quoted at some length from the Krueger report, the Prime Minister rather airily dismissed my comments by saying that obviously Professor Krueger does not like this government, which, of course, was a highly irrelevant comment. Whether Professor Krueger likes or dislikes this government is neither here nor there. He and his academic colleagues were doing an analysis of the facts of departmental chaos and confusion and he was presenting those facts. You cannot dismiss the criticism implicit in the report simply by saying that Professor Krueger does not like the government.

However, the more important thing was that the Prime Minister said, "Let us face it," addressing his remarks to me across the House, "There is a difference of philosophy in our approach." In other words, said he, "You believe in economic planning, we in effect, do not believe in economic planning." I think this is an accurate statement of the government's position.

In recent years all parties have increasingly paid lip service to economic planning. For decades prior to that the only party that espoused the cause of economic planning was the CCF and the New Democratic Party. At least the older parties have now reached the stage where they are paying lip service. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it is in conflict with the basic philosophy of a government that says, as the hon. Minister of Health has said so often in his estimates, "We expect that the action and the initative will be taken at the local level, we count on this." In other words, the sum total of the actions of each industry and each private enterpriser in the province, in some fashion or other, is

going to be able to contribute sufficiently to achieve regional or economic development in the province of Ontario. In fact, it is a refusal to accept, even in 1966, the positive role of a government in terms of giving leadership for economic development.

This basic hesitancy on the part of government, arising from their philosophy, I suggest, is going to be crippling in terms of effective action in economic development. Indeed, not only is it just vague economic planning at the local level, but there is no willingness to accept the recommendation of so many experts to underpin this economic planning, with regional government—with the kind of administrative framework in terms of local government which will make it possible to do something.

I come back to something on which we have touched in the last two or three weeks on a number of occasions; I want to repeat it briefly in the context of this debate.

Some year or two ago after deliberations that extended over a span of two or three—or was it four years?—a select committee on municipal affairs brought in a report. The second half of this report deals almost completely with the proposition of local and regional government. Coming from a committee, the overwhelming majority of which were members from the government side of the House, they brought in details for moving towards the establishment of regional government in the province of Ontario. The government paid lip service to this recommendation. A year or so ago, the hon. Prime Minister was quoted in the press in various addresses across the province of Ontario in which there was a note of threat in his admonitions to various audiences, particularly municipal audiences—that if they were not willing to get together themselves and to establish some more rational local government structure, then the provincial government would have to move in and do something about it.

However, somewhere along the way the Conservative Party apparently has come to the conclusion that this is politically too dangerous, that whatever may be the imperative dictates of the needs of this kind of thing, they are simply not going to grasp the nettle. So now we have the statement by the Prime Minister a few weeks ago, when he was speaking to the urban development institute, in which he clearly indicated that there was "no compelling reason for disturbing the existing structure of municipal or county government." In other words he was backing away completely from an objective which had been spelled out by a select committee of this Legislature and by so many experts across the province of Ontario, including the Krueger report.

And I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, to have sent to me following a brief exchange in the House on the first reading of this bill, a speech of the urban development institute to which the hon. Prime Minister spoke.

This is a speech that was given by the president of that body, Grant L. Duff, to the Waterloo county area planning board on Thursday, March 31. It has been drawn to my attention that this is an accurate statement of the aims and basic philosophy and approach to this problem by the urban development institute. Obviously, the Prime Minister will have to make many more speeches to them until he dissuades them from this long-established goal. I quote from the speech of Mr. Duff:

> Planning on a regional basis can provide the guidelines to permit urban expansion which is properly planned, suitably contained and adequate to today's growth requirements. However, it does not require the municipal organization to ensure its implementation. Regional planning, for example, may result in the location of more industrial and commercial assessment in some municipalities than in others. Those with the higher proportion of residential assessment, such as dormitory municipalities, must have access to the tax base of the region.

And here, if I may interject, is the nub of the issue:

> As we see it, regional planning can only be fully effective when the boundaries for planning purposes coincide with the boundary of a single municipal corporation, whether this be by means—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We have only said that 100 times.

Mr. MacDonald: Agreed!

Mr. Singer: It has not got through over there.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. I thought the hon. member was interrupting and disagreeing with me.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no!

Mr. MacDonald: Quoting again:

> —whether this be my means of a metropolitan form of government or by outright amalgamation is dependent on the particular circumstances.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, you simply cannot have local regional planning unless you have regional government for the machinery to implement it. And in co-ordination with this regional government, you have to have decentralization of the provincial department, which has been at least set forth as an objective in the design for development.

It is one thing for this government to have all the tens of thousands of dollars that were spent in producing a report like this, to talk about it for a year or so—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Would the hon. member permit one question?

Mr. Speaker, is it the member's proposition that he would develop planning areas throughout the province and then superimpose another form of government or destroy the local governments and replace them with a municipal form of government that would coincide with the boundaries—I presume new boundaries—that he would establish across the province in the interest of economic planning?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Prime Minister said, "Are you going to be superimposing another kind of government?" Let me say this, Mr. Speaker: To the extent that you superimposed a federal kind of government in the Metro area when you moved to establish a regional government in this area, yes, you are imposing it.

What you are doing is trying to rationalize the boundaries and the lack of capacity that has emerged in all of these historic boundaries of small municipalities, to rationalize it through a new governmental structure on a regional basis, that takes in an area that has certain homogeneity so that you can avoid competition between these municipalities, each of which is trying to seek industrial assessment when conceivably it is wise that the industrial assessment should be in one and the residential dormitory area should be another. In essence, it is the same kind of a problem as we are trying to grapple with in the metropolitan area at the present time.

But all I am saying is that Professor Krueger, and all others who have studied this kind of problem, say that if you are going to implement a regional economic development you simply cannot implement it effectively if you have not the modern rationalization of the old outmoded and increasingly inefficient municipal governments that we have in the province of Ontario. Furthermore, at the higher level, you have to get some rationalization of all of the conflicts of the provincial government and decentralize the administration into units across the province of Ontario within which these regional municipal governments can then fit and operate. But without that modern machinery, you cannot implement regional development programmes.

Our problem, if I may just say so in summation before I sit down, is that the Design for Development is a very vague statement that cannot by any stretch of the imagination be accepted as a statement of policy with adequate substance in it for economic development across the province of Ontario. At best, it is an expression of pious objectives, of hopes. But in addition to not having a policy, the government refuses to underpin any potential regional economic development with the local regional municipal structure which would make it possible to implement the policy, even if there was one.

This is the reason why I rise to say that we will support this bill on second reading; at least it has within it the nucleus of a potential development that will be moving in the right direction. It particularly has, in the Cabinet committee, a key element in the new framework that is necessary. But even where there are things that look promising, there are still doubts with regard to how they are going to operate, which I think justifies the widespread criticism that we have had across the province of Ontario since the original announcement that the government made on this.

I was rather interested in one comment on the design for living after the hon. Prime Minister made it. I refer to Bill Rathbun on CKEY in his broadcast of April 24. He opened a rather detailed and fair analysis of this whole programme the government had presented, by saying:

> For several years there has been in this province a carefully manicured garden path that promises to lead to the golden tomorrow where the anachronisms of the 19th century would be laid aside and vibrant new systems of local government would come into their own. Villages, towns and townships, even counties and cities, would become interacting units of what is described as regional government.

His third paragraph has the appropriate comment:

> The garden path reached the bramble stage in a little-publicized speech by Ontario Premier John Robarts to the urban development institute on March 25.

We have been on the garden path, Mr. Speaker, we have gotten to the bramble stage, but I have not seen enough evidence in this development to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that towards the end of the path you are going to have any golden tomorrow for economic development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will cut through the bramble and we will cut through the patch.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I had not really anticipated that there was any great necessity for participating in the debate on the second reading of this bill. I do not know how many times it is that my colleagues and myself have said over the years that there must be a form of regional development in the province of Ontario and that along with regional development there must be regional government.

As a matter of fact, as the hon. member for York South was talking, the interjection of the hon. Prime Minister at this stage and after his elaborate production of the document called "Design for Development," convinced me that as laborious as it might be to us, everyone in the Opposition has to get up and continue to repeat and repeat and repeat and repeat the things that we have said over all these years. Obviously, it just has not leaked through at all to the Prime Minister of the province.

I think he has the words "regional development" in his mind and I think he recognizes that it is a good thing to be in favour of—like motherhood and being against sin and that sort of thing—but I think that is about as far as his thinking goes on this subject. I do not think, from what we have heard in these remarks, that there is any encouragement at all to be found in Bill 89. It will be another piece of legislation which advances the idea that our friends in the government are in favour of all things that sound good. They are not prepared to do very much about them, but they are going to pass another bill and it makes a lot of fine noise and perhaps the problem will go away for a bit.

I had hoped, when I read reports of the Prime Minister's speech in London—when was it, a year and a half ago? He went to London in the month of August, I think, about a year and a half ago, and he was very firm; he pounded the table and he said, "You fellows in local government had better smarten up, you had better learn how to co-operate—or else. We have the power and we are going to do something about it."

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I presume. That speech I made has been fairly thoroughly misinterpreted and I was going to mention this point when the hon. member for York South was speaking. At that speech in London I was referring to regional planning; I was not referring to regional government.

I was not knocking heads together saying, "Now you municipalities had better get together and surrender the sovereignty you have and put yourselves into one or the provincial government will come and do it." That is not what I said; I was referring to the necessity for area planning boards which, of course, require the co-operation of the various municipalities in area planning.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It took a long time for an explanation to come forth!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in answer to one of these offhand remarks that it has taken a long time for this explanation to come forth—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister rose on a point of order and he is permitted that, but he cannot take over my position in this debate!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —I well recall making this same explanation last year and I object to having to define it for the hon. member. But he does not choose to understand what I said because it serves his purpose to do something else!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am very interested to hear this. I did have at one time, and I am sure that I still have in my files, a copy of the text of this speech. It may be that the hon. Prime Minister meant what he said this afternoon. Certainly, as I read the text of it, this was not the impression I gathered from it and I will be very happy to hear him join in this debate and explain to us just what his theory is.

If this theory is as he presently says it is, then I say to you, sir, that he should go back and spend some time at municipal council level and actually learn what went on; how things operate; where the sovereignty lies; who is the boss and how you achieve these things. He did serve for a while as an alderman in the city of London, but unfortunately I do not think that he spent enough time on the local council to actually find out how these things work.

I think it is most important that there be an understanding from government. Let us

know what government's position is. Can we talk? Does the hon. Prime Minister really believe that we can talk about regional planning as an abstract thing, unless there is machinery to make it work? Does he really believe that his colleague, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, can set up regions as he sees fit; that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare can set up his regions?

The hon. Minister of Education, the day after the hon. Prime Minister talked about design for development, stood up and said something about his regions. When I asked him, he said that these have no relationship to the design for development regions or the hon. Minister of Economics and Development' regions, that they were his own regions and that they had been worked on for a long time before, and so we are really not co-ordinating.

Does the hon. Prime Minister really believe that he can send a half dozen or ten of his colleagues off in as many different directions and achieve anything? Does he really believe there is sovereignty resident in the municipalities that finds its authority—from where? From the fact that they are there? Surely, if he understands the functioning of provincial government, he must recognize that any authority that a municipality has comes from this Legislature; the municipalities are the creatures of this Legislature; their powers are given and they can be taken away.

If this is going to work—and it is almost like starting at the beginning, starting with the alphabet—if municipalities are going to move in a certain direction—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): It is a pretty good place to start.

Mr. Singer: Well, it is a pity. I am very disappointed in the performance of the hon. Prime Minister because I find I must come to the conclusion that he does not understand the basics of municipal government, and it is a very sad thing to say about the Prime Minister of the province because he is such a nice man. But he should know, Mr. Speaker, how these things operate and he should know, as his colleague the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs recognizes, that if you are going to achieve something in Metropolitan Toronto, you must have a form of regional government that is going to look after regional planning.

Why is the government spending money on Murray Jones to do studies in Ottawa and on the gentleman who is doing studies in the Niagara peninsula, and on the other gentleman that a department of the government is hiring to send all around the province to do these studies, unless there is a means of implementing these studies?

If the growth in a regional manner is going to come to this province, if it is going to have any sense of motivation at all, surely it is not going to bubble from the bottom up. The direction has come from our friends on the government benches, and they are in such a confused state that all of the Ministers are going off in as many different directions as there are Ministers.

I would have hoped that this simple basic fact had sunk through, but it has not. So it is worth spending a little more time, I suppose, hammering at it again and I suppose we are going to have to hammer it on every possible occasion.

This is a pallid bill; it really does not produce very much and does not mean any more than the Alphonse-Gaston act that the Prime Minister put on with his Minister. The hon. Prime Minister came on with his great speech on design for development. It was nicely bound and had a fancy cover on it—a blue spiral binding held it together; the provincial crest adorned it; the Prime Minister delivered his half-hour speech; he was followed by his colleague, the Minister for Economics and Development and he delivered a great speech.

We have had two fine speeches, Mr. Speaker, full of sound and fury and saying absolutely nothing. And now we have a very pallid bill of nine sections and what does it do? Let us look at it. It has a definition section, and section 2—a great and important section—changes the name of a dozen or so associations and the word "council" is substituted for "association." Now, this is a real departure. This is going to change the whole programme of regional development in the province of Ontario and we are no longer going to have regional councils; we are going to have regional associations. I think this is a great advance step forward.

Mr. MacDonald: Do it in reverse!

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, it is the other way round; we are no longer going to have regional—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: It is six of one and half a dozen of the other! Put both names in, if it is going to achieve anything, Mr. Speaker.

What is the point of bringing this thing forward unless it means something—

The objects of each council—

the bill says:

—are to undertake such informational, educational and promotional programmes.

Well, I thought those were the objects of the associations and I am going to come to in a few moments some of the results of studies we have done with the existing associations. They, at least think that those are their present objects.

"The Minister shall designate the region in which each council shall have jurisdiction." I suppose this is enshrining in legislation the authority of the Minister of Economics and Development, so that he is not going to have to worry about the Minister of Education standing up the day following and having different regions. He is going to have his own regions and it says in the statute he can have his own regions, so he can do exactly what he wants insofar as regions are concerned. He is not going to be awfully concerned about the studies of the people appointed by his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, because they have got their own regions too, besides which the hon. Prime Minister says regional government is not very important in this, so the Minister of Economics and Development is going to function absolutely on his own.

"The council may receive funds from any source and the province may contribute to it." I would like to know, and I hope we hear both from the hon. Prime Minister and from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development before we are through this afternoon, what money the province intends to put into this, as they are going to be empowered to do when this Act passes, and how this money is going to be spent, what it is going to be used for, and how the province is going to ensure that it is going to be properly used.

That is about all the Act says. It changes a few names, it has a couple of definitions and it empowers the province to spend money. Why all the sound and fury? What are we going to achieve by passing this Act, Mr. Speaker? I say, absolutely nothing. I say it is part of a recognition, and this is as far as the government has got, that the words regional planning and regional development are nice words for a government to use in the province of Ontario, so the government is going to be nice and pleasant, we will have another statute, and my good friend and very able speaker, the Minister of Economics and Development is going to enjoy himself thoroughly. He is going to go around the province and say, "We have got a new Act, we have got a few dollars here, perhaps we will spend it in your area."

As far as improving this whole programme in the province of Ontario is concerned, Mr. Speaker, unless there is some meaning in the hon. Prime Minister's controlling regional planning in all its aspects as head of the Cabinet, then this means absolutely nothing and there has been nothing forthcoming at all from government to indicate that they really mean what they say, when they are setting up this Cabinet council, because every day in this House, each Minister gives his own interpretation of the way this is supposed to work.

For instance, sir, in our survey that we did in the various sections, in the northeastern Ontario regional development council, we discovered that only 41 of 130 municipalities, or 31.5 per cent, are members. The association lost the city of North Bay. There are 30 corporate members, of which six are elected to the board of directors. The board meets only three times a year. The zones, of which there are seven, have meetings perhaps twice a year. There are substantial complaints from that area and they revolve around these facts. In one instance, the officials of my friend the hon. Minister of Economics and Development came into that region, did not even advise the local people that they were coming, put on a bit of a show, but the local people were left standing with egg all over their face. They were the local regional council, the local regional association. My friend the hon. Minister of Economics and Development sent his people in, and they did not even bother to advise the local people that they were coming at all. Is this the way this Act is going to be carried on?

Certainly it is important and the word from this region is that it is important that the government should support these regional councils or regional associations. The education of the municipalities falls on the shoulders of government as well as the local association. The city of North Bay withdrew from lack of knowledge on the part of the councillors and that council came to the conclusion that there was no point in wasting the money of the taxpayers of North Bay because that regional association was getting absolutely nowhere. Members of that association and people in that region are not impressed

at all with the great objects that are set forth in this bill.

In the Lake Erie development association, Mr. Speaker, 71 municipalities comprise that region. Thirty-four are members, less than 50 per cent. The board of directors meets monthly. They work on certain projects there and they developed a municipal directory of their own. They encouraged the compilation of an atlas of the area. Certain work was done by the University of Western Ontario as a project of the geography department and that work consisted of some 43 maps, covering topics such as population, growth, agriculture, power and so on. This is of great value to the elementary schools in the region. The staff in that region, sir, consists of a manager and two female assistants and the only reason the staff is as small as that is is because they have not got funds to hire a larger staff.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): They are doing a great job.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I am sure they are, but it is not because of what comes out of government, it is what they are doing on their own. It is what they are doing on their own.

Mr. White: People think very highly of this programme.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Has the hon. member got any good news for us?

Mr. Singer: I would have hoped—and I am glad the hon. member for Simcoe East asked that question. I would have been glad to let this second reading go, Mr. Speaker, without any comments from us, if there had been any reason to expect the government meant something when they brought this bill forward, that really the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues had discovered the importance of regional development and regional government, and regional planning. But I was just forced to get into this debate even though I did not want to, because of the hon. Prime Minister's remarks, and it is just a pity, and I say we are going to have to repeat and repeat and repeat and repeat—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker. Order, order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the concern in this region and I—my hon. friend from London South has gone; he was saying what a fine group this was.

The concern in the Lake Erie region is that they have to spend too much time soliciting memberships. The 37 non-member municipalities will not join because they receive all the benefits anyway and each year time must be wasted soliciting in order to retain old members and bring in new members. This causes substantial financial loss and time loss and they are not able to get on with what they are doing. I do not disagree with the hon. member for London South that there have been achievements by this group, but I suggest it is as a result of having found a pretty good manager to do a job in that area.

The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, who sat on the municipal affairs committee, and signed the report, and who agrees that you have to have—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not sit on that committee.

Mr. Singer: Well, I am sorry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member had better look up his records; I did not sign the report either.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Minister should have.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I should have, I will admit that, but I did not.

Mr. MacDonald: You sat on the committee. You should know who the members were.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Did the hon. member sit on it?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Is the hon. member going to vote for this?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Managament was on it or not—and apparently I made a mistake, his colleague next to him, the hon. Minister without Portfolio was on it—he signed the report and agreed with the recommendation that if you are going to have regional planning you must have regional government. The Minister of Energy and Resources Management has served in a municipal capacity and I think has learned that if you are going to do planning in a regional way you have to have regional government to make it work.

I am disappointed—and I say again and as long as I continue to get these interruptions, I am going to repeat it—I am disappointed that this intelligence has not seeped through to the government front benches. This is the only way we are going to get these things to work, and unless the government is prepared to embark on a scheme like this, then all we are doing is making nice-sounding words. That is all that is being achieved at all.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in the midwestern region, there are some 80 municipalities. The record of membership is a little better. Of the 80, some 68 are members. This association has been going for some ten years and there are reasonably frequent meetings. The general manager there has only one secretary to assist him but they in that region have the same complaint: Too much time is required for the soliciting of membership and the raising of funds. This requires two or three months during which not only new members must be gained but the member-municipalities already there must be encouraged to stay on for another year and pay their dues. The association requires recognition both at government and the local levels. Only one person sits—and this is another source of real complaint from all these regional councils—only one of the members of all of the regional councils sits on the Ontario economic council representing all nine associations. And they feel that because they are the people out in the field, as it were, who are charged with carrying on this responsibility, they should have a much larger voice than only one member of the Ontario economic council.

In the Lake Ontario regional development association the same sort of concern is expressed. They have to spend time soliciting membership, they have to spend a quarter of their time, they estimate, in soliciting membership and attempting to retain the existing membership. They say that too many municipalities do not have the right approach; they think in short-term rather than in the far-sighted approach. It is small wonder that this is the sort of comment that comes from these regional councils, because this is the approach of the government. They again complain that only one representative of the nine active regions sits on the Ontario economic council. They think they should have much more to say.

Well, not to coin a phrase, but to add a word or two, it seems to be the feeling throughout these regional councils that there should be some form of economic planning. Is this what the government is doing? What is the government really trying to do with the Prime Minister's great speech on design for development and the introduction of this bill?

The Georgian Bay regional development association has exactly the same sort of comments to make. That association has done thorough industrial surveys but there has been no skill survey in that area. The association has produced a trade directory. It has not arranged for any financial assistance for industry in the area. It has done a land use survey and this is by the Canadian Land Inventory. It complains that board meetings are quite expensive—they run between $300 and $800, depending on the region—and it has difficulty in getting funds, maintaining its membership and carrying on its business in the direction that it can see that the business should be carried on.

The Lake St. Clair regional development association: There are 70 municipalities there, only 41 are members. They pay at the rate of four cents per capita of population to join the regions. Each of three counties are members. They hold meetings every two months. They have had a couple of projects, they have done a tourist survey and they are working now on a regional needs study. Limited in staff, they have only the general manager and his personal secretary. They are seriously concerned again about voluntary membership and the length of time they have to spend on looking for members in order to bring in enough money so they can carry on. They spend a great deal of their time and effort holding present members and soliciting new members so they can go on for a limited portion of the year to carry out the work they are trying to do.

The eastern Ontario development agency: 38 members in the association and 190 associate members. They hold meetings four times a year. Apparently there, although no specific projects are apparent, the association considers itself an image builder for what it describes as the golden triangle. They keep in contact with industrialists, they advertise about the importance of their own area and they try to interest industrialists in developing in their area. They provide travel folders and so on. The staff there consists of a general manager and one assistant and one secretary—a limited staff.

Their complaints are that they feel they are very restricted because of lack of cooperation from other governmental departments, they feel that they have not really been recognized by government, and they feel that there should be sort of a general recognition on the part of government of the work they are supposed to be doing and the

work that all of these regional associations is supposed to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, we have looked across the province in these various regions in an effort to find out what has been done in the past, what is the opinion of the local people, and what is the opinion of the staffs that work on these local councils. We had hoped and we had expected that with the emergence of the select committee on municipal law, there might have been some recognition. We had hoped that with the hon. Prime Minister beginning to make speeches sounding as though he believed in regional planning and regional government, there was some intelligence coming forward.

Our examination of his speech on design for development was disappointing. Our view of this bill was again a disappointment. Maybe it is going to be of some help—certainly it cannot do any harm—but the province of Ontario needs far, far more in the way of regional planning and regional government than is at present indicated, than the Prime Minister has indicated by his interjections or than the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has indicated by his speech on first reading of this bill.

We will support the bill, but in looking to the proper use of the machinery this government has available, there is such a tremendous field whereby this government could really set the province of Ontario on its proper track, and could take advantage of all the natural resources that we have there. But the province has not as yet recognized that it has this role to play. We hope some day that it will, and maybe there is some faint glimmer of hope being brought to us by the introduction of this bill.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, in view of the trend that the discussion on Bill 89 has been taking, I would like to add a few remarks at this time. I had intended to discuss matters pertaining to regional development, regional planning and regional government when I took part in the Throne debate but I do believe that my remarks would be a little more appropriate during discussion on this bill.

I think that on the municipal scene, other than the need for revision on the basis of taxation, probably the most widely discussed topic is that concerning the need or the desirability for a regional concept, and I think this extends to all things.

Municipal associations have been talking about it for several years. The experts are writing articles on the subject and municipal officials from all sections of the province have expressed their views both pro and con. I think this very awareness as evidenced by the thousands of spoken words is surely an indication of a realization that something is certainly needed.

The term "regional" has been utilized in conjunction with numerous phases of the total provincial-municipal programme, as, for example, the economic regions, regional development associations, regional conservation authorities and industrial regions, regional detention centres, and most recently, planning regions. I think the term "area" has been used also in the case of the Waterloo area planning board. Reference to area or regional education units has also been made.

So the term "regional," which is interchangeable with the word "area," has come into popular usage. I think we may also substitute the words "district," "territory," "zone" or "locale" and in so doing perhaps enlarge the view of just what is meant.

During the 1965 session of the Legislature, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs mentioned ten areas or regions of the province that in his opinion were regions in which a study of the municipal situation would be desirable. To be specific, he mentioned the Halton-Peel county area, the Waterloo area, the Lakehead, the Niagara peninsula, Brantford-Brant county area, the Hamilton area, London-Middlesex, Muskoka area, Ontario county and also the Ottawa-Carleton-Eastview region.

If we exclude the Metropolitan Toronto region from the total Ontario population, the remainder of the province represents a population of about five million, roughly. The population of the ten areas which were mentioned by the Minister and which I just mentioned, is approximately 2.5 million, leaving a total of about another 2.5 million citizens who reside in areas in which regional studies are not deemed necessary or desirable.

This analysis would indicate three distinct types of areas—the Metro Toronto area representing about 25 per cent of the total population; the areas in which no studies have been recommended, which would represent about 37.5 per cent, and the ten areas mentioned by the hon. Minister in which studies may reveal a need for some degree of revision.

In my view, sir, there are certainly sections of this province in which there is no need for revision of the municipal structure. The existing county system is still functioning quite well, and I believe it can continue to do so for some time in those areas.

The Municipal Act, at section 250a, reads as follows:

> 250a. The council of a local municipality may pass bylaws for entering into and performing any agreement with any other council for fulfilling, executing or completing, at their joint expense and for their joint benefit, any undertaking, work or project within the jurisdiction of the council.

Section 377 of The Municipal Act further provides:

> Bylaws may be passed by the councils of all municipalities for many specific programmes, such as, fire protection, water supply, insurance programmes, sewage works, garbage collection and disposal, transportation systems, road systems, police departments and so on.

I think the utilization of the foregoing provisions of The Municipal Act can serve to streamline the whole municipal function in those areas other than Metro Toronto and the ten potential study areas mentioned by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In fact the same provisions may be utilized to good advantage in some of the ten study areas. However, as a member of the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts, I did have sufficient opportunity to study our existing municipal structure to a great extent. I have had many opportunities to continue these studies since the filing of the select committee's final report. I have come to the firm conclusion, sir, that there are some sections of our province in which a revised form of county or area or regional government is an absolute necessity.

I would like also to refer to the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister which have been quoted on two or three occasions in this House and this was the occasion of his speech on August 25, 1965, when the Prime Minister was speaking to the Ontario municipal association. His words, in part, were as follows, and I would like to quote directly from this speech:

> There are in my view several alternatives which are open to us to solve the problems which I have mentioned. The province has the constitutional power to realign responsibilities between the province and the municipalities and to take over on a direct administrative basis many of the services which up to now have been considered local in nature. This approach, however, strikes at the core of local autonomy and may therefore not be acceptable.
>
> The second alternative would be to maintain the division of responsibilities along present lines and either make more money available to local government through grants or other financial arrangements, or to widen the tax base of local government. There would be, however, several difficulties with either of these arrangements, not the least of which would be the maintenance of adequate control and efficiency.
>
> A third alternative, which has received a great deal of public attention, particularly in the last year or two, is the creation of regional governments.

Those words were a quotation from the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister on August 25, 1965.

Mr. Bryden: What did the hon. member say about regional governments?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Read on! Read what he said next!

Mr. Reuter: I am quoting what he said. I intend to, if the hon. member will just listen for a moment. The hon. Prime Minister went on, Mr. Speaker, to comment upon the regional approach to municipal government, expressing the view that regional government is simply the joining together of autonomous municipalities and the establishment of a level of government which is given responsibility for the provision of certain specific services for all the member-municipalities.

The Prime Minister went on to say, and I again quote:

> If we continue to approach regional government from this point of view, it is my firm belief that we can achieve more than if the province arbitrarily imposed any level of government on our existing local government structure. For example, it is probable that in many areas of the province the county as it now exists could operate effectively as a regional government. In some cases an effective regional government may be composed of two or more such areas.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty well in line with the recommendations of the select committee on The Municipal Act in which they were discussing regional government.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to have read the hon. Prime Minister's remarks of last August 25. To me the entire speech indicated a sensible approach to our municipal needs. There would be problems; the hon.

Prime Minister recognized these and went on to set forth some of them, and regional government would not necessarily solve all of these problems but a sensible approach would go far towards solutions. I might say that my pleasure at the views of the Prime Minister was increased upon reading a government release dated March 8, 1966, which was obviously a repetition of the remarks of last August 25. This was a condensed report and this particular item goes on in part as follows:

> In this day and age where communities must work together, there are several alternatives available to solve the problem.
>
> (1) The province has the power to take over services which have up to now been considered local. This approach however strikes at the core of local autonomy.
>
> (2) The province can maintain the present division of responsibility and make more grants and other help available to local government. Or the alternative is to create regional government—

and this release goes on to say, I am still quoting from the article:

> The government feels more can be done through the last approach—

That is create regional governments. That, sir, was on March 8 this year. To those of us who have given serious study to our municipal system, the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister are indeed quite encouraging. As a strong advocate of regional government, I have confidence that before too long we will see an initial programme instituted in one of the ten study areas of the province.

In Waterloo county we do have the first area planning board of the province. This new venture came about by the keen awareness of the people of Waterloo county that our municipal system and our planning programme needed modernizing if the people of Waterloo county were to continue to receive the good government that has been provided for many years. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs authorized a study of the circumstances in the Waterloo county area and eventually a very comprehensive report was submitted. I understand this report has gained wide acceptance and is being referred to and used in many points right across the Dominion of Canada. This report led to the formation of the Waterloo area planning board, and the new board has just recently embarked on its initial programme of organization and preliminary study.

But the board's terms of reference are not limited to land use study. Rather, it is expected that they will also make recommendations pertaining to governmental revision and other matters and I am sure this is exactly what the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs had in mind when he authorized the formation of the new body. So, Mr. Speaker, we in Waterloo county are very keenly conscious and aware of the whole concept of regionalism. We have regional planning. The entire region is developing rapidly and we expect the next move to be regional government.

In view of this general awareness of the problem and widespread thinking towards regionalism, extending even to a governmental unit, it has come as somewhat of a shock to read and hear certain comments that have been made in recent weeks.

Let me quote some of the new headlines of recent dates. From the London *Free Press* of March 29: "Regional government policy unlikely, Robarts declares."

The report of March 26: "No need for regional governments, Robarts."

The Kitchener *Record* of April 5: "Is Queen's Park split on area rule?"

From the editorial in the Kitchener *Record* of April 9:

> Anyone looking to the Ontario government for a strong lead in shaping the municipal organization of the future, and operational revamping with innovations which quite plainly need to start now, is doomed to disappointment.

To one who has been advocating regional government as an individual, one who is the co-author of a select committee report recommending regional government and who during the past few months has made a dozen or more speeches on regional government, I must say the recent headlines have been distressing, to say the least. In conversation with numerous persons the general impression seems to be that the government's attitude has recently changed pertaining to regional government units.

In the face of the hon. Prime Minister's remarks last August and the repetition of his views as recently as March 8 of this year the entire issue has seemed to be somewhat confusing. However, sir, I have nothing but great admiration and respect for the Prime Minister and I have refused to accept or believe that such a reverse position would be taken either by the Prime Minister or this government. Consequently, I have spent several days and many hours diligently reviewing many reports and speeches made by various persons during the past year or so, in an effort to analyze the situation.

First of all, sir, it is important that we have a clear distinction between regional planning, regional government and regional development. Planning and development can take place up to a point on a regional basis without regional government. In fact, this is exactly what has been taking place for many years. We have had joint planning boards, covering two or more jurisdictions, and their plans have been implemented by the two or more jurisdictions to which they may make their recommendations. We have not, however, had area planning boards, until the formation of the Waterloo area board and sooner or later, when they have done some planning, it will be necessary to have an area governmental unit to whom they may make their recommendations.

Until then, and only then, can their plans be implemented. Development within a region has, on the other hand, taken place regardless of a governmental unit. There are zoning laws of course, but generally speaking the development of any municipality or group of municipalities is a natural growth process. In fact, the lack of planned development of a community is one of the reasons why we must have a regional governmental unit in some sections of the province.

Towns and cities are clustered together in groups and their social and economic needs overlap. Even as we have had helter-skelter planning, and hit-and-miss development, we have had and still do have a hodge-podge of municipal jurisdiction. We need orderly planning, orderly development, and orderly municipal government.

Having thus distinguished between planning, development, and government on a regional basis, let us consider the occasions on which the statements were made that had led to the thought that the government had changed its views regarding regional government.

The speech which led to the news reports was given to the urban development institute. One statement referred to the word "region" as an undefined term and continued to state that there was so far no compelling reason put forward to define a political region and to impose a so-called regional government over the existing municipal and county government. I think the key word here, Mr. Speaker, is county, because to create an additional level of government on top of the municipality and the county would indeed be something that I would oppose, and which has so far not been recommended by any responsible group or individuals to the best of my knowledge.

The second statement which led to the headline in the Galt *Evening Reporter* was simply quoted out of context. The headline read: "Regional government not necessary." Certainly this statement was made, but was only part of a sentence forming part of a paragraph, dealing with regional planning for land use and economic development. The whole sentence read:

> It is not, however, necessary that regional governments be established to carry out these functions.

It is amazing how a news reporter can omit a few words or a sentence, and convey an entirely wrong impression to the public.

Again it was reported that the hon. Prime Minister said that regional governments would stand between local government and the provincial government. Most certainly it would, if an additional level was created between the county and the province. But no one has intimated that this will be done. The hon. Prime Minister very probably stated that the government was reluctant to create a new body called a regional government, and in this respect, as an additional level of government, I share his reluctance to a great degree.

Mr. Bryden: No one ever proposed that.

Mr. Reuter: The select committee on The Municipal Act clearly recommended, very clearly recommended, that regional governments were desirable in only some areas of the province, and that the existing counties could serve as a practical starting point for the purpose of defining regions. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has mentioned ten areas in which a revised system of municipal government may be found desirable. Studies are underway in several of these areas. Item number eight, on page seven of the hon. Prime Minister's statement of April 5, entitled "Design for Development" clearly indicates that the studies now underway could lead to adjustment in local area governments.

Mr. Singer: He said this afternon he did not think so.

Mr. Reuter: He says so right in his speech, if you will read it.

Mr. Bryden: I wonder if I might ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker? Is the interpretation of the hon. Prime Minister's words which the hon. member is now giving an official, sanctioned, authorized interpretation? And how is it that he has to interpret the words of the hon. Prime Minister, when

the Prime Minister is sitting right here in the House?

Mr. Reuter: I am giving my own comments in connection with this bill and I am expressing my own opinions. If any hon. member cares to take my interpretation as the correct interpretation, that is his privilege. If he does not, that is up to his own thinking on the matter.

To sum up, sir, I can see no change in the views of this government pertaining to regional thinking.

Mr. Singer: That is the problem.

Mr. Reuter: When any specific study recommends a new plan that meets with the general approval of the people of that area, I am sure legislation can and will be provided to meet the needs and wishes of those people. In the meantime, I would not want to see any cut-and-dried plan imposed on any area. We have the most extensive example of regional government possible in the form of Metropolitan Toronto, a system that has been tried and proved and which has been studied and revised. We have several studies underway in areas of high population density where municipal problems are increasing. These studies are being subsidized by the province and will no doubt lead to desirable revisions in our present regional unit, the county.

We have area planning boards in operation and in the formative stage. Sections 258 and 377 have not been removed from The Municipal Act and they may be freely utilized by those who wish to regionalize only certain phases of local activities. As an advocate of regional government, I believe this government is taking an acceptable course to achieve a regional concept of municipal government in small metropolitan areas where it might be needed. I further believe that no purpose would be served in devising a standard or model plan, because any such plan would undoubtedly be amended to suit the circumstances and needs of any particular area. To devise any such plan, and to attempt to impose it, on the people of any area, would be, in the words of the hon. Prime Minister, to strike at the core of local autonomy.

Mr. Macdonald: What did this government do in 1951 with Metro? They imposed it.

Mr. Reuter: Circumstances vary from one locality to another, in the social sense. Circumstances certainly do vary in economic character and in geographical nature, so that the establishment of a set of standard rules or a set pattern would be impracticable. Much better, I maintain, to undertake a study of needs, fashion a programme to suit those needs and then prepare legislation in full co-operation with the people of the area concerned.

So much, sir, for regional government. I would like to move now to the actual statement of the hon. Prime Minister, of April 5, entitled "Design for Development."

This new proposal is something that is so broad in its scope that one cannot help but realize the tremendous degree of co-ordinated thought and effort that has gone into its preparations. The main theme, of course, is an expanded view of planning, which has been too often, until now, limited in the minds of many to land use planning. When the term planning or planning board has been used, the only thought associated with it has been to land zone and restrictive land use regulations. Design for development would seem to embody all of the definitive functions of planning bodies as well as all possible programmes of development.

It seems to me that a certain degree of this new thinking on the part of the government is evident in the terms of reference laid out for the Waterloo area planning board which, among other things, has been authorized to study and recommend upon all matters affecting the social and economic needs of the people of Waterloo county.

This, of course, includes the co-ordinating of the planning patterns of all local planning boards in the Waterloo area with a view to a broad and orderly plan for the entire county area. The terms of reference have been interpreted to include the authority to make recommendations pertaining to municipal government, and I might say that the whole idea seems to have gained generally favourable acceptance in the Waterloo area.

To quote the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs as it appeared on page 1604 of *Hansard* for March 24, 1965:

> This would be a planning organization that would permit the planning board for this area to make significant recommendations bearing upon area government and administration.

The design for development appears to me to be a large-scale model on a province-wide basis of the plan for the Waterloo

area. There are many more aspects of provincial-municipal concern included in the provincial plan and this is essentially due to the diversity of circumstances across the province.

As in the case of the smaller counterpart, the provincial plan includes the express intention of encouraging local initiative and participation, which is certainly desirable.

The success of this philosophy is evident, I believe, in the operation of our conservation authorities' programmes and it is to be hoped that enthusiastic local participation will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot, however, become overly or too quickly enthused about the new provincial plan. I believe it is fair to say that the nine regional development associations that have been formed since 1954 have achieved only partial success as far as public support is concerned. In fact, that support has been entirely absent so far as some municipalities are concerned.

Some towns and cities have thought that perhaps they could develop their communities much better on their own, as the annual contribution to the regional development association was better spent toward the promotion of their own municipality.

In the case of large centres, such as Kitchener-Waterloo, I have been inclined to agree that the regional development association could provide little in the way of assisting development in that particular twin city. The terms of reference had been limited, however, and the representatives of regional development associations had never failed to provide a very satisfactory answer to the question: What can the association do for our town?

There is no doubt, nevertheless, that the associations have in the words of the hon. Prime Minister "performed creditably" in establishing regional identity through promotion, information and education.

As mentioned earlier today, the design for development is not, apparently, intended to replace any other promotional activity pertaining to regional government. It was stated that a new development policy could lay the groundwork for changes that might eventually be appropriated in this respect, and I would concur in this.

If one views the whole new idea with a very broad outlook, it is evident that the scope of activity could not help but include an encounter, sooner or later, with the need for local government revision. The ten economic regions of the province as now defined are perhaps due for some revision too. The midwestern Ontario region, for example, includes the highly industrialized and rapidly expanding counties of Waterloo and Wellington. These two counties make up over 70 per cent of the total regional population, and it is difficult to tie them in with the counties of Huron and Perth, for the city of Stratford is the only urban centre with a population in excess of 20,000, and with only one other town exceeding 5,000 population.

In any event, sir, I think that such problems as I have mentioned will be dealt with adequately as they are met. The new concept is certainly visionary, to say the least, and I can only say that I commend the authors of the report for the excellent preparation of the comprehensive plan. I will certainly lend my full support to this bill, on second reading.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Young: The hon. member for Waterloo South has just been demonstrating the fine art of coming down on both sides of the fence at the one time—and sitting on top of the fence as well. It reminds me very much of a story which may have involved some of his ancestors, I do not know.

A Home Rule organizer in Ireland was getting around and seeing some of the people and he called on one of the men—his name may have been Reuter, although I do not think that a name like that would have been found in Ireland at that time—but the organizer talked to this gentleman about the need for Home Rule in Ireland, and the man agreed with him, "This is wonderful we are going to have it"—and all the rest of it.

Finally the organizer said to him, "Yes, I am glad you agree with me. Now, I believe, if you do your part and all of us do our part, we can have Home Rule within two years." The Irishman's face fell, "Two years!" he said, "Why it would be the very ruination of the country." The organizer looked at him and said, "I thought you were for Home Rule!" "Sure, I am for Home Rule; I am as good an Irishman as anybody." "Well," said the other, "what do you mean it would be the ruination of the country?" "Well," the Irishman said, "just this: if I told you you were going to heaven, you would be very happy, but if I told you you were going to heaven tonight, you would be in the very divil of a fright!"

You see, this is the situation that this government is finding itself in. It wants to go to heaven, some time. It wants to have regional government—some time, but not now.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the hon.

member for Downsview in one of his statements, when he said that the hon. Prime Minister and the front benches of this government —and I regret to see that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is not here today to participate in this very important debate— but he said that these people did not understand regional government, that we were not getting "through" to them, that some of their own backbenchers were not getting through and that they do not understand what we are driving at in regional government. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that the member for Downsview is wrong, because I think that the Prime Minister and the Ministers on the front benches understand what we are driving at. They know what regional government means; they know something of the urgency of it.

Over these last few years nobody in government could possibly sit here and move around in the province without realizing that these small, anachronistic entities can no longer function properly and adequately; that these little municipalities cannot do the job they were designed to do a century ago; that they cannot do the planning and build up the planning staff that they ought to have; that these little municipalities cannot have an engineer to do the proper engineering service within its boundaries; they cannot do the proper assessment job and now they are going into the county to do that; that they cannot, under any circumstances today afford the kind of automated machinery which is now coming into vogue in the larger municipalities for processing bills and doing all the intricate jobs that have to be done.

These little municipalities have had their day, and they ought to go out of existence; they ought to merge with a larger regional government. I am dead certain that the hon. Prime Minister knows this, and if he does not know it, he is facing the problem right in his own backyard. The pipeline is coming in from Lake Huron, and a second pipeline is coming up Lake Erie to service the new Ford industry at Talbotville and the city of St. Thomas—although I understand that there is some little disagreement here as to the primary purpose of this pipeline and the ultimate advantage to the people of St. Thomas.

When we look at the township of Southwold in which the new Ford plant will be located, we see the problem and the hon. Prime Minister must see that problem, and all members of this House can see the problem clearly and adequately. That municipality will be overwhelmed by the Ford plant, when it comes. More than that, the new pipelines will bring to that whole region new industry. When water comes into a municipality or into an area, it determines the development that is going to take place. This is primary, and so land speculators, I expect, are moving in now and plans are being made to build all over that area. As workers come to the Talbotville plant, they will have to have housing and that housing will demand commercial area and you will have new feeder industries springing up all over the place.

This kind of development must be planned; there is no other answer, Mr. Speaker. If it is going to be planned, it cannot be planned by Southwold township, or by the individual townships in that whole area. There must be a coming together, there must be a regional planning. But the regional planning will be futile unless there is a regional government to back up that planning. This is the kind of problem that the Prime Minister and the members of that area are now facing, and I think they know, and they understand, what must be done in the whole region.

Unless, when those pipelines start to deliver their water, there is a regional government to back up regional planning then that planning will go for naught. This is the very problem that we have been facing in Metropolitan Toronto, I am not going to go over that again, but so far in Metropolitan Toronto we have failed to adopt an official plan for the whole area. Why? Because the individual regions, the individual municipalities, were not satisfied with the document. They wanted more assessment than the plan would give them, and unless they got that assessment, they vetoed the plan. So that struggle has been going on here.

The hon. member for Waterloo South can talk all he likes about a regional planning board, but he will find just as Metropolitan Toronto has found, that unless that board is backed up by regional government, planning will not be efficient. It cannot be, because Galt, and Preston and North Dumfries, and the other areas, Hespeler, Kitchener, Waterloo, keep struggling for assessment, will insist on high value land, and the kind of planning that gives them that high value and high assessment land, and unless they get it they are not going to cooperate with the plan that may emerge. And so, what in effect is happening in Waterloo county, regarding that regional planning board, is that each one of the small municipalities is, in effect, being given the power

of veto over the plan. Any one of those municipalities can frustrate the plan for the whole area.

As far as imposition of plans are concerned, this seems to be a fear.

The hon. member for Waterloo South talked about the undesirability of imposing plans upon areas. Perhaps it is not desirable, but this government is facing that issue right now because the Metropolitan Toronto area could not come together and could not agree upon a plan, and this Legislature is, in effect, imposing the plan upon the region. For efficient government, right across the board, the fact is that there must be leadership, and strong leadership, by this House and by this government if we are to solve the whole problem of municipal government, in the days ahead.

What the member was advocating is that we limp along over the next period and that we limp along with the old-style municipal government until something happens and we are absolutely forced into action. Then, perhaps, this Legislature and this government will be willing to act.

But I come back to the fact that this government knows all these things. The committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts reported a year ago. Many members of this government were on that committee, and an almost unanimous report was brought in. It was unanimous as far as the necessity of regional government was concerned. Some of us disagreed on minor elements. So we felt at that time that we were moving forward, and particularly in view of the statements of the hon. Prime Minister at that time and later. All the interpretation that the hon. member for Waterloo South has put upon the Prime Minister's words will not change that fact. Everywhere there was optimism.

But then, recently something has happened. After that report, after the feeling of optimism and after the feeling we ought to move forward, the members have gone back to their own ridings, and they have talked with the municipal authorities there, with the councillors and the aldermen, and the people who are charged with municipal government. One thing they have found with the official group of this kind, is that there is opposition to change, and so there has been a growing feeling that they should not cut off the grass roots of their party structure. Fundamentally this is the problem that this government faces.

An election is due within the next year or year and a half, and so disruption in that period is not to be desired as far as the local member is concerned. His strength is right there in that municipal structure, and the Tory strength of this province is rooted and grounded there. These people do not want to see these changes. So, rather than what the hon. member for Downsview said about the Prime Minister not knowing, this is a cold, calculated political decision to change the policy and to delay any action on regional government. This is all it is. It adds up to a political decision which will get this government over the next period until the election is fought. There will be no disruption in the present setup.

Once that is over, it may be possible then to talk more sense to the other side of this House. It may be possible, because they know and they understand the need. But with the kind of mind that has been demonstrated to us here, I am afraid that even then there will be an unwillingness to move until a crisis builds up, and then crisis by crisis, in area by area, we will move toward this new municipal setup.

So, today I simply stand to say that we will support this bill because it does give some inkling of what the future might be, but I am saying that it is desperately inadequate. It is unfortunate that political considerations at this time should leave this province without the leadership that it ought to have in moving toward regional government on Ontario.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): As one of the members who lives in one of the associations now to be known as a council, I feel I would like to say something while this bill is getting second reading. I have been somewhat amazed by some of the things that have been said here this afternoon because as far as I can understand, in the explanatory notes of the bill and in the bill itself, this has really not a great deal to do with regional development government. It has to do with regional development councils, which as the explanatory notes of the bill explain, are going to try to promote early growth and economic development of the regions which are mentioned.

This doesn't mean areas such as Bruce or Grey county, much though we might desire it. If there is only going to be one form of municipal council, this simply means that the name of the development association that we have had in the past is going to be changed to "council" and that it is going to be strengthened, we hope, in order to promote the economic development or industrial

development primarily of the regions mentioned. I might say this, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion there has been no Act that is more needed in the province of Ontario than this one. The brutal fact is that while parts of Ontario, for the past number of years, have been growing, rural Ontario, which to a large extent is enclosed in the list of councils listed in this bill, is starving to death. It is either being strangled or it is strangling itself through lack of planning.

Perhaps it is a result of us who live in these areas. Perhaps, as other people say, it is the result of this government or the county councils or the federal government. But the fact is this, and this cannot be denied, that while cities like Toronto and London and Ottawa and Windsor and Kitchener-Waterloo are growing, we who are listed in the development areas are not only decreasing in a population, but as far as income is concerned we are at the bottom end of the stick. In my opinion, for us who live there as residents, it is high time we, and all other governments, did something about it.

I remember in the past, one of the slogans of the former Prime Minister of this province was "Forward, Ontario" and he was very successful with it. He won many elections and he had great support throughout the province. But may I say this, that certainly as far as area is concerned, and I am not being critical when I say this, but as far as area is concerned, Ontario has not gone forward as much as we would have hoped, particularly we who live in the areas mentioned. Large cities such as Toronto is where the wealth is, there is no queston about it whatsoever. For somebody who comes from Bruce county, when I hear about poor Toronto or poor Ottawa or poor Hamilton and when I see a $30 million city hall down here, when I see subways that cost $200 million or $300 million that are being subsidized by this province and being subsidized by industry and large financial institutions whose headquarters are in this city and being supported by all the people of this province and not just the people who live in this city, then I might say that it does not go over too well with me. We need help in rural Ontario and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that help will come through this bill. And I urge that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development —I hope that this bill is not window-dressing such as the last speaker has just said. He suggested that perhaps this was window-dressing for the next election, but I hope that this is not the case and I hope that the present Minister of Economics and Development and the hon. Prime Minister and the Cabinet realize the serious situation that we have in large parts of Ontario. We are not just asking for help, Mr. Speaker, we are crying for help.

I have in my hand here a study that I believe has not been made public yet. It is entitled, "People and land in transition" and it is a study of the Ontario economic council. Some of these figures that are in here, insofar as they affect rural Ontario, are absolutely astonishing. One of the places —there are six areas—and one of these townships that has been studied is in my own area, the township of Lindsay. There is also an area from Rainy River, one from the district of Timiskaming, and one from North Hastings. And, Mr. Speaker, when I give you some of the figures that are given here for some of the farmers in this area, why, then, you will, I know, appreciate the fact that we really need help, whether it is in this bill or some other bill, I do not know. We do not just want the bill, Mr. Speaker, we want some action following the bill. We need action.

For example—listen to this—I will take it in my own area to start with—in the township of Lindsay in Bruce county, the gross income from the soil for full-time farmers, the gross income in the year 1965, was $1,530. And if you think that that figure is reasonable, if you happen to think it, why then listen to this—in the township of Carlow in North Hastings, the gross income for full-time farmers in 1965 was $1,380. Mr. Speaker, these are the Minister's own figures. These are figures that are set up and I am sure a most competent job was done by people who made this study under The Department of Economics and Development and the report of the Ontario economic council for the year 1966.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we need help. We are slowly being strangled in rural Ontario. I remember when the Georgian Bay regional development association was formed in our area, which includes Muskoka, Grey, Bruce and large areas in-between, I remember that we had great hopes. As a matter of fact, I think the manager and the people who have been associated with that association have done a very good job. They have done their best. But their best, Mr. Speaker, is not enough. We need help from the government. Those are the people, the Cabinet, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, who can do something for us.

If you want Toronto—and I am one of the greatest proponents of this great city. I am proud of this city as a matter of fact; this is one of the greatest modern cities in the whole world. We can go to cities such as Paris or London or go over to Peking or to Moscow; they are older cities, but this is one of the greatest modern cities in the whole world, and I am proud of it. But if the government wants to make it the greatest modern city in the world, it should just carry on the way it is doing now. It will get its four million, five million, ten million people, it will have a city that stretches from Hamilton to Toronto and all down in the Niagara peninsula.

But, Mr. Speaker, the rest of Ontario will be starved to death. And it is starving right today and if you do not believe me, look at the figures of a department of your own government whereby in my own area, in the township of Lindsay, $1,530 gross income for full-time farmers in the year 1965. This has not been "Forward, Ontario," this has been "forward" for the majority of people, probably two-thirds of the people in Ontario. It has been "forward" Toronto, Hamilton, Kitchener-Waterloo and all these other places that are growing. But for the rest of us we have not even had a chance. Because when you are trying to get industry into an area, Mr. Speaker, you have to in the majority of instances have industry where you are going to make the sales, unless it is an exceptional one. Why would you have an industry in a certain area of this province when you have to import the raw materials to that place with high freight costs, manufacture it, and then ship it back to the city of Toronto in order to sell the manufactured product?

This is the situation, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is facing. If he is prepared to do something about it, if he is prepared to suggest strongly and through tax concessions, as are given in many places in the world today—this is not something that it just pulled out of the air—tax concessions are given in many places in this world. In the Caribbean Islands today, you can get full tax concessions with no corporation tax whatsoever for ten years if you wish to move into that area of the world. They are crying for industry just the same as we are in the counties of Grey and Bruce and Simcoe and in the Muskoka area. If it were not for the tourist industry in Bruce county today, the whole county would be starving to death, not just our farmers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say through you to the hon. Minister and to the hon. Prime Minister and to the government as a whole, I wish them every success as far as this bill is concerned, but I hope that they will not do as has been done so many times in the past, that this is just window-dressing. Do not just play politics with this bill. They should think of their consciences. And if their consciences will not help them, think of the people who are having a gross income in this Ontario that they govern, in the township of Carlow, in North Hastings, of $1,380 gross income per farm, in the year 1965.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, to rise in answer to the comments by the hon. members, I am reminded of a book I read some time ago, "How to Make More Money." The theme of the book was to find a need and fill it. Six very small words. And that is exactly what this Act has, six words. It is an Act respecting regional development councils and I look at that in the same light that I did when I read that book many years ago, and I spent my life, before coming into government, following that philosophy, finding a need and filling it.

I appreciate the comments of my hon. friend, of the New Democratic Party when he complimented me on my salesmanship and the things I have been able to achieve. I think that is part and parcel of any salesman, to perhaps make people feel when you walk into the room that they have to buy something.

But I also follow the golden rule that all salesmen should follow: "When you have the sale made, stop selling." Perhaps I should sit down right now, because you fellows have convinced me that we have a good Act, and we are going to do something with it.

Mr. MacDonald: Where did the Minister get that idea?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member said he was going to vote for it, so I am sure that you agree with what we are going to do. It is apparent he is going to vote for the bill, so he is going to support it.

Today I am going to make an exception to my own rule, because I think this golden rule should be broken, and I should talk on this matter for a few minutes.

The first job you have to do in selling anything is to get the prospect's attention. I am delighted that since we held our regional development conference—and many of our friends across the way attended this conference—at least, like the mule skinner who hit the mule over the head with a ten-inch plank, we at least got attention.

Mr. MacDonald: We got their attention.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I get everybody's attention, including yours.

Mr. MacDonald: More important, it got your attention.

Hon. Mr. Randall: So I think we have achieved what we set out to do when we held the conference. We at least got everybody's attention at all levels of government, and right across the grass-roots areas of this province. I am delighted that you are reading my speeches to the various development associations, because what I say I mean, and I think my record in this House has proven if I say I am going to do something, I can get around to getting it done.

I want also to say that I notice the hon. member was kidding me, facetiously, I think, on all the wonderful awards we have been winning in our department. I want to assure him you do not get these with box tops. You get them for achieving an objective, and in a few days time perhaps I will have a better opportunity, when I introduce my estimates, to tell you why we got the awards, and what it means to the province of Ontario.

I would also like to make one other comment. I believe there is room for planning, various kinds of planning as our friends in the New Democratic Party insist on periodically. They make quite a pitch on planning. But I do not think we should have planning without flexibility and I believe we have plenty of flexibility in this kind of legislation we are talking about.

Mr. MacDonald: What about having machinery to put your plan into effect?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Show me a plan with no flexibility and I will show the hon. member a stagnant society, so we have lots of flexibility and we are going to implement it.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister has flexibility all right, both sides of the fence and on top of it at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I also say this to my hon. friends: I believe that if you have the responsibility you must have the authority. When I presented my thoughts on regional development to my Cabinet colleagues, as in other things they gave me the responsibility and I do not take these responsibilities lightly. I think I have indicated since we held the conference, and the conference was not entirely complimentary to the government, the Krueger report was not entirely complimentary to the government, we brought this wrath on our own heads, and we did it deliberately.

I think my hon. friend will agree that when I say I am going to do something, I do it. I can only refer to Sheridan Park, which you will hear more about in a few days, Expo '67, which is on time, the housing corporation which many people recognize is a tremendous success, the Ontario development corporation, which will supplant the agency which is a success, and the trade and industry plans which other people are beating a path to our doors to ask for, the same kind of help that has helped our small manufacturers.

Now, I do not want to be a one-man self-admiration society here this afternoon, but I do not think we should hide our light under a bushel. Like our friends over there, they do not, and I do not intend to hide my light under a bushel, I can assure you.

I also believe that conversation only goes so far, but you cannot eat it and you cannot take it to the bank. So now we agree.

The hon. member touched on the financial needs. I want to assure him that I recognize in looking over the regional development associations, I inherited them from my predecessor, that there was a problem of finance. But there was also a problem of getting action in the field and getting people enthused, and a lot of work had to be done before we could get the kind of action we think is necessary. The funds are provided not only to manage their operations and to attract the right calibre of managers, to do the kind of promotion they want to do, but also, as my hon. friend on the Liberal benches from Downsview said, to get other municipalities interested in working together in the various parts of Ontario.

I think this is going to be possible now that we have a programme such as we have outlined earlier. I might say that we do not expect all the development associations to agree with the government, because this is nonpolitical. There are many of your people serving on these associations, many of our Liberal friends serving on the associations and they are not always going to agree with what we say. They are going to take things out of context sometimes, which they have done, and attempt to beat my brains out. But I do not mind this. This is all par for the course. I am delighted to have an opportunity to defend our actions.

May I get back to the Krueger report? The report was commissoned by Ontario economic council, an independent body operating within our department. We knew, when we invited Dr. Krueger and his associates to give

us their views, we were perhaps going to get the same kind of criticism from him as Mr. Goldenberg gave on Metro. Actually, Dr. Krueger's report was a matter for us to look at, take out of it what we could use, ignore what we could not use, and work on it from here on in to build up the kind of a programme that I think we need in the province of Ontario.

Let me tell you, my hon. friends, any time you get to a point where you are afraid to call in someone to analyze your work, then you are in real difficulty. I have always followed this concept in my business. I have had consultants come in and see me. They want to tell me what is wrong with my business. I say the day that I do not need a consultant, the day that I cannot look out my office door and find out what is wrong myself, then I need the worst consultant I can get. I know there are a lot of things we can do without calling in consultants, but the time is limited. My feeling is that in asking Dr. Krueger to report his findings to the economic council, he is not going to give us a report that is entirely complimentary. We do not expect it. But I might also suggest to you, and my hon. friend said that we did not make this public; we do not intend to make public everything the economic council does.

You managed to get a report, so it was not hidden away in the Toronto-Dominion bank vault; it was available through some associations you had. But we did not agree entirely with what Dr. Krueger said and we asked for a further report. When we got the final report, my colleagues in Cabinet got their copy. I might say they got it after my hon. friend over here, from York South, got it. So we were not playing pussy with it. We just did not think it was time for us to release the report until we had the approval of the economic council.

A moment ago the hon. member touched on the requirements and recommendations needed to staff and operate the programme. I think I can assure him that with this programme we are setting up we will have sufficient staff and the right kind of staff to implement the programme. It is obvious it cannot be done by one man, not even two men. It has got to be done by many people and many people in various departments of government. I think all of us know it is very easy to define a problem. But it is a lot harder to find the answers, as our good friend from Bruce has just outlined. He recognizes the fact that to some areas in Ontario we cannot put a factor. But I agree with him there are many other things we can do. I also suggest the report that he quoted from takes a little guts to put out, because if you go from county to county you are going to find some people on the low end of the totem pole. If all we talk about are the people on the high end, we are not achieving very much. The only thing wrong with putting out reports, in my estimation, is that you do not do anything about it. That is the reason why we have a regional development plan.

I think also that the Krueger report, while a very fine report, has dealt with the past. And the past, in my estimation, is like yesterday's newspaper; it is finished. If we can take from those experiences, fine; but the problem in which I am interested in regional development is what is happening today and what is going to happen tomorrow.

This is why I believe the Krueger report did a very fine job. It gave us the basis for discussion, it gave us the basis for working out a programme for regional development. There is no doubt it is going to be like the Goldenberg report. It is going to be discussed for many months to come.

Mr. Singer: What does this Act let the hon. Minister do that he cannot do now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just wait a minute and I will tell the hon. member.

The hon. member for York South suggested that he was concerned about the government's attitude in working the programme through the various Cabinet Ministers and getting their co-ordination and co-operation. Again I can assure him that this was cleared by the hon. Prime Minister and my Cabinet colleagues before we brought this legislation into the House. We recognized that the departments would have to co-ordinate their activities and this is going to be done, I can assure you.

We have set up and we have staffed the regional development research centre in our department through the chief economist, and the research needed for regional development is going to be available.

He touched also on boundaries and wanted to know why they were not fixed, and compared them to what Quebec was doing. There are a lot of things they are doing in Quebec today that we have done many years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: And they are miles ahead.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, they are not miles ahead. Read Mr. Filion and read some of the other people, such as Mr. Marler. Read what some of these people are saying today.

You recognize they have moved quickly, and they have made some mistakes as we have and they are changing their plans every day in the week. I just suggest to you that Quebec has been to our office on many occasions to find out what we are doing and how we can help them. We are watching what they are doing and if we can take something from their book and adapt it to Ontario here, we are going to do it.

We certainly did that when we brought these people here from all over the world to our conference a year ago February. We did not bring them here just to give them a free boatride; we wanted their experience. The hon. member enjoyed learning of their experience and from that he got lots of speech material. He has been using it all over the country. It saved him sitting up nights burning the midnight oil writing his own speeches.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister discovered regional development at that point.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no, we discovered it a year before that, but we set up the foundation for a good regional development conference and did not run off half-cocked.

We can talk about boundaries. If the hon. member goes down to eastern Ontario, he will find most of the industrial centres down near the St. Lawrence river. It may be possible in these days that those counties will have to be cut in half from north to south and there will be a rural problem halfway through the county to the north, and an industrial problem to the south.

There is no doubt that we are going to have to look at boundaries. We are going to have to try to see if we could put our present ten regional boundaries in line with what the hon. Minister of Highways has or the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. It may be possible, but certainly we are not going to have boundaries meeting boundaries just for the sake of saying that everything is consistent. I think we have to be flexible and as time moves on we will find out what we can do about the boundary situation that is the most economic and that we can operate without difficulty.

I suggested earlier that there is going to be quite a bit of research required on regional development and we have set up a research team in our own department. We will be working with others under the chief economist to find out what we need to do, and if we need, as the hon. Prime Minister pointed out in his statement, to use some of the universities in the various areas of Ontario, we will certainly use those universities to do the job that has to be done. In fact, I can give the hon. members an example right now. We just employed the researchers at Queen's University to look at the limestone pits at Kingston. That was a co-ordinated job between the hon. Minister of Mines and our department, which put up the funds to get it done.

Mr. MacDonald: Students have been looking at it for generations.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, they have not come up with any answers yet. We are either going to find an answer or say it is a dead duck and forget about it. At least we are moving on it.

I do not share the hon. member's comments that there is a pessimistic feeling across the country about the regional development associations. Certainly you are going to get an expression of opinion, and I hope we always get an expression of opinion, but I think you will find there is more enthusiasm today in the regional development associations—now to be called councils—than we have ever had before.

When I went up to Ottawa the other day to talk to the EODA — one of the most vociferous groups has certainly been the eastern Ontario development association — they were most enthusiastic. They have a good reason to be because there are many things that can be done and can be achieved by them co-operating with us and us co-operating with them in the research that I think will have to be done in eastern Ontario.

There is no easy solution to regional development, and we found that out when we brought people here from many countries around the world. To anybody who thinks he has a patent on ideas on regional development, I simply suggest he should go back and check on the people who have been in it since World War II. They have not been able to come up with all the answers in regional development.

I agree with the hon. member for Bruce when he said there are many areas where we will have to employ all our forces in order to get action. If we go through regional development, through the associations working at the grass roots level, and we give them the tools to work with, I have no doubt in my mind, we can do the job.

It is not going to be done overnight. I have not given hon. members any magic wand formula here this afternoon. I do not have one. I think there is going to be a great number of problems in regional development. Perhaps a year from now the Opposition will be criticizing us because we have not done the job we should have in a year's time, but regional development is a long-term programme.

It is not one that I would advise anybody to rush into, particularly my government, my department, or anyone else's, because I believe in the past, as the hon. member has said, there may have been too many committees and too many groups set up. We get a lot of reports and you cannot do anything with reports unless you put people to work on them. When you take their recommendations, you must have the money and the research behind it, then you can encourage industry or rural growth or all the things we need to activate regional development.

I have no hesitation in saying that we are going to have a good, sound regional development programme. It is my intention where I participate to make sure that our department at least—and I am sure I can speak for my colleagues involved—is going to give this programme everything that is needed to make it work. I am sure when I take many of the things before the Cabinet committee we can get action, we can get the things that the regional development associations have asked for. We have taken all their recommendations—I think they had nine or 12, if I recall correctly—and every one is incorporated in the statement the hon. Prime Minister read the other day.

I am sure this bill will start the action that is required to give the province of Ontario a regional development programme in the areas where it is badly needed, and on a priority basis. I do not think we can run around putting out bush fires and control anything unless we do it on a priority basis, and we recognize where the need is the greatest, where the potential for growth is the greatest in the various areas of Ontario. If I have anything to do with it, I intend to plan it just as carefully as I have endeavoured to plan the other responsibilities which the government gave me since I took on this portfolio.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? What does this Act give him power to do, other than to make money grants, that he has not already had power to do? Why does he need the Act? He said he was going to answer.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to answer that. Everybody has an association; associations are a dime a dozen. When conferring with the development associations, we felt that the prestige they required—and I think they should have it—was to name them "Regional development councils." They are going to be the people at the grass-roots level advising the government. They are quite in agreement with this, and this is the reason for the change in name, to regional development councils.

If we had not changed the name they would still have received the money and all the government co-operation they were going to get. Changing the name did not mean they had to change it in order to get the grants. They would have got the grants if they had wanted to keep their own name, but they agreed with us that they wanted to change their name and be known as regional development councils.

Mr. Singer: Why not call it The Change of Name Act then? That is all he is achieving.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there was a point raised here during this debate concerning the policy of this government in regard to regional government and I think perhaps this is as good an opportunity as any for me to clear the air in this regard.

I was rather interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Waterloo South, because perhaps I was not quite aware before he spoke as I am now that there is some misunderstanding on this point.

Mr. MacDonald: You ought to listen to the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course, you know, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to really inwardly digest and assess everything the Opposition says and perhaps give it the weight it merits. If there were a little less volume, you could perhaps give some parts of it a little more attention. But in any event, the misunderstanding seems to stem from a speech that I made to the tenth annual meeting of the urban development institute at the Inn on the Park, Toronto, Friday, March 25. I have gone over this address and also I have gone over the address I made in London in August and there seems to be an idea that there is some variation between the position of the government as expressed in these two speeches. I personally do not think there is.

On re-reading—and I am going to take the time to do it, because I think really it is quite important from what I have heard

here today that I make the position of the government very clear in this regard—I propose to read into the record the parts of that address I gave at the Inn on the Park on March 25, I believe it was, of this year, in order that there can be no error, because apparently parts of what I said have been repeated and other parts have not. Yes, it was Friday, March 25. And I said:

> I have deliberately refrained from discussing local and regional government organizational studies to this point.

I was speaking prior to this point about what is really the function of this body and certain aspects of the construction work, and so on, that it does.

> I have left this aspect of our provincial research programme until the last since it is quite clear that this is an area of critical concern to the membership of the urban development institute. It is within the municipalities that your activities take place and it is primarily the policies of the municipalities which determine how you shall operate and in some cases whether you operate at all.
>
> It is in your interest, and indeed in the interest of all of us, that these municipalities be strong in their ability to evaluate their resources and their limitations, to plan for the future and to develop public interest and involvement. Financial strength is important. By this I mean the ability of each municipality to carry out its obligations effectively, to provide the required public services without drawing too much on the future and most important, without jeopardizing the economic health of its individual and corporate citizens.
>
> We all need strong municipalities and our efforts are being concentrated to this end.
>
> We are sometimes accused of moving too slowly toward a solution of the current problems of local government. However, responsible local government in this province with deep and historic roots extending back in time to The Baldwin Act of 1849, is older than Confederation itself. We must therefore progress cautiously and on the basis of sound advice in formulating any proposal directed towards changes in the structure of local government. I firmly believe an effective and efficient system of local government is essential if the needs of local citizens in the communities are to be met efficiently at reasonable cost and in accordance with the wishes of the local citizens.
>
> Government activities today are so complex that most provincial and federal programmes could not be carried out without the assistance and full co-operation of strong and efficient local authority. On the other hand, many of the problems which arise during the carrying out of slum clearance, urban renewal, water and sewage development, and area development programmes are for a large part the product of the complexity and fragmentation of local governments.
>
> The fourth and final report of the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts which was presented in March of 1965, made several recommendations regarding local and regional governments. The committee suggested that larger units of local government would facilitate the provision of services on an equitable basis, would facilitate agreement on common policy and the co-ordination of activities would provide a unit which is stronger financially, make it more feasible to employ highly qualified staff and permit an enlargement of the tax base with a consequent reduction in the inequalities of the distribution of the tax load.
>
> There is a consensus both within government and outside it that some form of regional government is desirable and would greatly assist in the solution of many problems facing municipal councils today. The county has been suggested as the basic political unit. Recognizing fully, however, that this unit will not be adequate in all circumstances, The Department of Municipal Affairs has several studies in progress in this area.

And then I go on and the hon. member for Waterloo South put on the record the next paragraphs:

> Administratively, regional government can be simply the joining together of two or more municipalities for specific purposes and construction and maintenance of essential public utilities. Amalgamation of school boards recently enacted is a strong move towards regionalism. Even now, in some parts of this province, there are counties that are reasonably close to a form of regional government operating as a federation of towns, villages and townships in co-operation with the city centres. In other cases, effective regional government may comprise two or more counties. The essential consideration is the provision of maximum flexibility in any proposal for regional organization in order that the

wide diversity of local needs throughout the province may be adequately met.

Municipal government representatives must exercise wise leadership so that whatever form of regional government is proposed, it will be based on the community's needs, while the responsibility of the government of Ontario is to exert every possible effort to develop and maintain a most effective liaison with and between local governments.

In 1964, the government of Ontario through The Department of Municipal Affairs and at the request of a number of municipal groups throughout the province initiated a programme of local government reviews for the express purpose of analyzing municipal problems in those areas. Four studies were undertaken and a report and recommendation growing out of the first study, that of Ottawa-Eastview and Carleton county areas, has been submitted to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. J. W. Spooner.

Let me quote to you the terms of refernece for this study. Similar terms will apply to all local government reviews.

Terms of reference:

To inquire into and report upon

(a) the structure, organization and methods of operation of all the municipalities and their local boards in the county of Carleton, including the cities of Ottawa and Eastview and the corporation of the county of Carleton.

(b) All aspects of the functions and responsibilities of the existing local government institutions within said area and in particular, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, intermunicipal relations and problems which concern or may concern any two or more of municipal corporations or local boards having jurisdiction within the said area.

(c) The anticipated future development of the area or other changes therein which may require reorganization or revision of the existing system of local government in the area.

(d) The effect of present and anticipated future projects and operations of the national government—

this is a local point:

—upon the responsibilities and resources of local government therein.

(e) Any other related matters affecting the local government structure within that area. The other three studies, one in the Niagara peninsula, one in the counties of Halton-Peel and the third at the Lakehead, are in progress.

Briefs are being received containing the views of councils, commissions, municipal organizations civic groups and individuals in those areas. There is reason to believe that at least as many more requests for such studies will be presented this year. The cost for each study of approximately $80,000 is shared, the province pays half and the participating municipalities share the other half.

While the initial studies were undertaken in areas proposed by the local people themselves, the rate at which concern over regional government is growing indicates that we can expect the local government research programme to become province-wide within a very few years.

Even though the absolute necessity for regional planning has been recognized, the government of Ontario has no desire to establish an additional level of government between existing structures and the province. While we do have, and accept responsibility for, decisions in this area, we must have the full co-operation of local municipalities in determining the most effective course of action to be taken based on the proposals arising from these local government reviews. To achieve the most suitable form of local government in Ontario, to meet adequately the problems which are at least in part responsible for bringing us together on this occasion, we must depend upon people who can bring a broad and informed point of view to the questions which beset all municipalities, large and small, rural or urban.

All organizations, government and private, must be aware of the need to study and understand the problems of our increasing urbanization. Otherwise the remedy may fail because the cause has not been understood.

I do not think that I need to go on any further, but I would just suggest to you that you cannot possibly read, or interpret into those remarks any interpretation that (a) we are not aware of the need for regional government or (b) we are disregarding the findings of the so-called Beckett committee, the committee which was put together. As a matter of fact, those findings are receiving very close study in connection with these studies that are being carried out in these areas of the province and which will, in due course, be extended to the whole province.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that some place in the remarks I made on that occasion—I can only think that a conclusion has been drawn from what I said. This address was distributed to the press; what I have read to you here, was in the hands of the press in the normal course of events when I delivered it at that meeting, and I cannot honestly believe that anyone can interpret from those remarks the conclusion that this government was not interested in regional government. Nor did I change the position that I set out in the speech that I made to the municipal association in London on August 25, 1965. I have gone back over that, and I find really, when I examine it, that all I do in that speech is suggest many of the things that are here that are going to need to be done, but that a high degree of co-operation will be necessary. Now there is one other point that I would like to make—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister, are there two texts of that speech, because I have one and half of what he was saying there is not in the text that I have. Maybe this is the source of the problem.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It may very well be, but—

Mr. MacDonald: This is a nine-page text, remarks by the Hon. John Robarts, Prime Minister of Ontario, at the tenth annual meeting of the urban development institute on March 25.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This one has eleven pages.

Mr. Bryden: What the hon. Prime Minister was reading from and what the press gallery got were different.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, perhaps it has been one of those things we call a typographical error. It may be that in the distribution there were one or two pages that were left out, unfortunately—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Prime Minister gave both sides of the story, and one was cut out!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, of course, this simply means that as soon as I am free I will check back because undoubtedly there are further copies of what was distributed to the press on that occasion in my files some place. This copy that I am using is the third copy of the original type. But in any event, this is the position that I took and I suppose really I should be grateful to the Opposition for raising this point today because it was not until today that I realized that whatever I said there had been interpreted as reversing the position of the government as of last August, and of course that is completely and absolutely false.

The other point I would like to make is in reference to this whole matter on page 7 of the Design for Development statement that I gave to the House. Paragraph 8 reads, and I think we should emphasize this, as follows:

> Finally, it must be emphasized that this statement is concerned with regional development and not regional government.

Now, I suppose somebody could take from that that we have thrown regional government out of the window, but that would be very ridiculous, because I went on to say:

> Any regional development structures created by this government would be such that they will not disturb the existing power and authority of the municipal and county councils within the region.
>
> Great caution has been emphasized to avoid the imposition of new forms of government. Moreover, studies are now being conducted in certain areas of the province which could lead to recommendations for adjustment in local area government. Implementation of our regional development policy will in no way interfere with such considerations of area government, but rather could well lay the groundwork for changes which might eventually be appropriate.

I just simply say in that paragraph in this statement, that we are attempting to keep the two things separated for the purpose of this statement, but that the two, of course, are inextricably bound up. Mr. Speaker, I hope that that sets the record clear.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Before the private members' hour, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he plans to continue with second readings after supper?

Mr. Singer: Through the whole of the evening?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Unless we run out of second readings to consider, in which case we will go back to the estimates.

Mr. Singer: With Energy and Resources Management?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Clerk of the House: The 36th order.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) moves second reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is directed toward a very narrow area of law relating to injunctions, as orders of the court issued in labour disputes. A brief word of explanation is necessary because the law relating to injunctions in labour disputes is embodied in The Judicature Act of this province, and The Judicature Act of the province is the statute under which the courts of the province are constituted and under which the rules and practices of those courts are established.

In section 17 of that Act there is a special provision relating to interim injunctions or injunctions which may be granted only for a period of four days in labour disputes. It is to that particular section of the bill that the amendment which I propose in Bill 25 has application. In section 17 of The Judicature Act, an interim injunction, or a four-day injunction, may be granted if a breach of the peace has occurred, if injury to a person has occurred, or if there has been damage to property.

Hon. members will note that the only instances in which such an injunction can be granted in a labour dispute are related to those situations where a breach of the peace has in fact occurred, where injury to a person has occurred, or where damage to property has occurred. There is no provision in that section of the Act for any injunction to be granted in situations where it is only apprehended that a breach of the peace, injury to person or damage to property will occur in the future.

There is one reference in that section dealing with the interruption of an essential public service, which relates not only to the past but also to the future in the phraseology, "likely to occur." But that is not a particular point that I wish to make today.

The bill does two things. One is that it provides that an interim injunction, that is a four-day injunction, cannot be granted on the application only of one party to the dispute before the court. At the present time, by special provision in section 17 of The Judicature Act, it is possible for one party with notice to the other party to go to the court and on affidavit evidence alleging that there has been a breach of the peace—that there has been injury to a person or that there has been damage to property—obtain an interim injunction for a four-day period.

One of the criticisms and one of the principal criticisms of this section of The Judicature Act is that such an injunction can be granted on the application only of one party and without notice to the other party. This means that where affidavit evidence only of one party is presented to the court, the court has little alternative but to accept the allegation in the affidavit evidence and therefore must, under most circumstances, be prepared to grant the ex-parte injunction or the interim injunction limited to a four-day period.

The second section of Bill 25 provides that there will not any longer be a provision permitting one party only to apply and to obtain a four-day or interim injunction. It will provide, if this bill is accepted and passed by this Legislature, that there must be six hours' notice to the other party to give the other party an opportunity to appear on the application before any injunction is granted by the court.

The second part of the bill deals with the considerations which the court must take into consideration if it is going to grant an interim injunction and five matters have been listed in the bill as proper ones for a court to consider before it grants an interim injunction. I need not, Mr. Speaker, read those considerations which, to our mind, should be in the mind of the court before it grants an interim injunction. It is sufficient to say that one of them is a provision that the court must be satisfied that the police officers charged with the duty of protecting the applicant's property are unable to, or have failed to, furnish adequate protection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this bill is accepted by this assembly and passed, it will mean that a court will take into consideration these matters that are listed in the first section of the bill; it will mean that the evidence that is placed before the court by way of affidavit will be supported by oral evidence and where necessary, the other party to the application in the court will be able to cross-examine on that evidence.

With that brief explanatory introduction to the purposes of the bill, I would like to place the bill and the reasons for the introduction of it into the context which we consider is the proper context in which this

difficult and emotionally charged subject should be dealt with by this assembly.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very important to assert and to establish in no uncertain terms three propositions about trade unions, which are sometimes, I believe, lost sight of in our society. The first of these propositions is that a trade union is a lawful association of people; there is nothing illegal about it, nothing unlawful about its activities and nothing which prevents people from joining together in the pursuit of their common objectives so far as their working conditions and wages are concerned, and it is quite a proper function in our society that there should be trade unions.

The second proposition that I would like to categorically assert is that strikes are at common law, as we know it, in this country, lawful activities of persons who are employed in any industry.

Third, I would like to assert, again categorically, that picketing in the course of a labour dispute and as part of a strike activity is also, under the common law of this country, a lawful activity. I think sometimes in the course of the disputes which occur in our society, these three particular items are lost sight of and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assert the authorities under which I am satisfied that the common law of England and the common law of the province of Ontario establishes exactly these three propositions.

I do so, Mr. Speaker, because you will recall that the hon. Attorney General on February 8, in this House, proceeded to intone a pronouncement about "respect for the law," and you will recall that in the course of that pronouncement, at the time of the strike and labour dispute in Oshawa, he went to great length to personify the law as something which required immediate obedience from everyone in this province. He proceeded to indicate to this assembly that, in some way, a judgment of the court had been rendered in the case of the Oshawa dispute. It was because he indicated that the law, as such, the rule of law, was something to which we must all give unquestioned obedience, that he in fact distorted the place of the trade unions, the place of the strikes and the place of the picket in our law.

I would like to comment, Mr. Speaker, that at that particular point in the labour dispute at Oshawa, no judgment of the court had been rendered on the matter which was in dispute between the parties; no decision of the court had been rendered at that time. An injunction had been granted and in this case, not an ex-parte injunction, but the court had seen fit to grant an injunction under a different section of The Judicature Act which states that:

> An injunction may be granted by an interlocutory order of the court in all cases in which it appears to the court to be just or convenient that the order should be made.

It was this order, this interim order of the court, which caused all the difficulty which led to the problem at Oshawa.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was the company, in that case, which purported under the guise of a civil dispute between two parties in the courts of the province of Ontario to make a use of the process of the court which, in my opinion, was an abuse of that process. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was on an application by that company to the court to call out the Ontario provincial police and to direct the sheriff of the county of Oshawa to read The Riot Act, that a threat of impending violence occurred in a situation which was otherwise not fraught with the possibility of violence. Up to that point, there had been no occasion under which either the law officers or the police force in the city of Oshawa had seen any need whatsoever, to intervene at any time or in any way to charge any person with any unlawful act or illegal act in that city.

But because the company, in that case, saw fit to make use of the procedures of the court to bring into force the whole play of the public law enforcement officers when, in fact, it was only engaged in a private dispute with the trade union which was attempting to assert its lawful rights in that city, that the people of Oshawa saw fit to join together and to protest against that kind of activity and it was such a dangerous situation that the government directly intervened and forced a settlement of that strike and that application was never heard by the court.

It is because of the hon. Attorney General's remarks at that time that I think it is essential in the consideration of this bill to point out to the House that in England, and under the common law of England, it has at all times been quite lawful for people to associate themselves together and to combine for the purposes of a trade association and that under no circumstances is such an activity unlawful. I will quote only briefly from two

particular cases which in my opinion state clearly and cogently the propositions which must be borne in mind in a consideration of injunctions in labour disputes.

In a case in England in 1909 in the court of appeal, one of the most respected of the judges of that court at that time, Lord Justice Fletcher Moulton has this to say, and I need not take up the time of this assembly with the facts of the case, his statement itself is evidence of the proposition which I place before you. He states:

> The flaw in the defendant's argument is the proposition that strikes are per se illegal or unlawful by the law of England. There is no trace of any such doctrine during the centuries when the common law of England was being formed nor in fact until the end of the 18th century. This was not due to any friendliness towards freedom of action on the part of workmen. On the contrary during the 17th and 18th centuries a long succession of statutes were passed restricting with a severity which shocks our modern ideas all attempts on the part of workmen to better their conditions of labour. Yet during the whole of this period, no court treated combinations to better the conditions of labour as being contrary to common law until after the Legislature swept away all those statutes by the Act of 1825. This innovation is suspicious and ever since then the weight of authority has been against it.
>
> Strikes per se are combinations neither for accomplishing an unlawful end nor for accomplishing a lawful end by unlawful means.

In my view this is an accurate statement of the law as it is in the province of Ontario, supported also as it is by the provisions of The Rights of Labour Act. So we have a very firm foundation in the common law of the province of Ontario for trade unions to be formed and for trade unions to exercise the right to strike.

It is also equally clear, Mr. Speaker, that it is just as lawful for members of trade unions or employees to picket in our society. I refer to the declaration of the common law as it appears in The Trade Disputes Act in 1906 in England and which I believe states accurately and concisely the same position which is in the law of the province of Ontario. That Act states that:

> It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working.

It is, therefore, an accurate statement of the common law that picketing or watching and besetting, conducted peaceably—that is without violence or intimidation or other wrongful or illegal means—though for the purpose of compelling or inducing employers to employ no one but union labour, is legal at common law, and nothing in section 366 of The Criminal Code of Canada overrides the legality of picketing.

Having established to my satisfaction, and I trust to the satisfaction of the assembly, that picketing is a lawful activity, that strikes are lawful in the province of Ontario and that trade unions are lawful associations in our society, it would appear to me to be seriously open to question whether it is up to any party in a private dispute in the courts of the province of Ontario, a private civil dispute in the courts, to obtain an order from such a court which is good against not only the parties to the order but against everyone. We all know that it has become customary, when injunctions are granted by the court, to enjoin not only the persons who are parties to the dispute but also to extend the application of those injunctions to all persons who have notice of that dispute.

I would hope that when the decision is rendered in the case which is now before the court that we will have some clarification of the question as to whether or not it is within the jurisdiction of a civil court in the province of Ontario to grant an injunction not only against the parties who are parties to the civil action before that court, but also to grant an injuction which purports to affect everyone else in the province of Ontario.

This to my mind is a very important aspect of the law of injunctions as we know it in labour disputes in the province of Ontario, because it therefore means that if the civil courts in our province do have that jurisdiction and are able to grant such orders, we as citizens throughout the province of Ontario, without any opportunity to be heard in that court, without any opportunity to be represented at that hearing, are faced with an order which is effective against us if we in fact have knowledge of

it, whether we are associated in any way with the parties to the dispute which is before the court.

I think a very strong argument can be made for the proposition that injunctions have no place as an interim measure in the course of the labour dispute. What has happened is that when a labour dispute occurs in the province of Ontario, and in the course of negotiations between the party which has been certified under The Labour Relations Act as the bargaining agent for the employees, and the employer, there has been a breakdown in the bargaining process, it then usually means that if the company immediately makes an application to the court to obtain the interim or ex-parte injunction to which I have referred, to preclude picketing at that plant, the immediate effect on the public is to place the trade union in an unsatisfactory position so far as public opinion is concerned.

If there has been a breakdown in negotiations under The Labour Relations Act, and that shortly thereafter the supreme court of Ontario has seen fit to grant an injunction against the trade union limiting its picketing or prohibiting its picketing for the four-day period, it is automatically, in my opinion, assumed by the public that it is the trade union which is at fault. This, in my opinion, is one of the principal reasons why an ex-parte injunction, or indeed all injunctions, as interim measures in a lawsuit, should be abolished.

I think there are few of us who recognize that the interim injunction, whether it is for the four-day period or whether it is continued until the trial, is simply part of a court proceeding in which the company has sued the trade union or the members of the trade union for a permanent injunction. The issue in dispute at that point in time has not been before the court. The merits of it, either for it or against it, have not been decided by the court, and the court has simply stated that as an interim measure, until that matter is before the court, it will prohibit or limit picketing.

Again, the effect of this interim order of the court, in the minds of most people, is the same as if the court had in fact adjudicated after hearing both sides to the dispute and come to the decision that the trade union was at fault, or that it was engaged in an illegal or unlawful activity. In putting forward this bill for the consideration of the assembly, we have attempted to frame it in such a way as to deal only with the question of the interim, or four-day injunction.

As I say, a very strong argument, and an argument which I think would find favour with us if fully discussed and debated, would be to abolish the interim injunctions as an interim measure in all labour disputes and that it should not be within the province of a company to go to the court and get an injunction against the trade union under any circumstances, as an interim measure.

But we wish to focus attention at this time solely upon the abuse, in many cases, of the ex-parte injunction, or the four-day injunction, and it is for this reason that this bill, in its application and in its intended application, is limited entirely to that particular aspect of injunctions in labour disputes.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, we consider that this bill deserves the attention of the assembly and should be passed, because it has such a simple relevance to the situations which have occurred at Peterborough and again at Oshawa.

Now this would mean that an ex-parte injunction, or a four-day injunction, could not be granted unless both parties were present before the court and it would mean that the court would have to take into consideration whether or not the law-enforcement bodies, the police forces, were in a position to enforce, or to ensure that law and order would prevail.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree that there was no breach of the law, no threat of violence, and no injury to any person either in the strike at Oshawa or in the strike at the Tilco plant in Peterborough.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we would ask this assembly to pass this bill.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I spoke on the problem of injunctions in labour disputes. Specifically at the time I referred to the labour-management dispute at the Oshawa *Times* which emphasized the need for a review of our present labour laws dealing with injunctions generally. I think that it is possibly right and proper that I should speak briefly at this time, because, following my speech at that time, it was intimated by an hon. member of this House that at the time I was speaking simply because of the emotional situation in which I found myself.

The hon. member for Riverdale has dealt at some length with various aspects of the legal side of the injunction question. As one of those unfortunate members of this House who has not attained the status of a lawyer, I will leave the legal arguments for those more qualified, and speak for a few moments if I may, on general aspects, or what might

be considered the practical side of this injunction problem, based very definitely on my own point of view.

Injunctions in labour disputes are used mainly by small companies. It can be argued that in many cases, the small companies are using injunctions to weaken or break a strike. It can also be argued that small employers are less likely to bargain in good faith, if they know that when a strike is called, they can easily get an injunction against picketing, which is really, as has already been stated, the backbone of any strike and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it can also be argued that the entire process of collective bargaining is seriously undermined in many cases because of this type of injunction.

I recently discussed the problem of injunctions with a very responsible citizen, and one who must be considered as an authority in this field and the opinion was expressed that the issuing of interim injunctions in labour disputes is contrary to the use of interim injunctions, because the main purpose of interim injunctions is to keep the two parties in balance. This purpose is being thwarted and experience has shown that this is not the way it works out in labour disputes. These, by which companies are able to secure court injunctions limiting picketing, has been a real thorn in the side of labour ever since this law has been placed on our statute books.

Now, it may be, Mr. Speaker, that we certainly do have emotionally charged situations and it is also true that there are many and varied views as far as this entire situation is concerned.

I have stated previously, and I would reiterate that I cannot agree with those persons who would flout the order of the court. I support the thinking that the present position in regard to court injunctions in labour disputes is definitely in need of review, but when a court decision has been handed down, this decision must be upheld. The very basic foundation of our society depends on these same courts for law and order. If the law is wrong we must change the law, but once the decision has been arrived at, it must be upheld.

The phrase ex parte simply means, as I understand it, a proceeding whereby it is only necessary to hear one party and the other side is not represented or heard from. If for no other reason, the fact that in most cases labour is not represented or heard from at ex-parte hearings, I submit this type of injunction in labour disputes is wrong. I submit that no interim injunction hearing should be held in our courts until both sides of the dispute have received notice and have been given an opportunity to prepare a defence.

In support of this statement, it is interesting to note that in 1958, the select committee on labour relations recommended there should be no ex-parte injunctions granted in matters affecting The Labour Relations Act except in cases of emergency, and suggested that (a) the rules of practice in the supreme court and such other rules as might apply be amended to require notice to both parties and (b) that prior to an injunction being granted, application should be made to the labour relations board and permission of that board obtained.

I would like to suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, the entire area of interim injunctions as they apply in labour disputes, should be removed from The Judicature Act and placed under the jurisdiction of the labour relations board. In support of this thinking, I submit that it is wrong that an otherwise honest, hard-working citizen should suddenly find himself in the position of acquiring a criminal record simply because he stands up for what, as he considers it, are his justifiable rights. Possibly his only error was in walking up and down the sidewalk as a picket.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that penalties could be worked out by the labour relations board against unions, if their members insisted on disobeying regulations or orders of the board, and in the actual case of violence, we have laws under the present code to handle such matters and I would certainly agree that this type of action should be handled in the courts.

I would like to turn for a moment to another area and comment briefly on the reason behind the granting of injunctions in labour disputes and place on the record another possible solution. Usually the complaint is intimidation, violence on the picket line or the threat of violence and mass picketing. Consider for a moment the background behind these items, which I suggest is in practically every case the crossing of the picket line by so-called strikebreakers.

I suggest it is readily understandable when a worker sees another man crossing his picket line to take over his job, which may have been his livelihood for any number of years, it is understandable, I repeat, that he gets somewhat riled. This job is his life, is the life of his wife and his family. He has acquired equity in welfare schemes, pension plans, seniority rights and other benefits attached to the company. It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, The Labour Relations Act has placed many restrictions in the path

of this worker before he can legally go on strike. He must obey the various requirements of the law and then he can enter into a lawful strike. And yet when he finally becomes involved in a lawful strike, the law seemingly deserts him and provides him with no protection as far as his job security is concerned.

While I agree that interim injunctions as they apply to labour disputes are definitely in need of review and I suppose that we must walk before we can run, I submit that job security for the striking worker during a lawful strike period is actually the basic solution to this entire problem. If the possibility of strikebreakers were eliminated by the introduction of a job security section in our Labour Relations Act, then I suggest picket line violence, mass picketing and the need for injunctions in labour disputes would rapidly disappear.

In offering this suggestion I have not forgotten the right of the worker to continue working if he so desires. The right to strike does not carry with it the right to prevent others from working, if they wish to do so. This, I submit, is a union organization problem and cannot be governed either by law or by violence. Neither have I forgotten the rights of the employer, it is his business. If he wishes to continue operating with a reduced staff of regular workers, who do not wish to join the strike, this is his privilege to do so. And here again the law or violence has no right to interfere.

A labour expert in the field of labour-management recently told me that we need an even greater sense of understanding and maturity in labour-management relations, although we are making definite strides forward in this direction. Today there is no comparison between labour-management relations and those of the 1940s. In this advanced age in which we live there is no place for either labour or management to take a high-handed attitude toward the other. The employee needs and relies on management for his livelihood and that of his family. In the same vein, management relies on the workers to produce the best possible product so that in the final analysis the success and profits of management depend on the skill and hard work of the employee.

Today, as never before, there is a restlessness among the workers of Ontario that cannot be dismissed lightly. The frustration is brought about by the growing use of injunctions in labour disputes.

It may be noted, Mr. Speaker, that I have not actually made any direct comment regarding Bill 25 and the suggested amendment contained therein. I stated earlier that I am certainly not a legal expert; however, I did discuss the bill with one citizen whom I am sure most members of this House would agree is somewhat of a legal expert. And it was suggested to me that the wording of the bill, as outlined, would eliminate practically any possibility of the granting of an interim injunction by the court because it is improbable that subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) would all be complied with which they apparently must be under the present outline.

An hon. member: With whom did the hon. member discuss it?

Mr. Walker: Under the present outline of the amendment it is suggested that it would have been just as advantageous to recommend the removal of this labour injunction from The Judicature Act, as I have previously suggested.

Mr. Bryden: We will go for that.

Mr. Walker: In conclusion, I submit as I have done before that there is an immediate need for review of this entire area of labour laws. I would respectfully urge that serious consideration be given to implementing such a review.

Mr. Singer: It is very interesting that in this debate the mover of the bill, the member for Riverdale, has presented a substantial, and, I would say, a very good and learned analysis of the existing law. As the bill stands before us, in effect he is suggesting that we can make the law as it exists more workable by introducing certain amendments to The Judicature Act. I know that both he and his colleagues would go much further but it does, however, surprise me that the hon. member for Riverdale is trying to bring the law in this very important field within the four walls of The Judicature Act. In so doing, I think it must follow, that he is encouraging the continuance of the injunction procedure as it presently exists subject to the variations he suggests to be determined by our judges and by our courts. In effect, he is advocating a continuance of the present methods subject to the variations he suggests.

By contrast—this is an afternoon of some surprises—the hon. member for Oshawa is the radical one this afternoon. He suggests that we take it out of The Judicature Act and we evolve, perhaps, the new procedure.

Mr. Bryden: We agreed to this.

Mr. Singer: And they agreed too. It would seem to me that we have got to fight with basic issues here.

Mr. Bryden: We want some action.

Mr. Singer: All right, I agree with that, too. It would seem to me that we have got to come to grips with this very, very serious situation. I do not think it is enough that the hon. member for Oshawa, having walked bravely up to the door of some reform, walks away. He uses such phrases as, "If the law is wrong we must change the law; perhaps we should have some greater responsibility put on the labour relations board." He talks in an unsure way about job security and that sort of thing. But at least it is—and I give the member for Oshawa substantial credit for this—at least it is as bold an approach as this House has ever heard coming from a member of the Conservative Party.

I would hope, sir—but I am not really expecting that this hope will be fulfilled this afternoon—I would hope before this House finishes its present session that we would hear authoritative comments from the hon. Minister of Labour and from the hon. Attorney General about what the government's view is in regard to labour injunctions. Surely it must disturb senior Cabinet officers—one such as the Minister of Labour who has the responsibility in this field, and one such as the Attorney General who is the chief law enforcement officer—that the situation in this particular aspect is in such confusion and is causing so much difficulty.

It can escape no one's notice that the hearing took place about the events in Peterborough and judgment has not been rendered as yet. It can escape no one's notice that the Toronto and district labour council has met and considered all the questions of injunctions in labour disputes and has given certain opinions. Again, it can escape no one's notice that the Canada council in Winnipeg heard some very strong speeches attacking the whole present system of dealing with picketing and the use of injunctions in labour disputes.

So I would say, sir, and I am sure it is a vain hope to express this afternoon, that somewhere there is a duty, there must be a duty and responsibility on the two senior Cabinet Ministers that are mentioned, the hon. Minister of Labour and the hon. Attorney General to say where the government stands. Is the government content to let the situation just amble on as it is doing with all the serious disagreements, with the whole threat to the system of law enforcement, or is the government prepared to look at this situation in a realistic manner and perhaps suggest some changes?

To return to the bill just for a moment; as I say, I compliment the hon. member for Riverdale for his careful analysis of the position and if we have to accept this procedure of dealing with injunctions in labour disputes as a system that has to go before our supreme court, then we can see, certainly, no objections to the hon. member's suggested amendments to The Judicature Act.

I would hope, sir, that this is not going to be the answer that is forthcoming. I would hope, sir, as we get into more labour disputes, as we get into more picketing disputes, as we get more applications to the courts, that we are not going to hear the hon. Attorney General stand in his place and say, "No one in Ontario is going to defy the law and I am going to see that the law is enforced." I would hope that we do not have to go through this time and time again, until eventually, sir, a confrontation is going to take place. Eventually there is going to be enough feeling on the side of labour that they are going to—wrongly, I would suggest—that they are going to challenge the law-enforcement power, and I suggest that we have had enough warning; we have had more than enough warning in the province of Ontario that our system of dealing with picketing, our system of dealing with these matters before the courts and the effect of picketing is improper and wrong. The law is wrong—to use the words of the hon. member for Oshawa, "The law is wrong"—and we now should consider how we are going to change it.

I suggested to this House a few weeks ago that there is on the bench in the province of Ontario in the court of appeal, a gentleman, the hon. Mr. Justice Laskin, who has by reason of his training, knowledge and experience, perhaps more reason to be an authority on the subject of labour relations than almost any other judge in the supreme court of Ontario. I suggested to the government then and I suggest it to them again this afternoon that the government could and should appoint Mr. Justice Laskin as a committee of one—as a Royal commission of one, if you will—to look into and investigate the whole

problem of picketing and the use of injunctions in labour disputes.

I would suggest, sir, that Mr. Justice Laskin's terms of reference could well be that he prepare and present to the government—and I do not think that it would take too long; a few months at the most—a series of amendments, not to The Judicature Act, but to The Labour Relations Act, whereby there would be a system of dealing with picketing, labour disputes and the policing of the same where the Criminal Code is not sufficient.

It would seem to me, sir, that the labour relations board is the board and is the jurisdiction within the province of Ontario that is competent and fitted to deal with disputes of this nature. It would seem to me, and I give no disrespect to the judges in the supreme court of Ontario, that those gentlemen—or most of them who are forced to deal with these matters from day to day if they come up—are not fitted by their training, by their temperament or by their background, to deal adequately and properly with the whole question of injunctions and with labour disputes. I think the government accepted that all the matters that arise in labour relations cannot be dealt with by the judges of the supreme court, and that is why, in the first instance, we have a labour relations board, because we needed men of special training, special knowledge and special background to deal with labour matters.

Why then, sir, when we have this very serious problem here in the province of Ontario, does the government not recognize that the labour relations board, with these men of special knowledge, special background and special training, is the group that should substantially be able, by reason of its knowledge, background, training and experience, to deal with the questions that arise insofar as picketing is involved, and the matter of handling it?

I am not suggesting that where there are violent breaches of the peace and that sort of thing, the police arm is not able and should not deal with this sort of problem. There are numerous sections in the Criminal Code—section 633, the "watching and besetting" section, which amply deal with the problems set out there; there are sections dealing with assault—and the police forces through the province of Ontario are able to enforce these sections as the necessity arises.

But this is a unique kind of a problem. This is the sort of a problem which has created such ill-feeling amongst the citizens of Ontario, that we have to have in 1966, a 1966 method of dealing with it. This is why I am somewhat concerned and why I accused the hon. member for Riverdale—mildly—of being a reactionary this afternoon.

I know that he agrees that we need a new concept and he is trying to put his Bill 25 within the present concept of the law, but I do not think that the present concept of the law—based on our precedents, based on the rules that our courts have applied over the years, based on the rules that have applied in England over the years—is able to deal with a 1966 problem.

I would suggest that the government has to move, if it is going to avoid the next crisis. I do not know where it will be. I do not suppose anyone knows where it will be, but one day, not too long from now, if the government does not move, we will pick up our newspapers and read of a new strike; we will pick up our papers and read of a picket line being put around the struck premises; we will find that someone, under the present rules, has applied to a judge of the supreme court and has either been granted an ex-parte injunction or has been granted an injunction after notice has been served, and so on. And there is going to be an attempt by some police officers or some law officers to enforce it, and somewhere along the line—and I hate to predict this—unless the government indicates that it is going to take some steps to change the law, there is going to be real violence in the province of Ontario. I say, Mr. Speaker, if this event occurs, the blame for it will lie on the shoulders of those gentlemen who occupy the front benches of the present government of Ontario.

The two gentlemen who must consider this an urgent problem are the hon. Minister of Labour and the hon. Attorney General. The Minister of Labour, leading a department that concerns itself with the problems of management and labour, must take a lead in this; the Attorney General, who is concerned with the enforcement of law in the province of Ontario, must be the legal adviser. I suggest, sir, that we need twentieth-century remedies and we are going to get them only if we take a twentieth-century approach. We are still back in the hoary days of the English common law as it evolved over several hundred years. These laws will not deal with the situation adequately; the government must act to bring the laws up to date.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, we in this group will not argue with anyone who wants to go further than our bill proposes, and in particular, we will not argue with the government if it wishes to bring in legislation going further than our bill; we would be happy to withdraw our bill under those circumstances.

We insist, however, that our bill represents the absolute minimum of what must be done now. The hon. member for Downsview has suggested that the whole situation should be reviewed by Mr. Justice Laskin. There is a lot of merit in that suggestion. I can think of no one who would be better qualified, in terms of all his training and experience to look into a complex question of this kind, than Mr. Justice Laskin. But I do not know if he suggested—I am not quite sure—that pending the inquiry by Mr. Justice Laskin we should just mark time. I do not know if he suggested that, but if he did, I think his suggestion, if that is what it was, Mr. Speaker, was inconsistent with the rest of his speech.

The rest of his speech, I think, pointed up quite clearly that we are sitting on a powder keg and we have to do something now. This matter has been before the government for a long time. The government has promised frequently that it was going to consider the matter. It has really been before it in a semi-active way ever since the report of the select committee on labour relations, which was tabled here a long time ago—I have forgotten how long ago; in 1957, my hon. friend says. This has been before the government all these years.

From time to time, when critical situations arise, the government seems to indicate that it has the matter under review, it is considering action, and then it does nothing. I understand that it told the Ontario federation of labour this year, when that federation brought in its annual brief in which it put special stress on the problem of injunctions, that it had this matter under active consideration. Active consideration by Tories is apparently indistinguishable from deep slumber. One can never see that they ever do anything, or consider anything.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I think the government ought to indicate what its position is. It will allow us to debate this bill for about another four minutes and that will be the end of it, and as the hon. member for Downsview said, who knows when we may meet a really critical situation?

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Pessimist!

Mr. Bryden: "Pessismist," says my hon. friend from Durham. Unfortunately he knows so little about labour relations that he cannot appreciate the type of problem we are up against. I would suggest that he have a discussion with his friend from Oshawa. I think his friend from Oshawa put his finger on the really critical problems. The basic point is that injunctions as used in labour disputes—I am not making any reference to their use in other situations at all—but in their use in labour relations they are totally unfair devices whereby the forces of law and order are massed to smash down the rights of one group to the benefit of another party to the dispute. Usually the other party to the dispute is a person who himself has been thumbing his nose at the law right through the piece.

The typical sort of situation where the injunction is used runs along this line:

A trade union is certified. It attempts to bargain. The law says that both the employer and the union must bargain when the union is certified and the procedure is initiated. The employer does not make the slightest effort to bargain. He simply stalls, obstructs and delays. He comes forward and says, "I agree to nothing." And so they go through all the long drawn out procedure of The Labour Relations Act, which requires that you must go to conciliation.

This is being changed now and, I think, improved, but this has been the situation up to now. You must go to conciliation. If that fails, you must go to a conciliation board, and if that fails, the report must be delivered to the Minister. Seven days must then elapse, and although time limits are set down they are hardly ever observed, so there is a long delay.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I must object to that statement about time limits.

Mr. Bryden: Well, all right. We will note the objection of the hon. Minister, but let me just continue. I have about one or two minutes I think, in which to wind up.

At any rate, all this procedure is gone through. The employer has been thumbing his nose at the law right through the piece and then finally the workers go out on a lawful strike. And what happens? He runs into court to get an order, in effect, to destroy their picket line and thereby destroy all their bargaining power. Then all the forces

of law and order are directed against the workers.

Let us carry it a little further. All the forces of propaganda in the community are directed against them, as we saw in the Oshawa dispute. I will not refer to the Peterborough dispute, because it is before the courts. But as we saw in the Oshawa dispute, every paper in this country as far as I know, certainly all that I saw, were yelling for the blood of the workers, branding them as lawbreakers. These men had never been convicted of breaking any law. They had not even been charged with breaking a law and yet they were tried and convicted in every newspaper in this community. This is the type of effort used to destroy a group of poor, struggling workers, grossly underpaid, very small in number. This is the way their rights are trampled into the ground.

In my opinion, injunctions have no place whatsoever in labour disputes and I think that the idea of the hon. member for Oshawa is a good one: any problems that may arise in this area could much better be handled by the labour relations board. But any of these long-term solutions are matters that we can look at in the long term. What I am concerned about is the short term, not entirely in terms of the dangerous situation that the hon. member for Downsview sees arising. Although I do not by any means want to suggest that he is an alarmist in saying that, but it is not only that that I am thinking of. I am thinking of the simple justice of the situation. The just rights of working people to be able to use the limited methods at their disposal to try to gain some reasonable consideration of what they conceive to be their legitimate interests in the employment relationship. I say that this bill now before us, or something like it—we are never wedded to the precise forms of our bills—should be passed immediately, and I think it is clearly incumbent upon the government to bring in legislation.

The hon. Attorney General was quick enough to herd 20 or 25 honest, law-abiding citizens into court as criminals, but he will not do a thing to solve the real problem that we are up against. I think it is time he took action and brought some legislation into this House.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 99

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-1963, bill to repeal, **Mr. Randall,** second reading 3100

Ontario Development Corporation, bill to incorporate, Mr. Randall, second reading 3100

Evidence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, **second reading** **3111**

Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3114

Fire Departments Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3115

Credit Unions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3115

Land Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3115

Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3115

Duties of a consumer protection bureau, bill to establish and provide for, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3115

Protection of buyers of consumer goods and for the fair disclosure of the cost of credit, bill to provide for, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3116

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to **3133**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before we resume the evening sitting, perhaps I should explain to the House a series of events which I have had an opportunity to straighten out now.

In the first place, I would say that the copy of my address at the Inn on the Park on March 25, that was held by the press and by the people in the Opposition, was in fact the address that I delivered.

When I sent for a copy of it, what was sent down to me from my office was a previous draft in which I had set out the statements that I read in the House. On checking the draft, I took that out because in fact it is a recitation of what the government has done and because I was trying to shorten the speech down. However, I would say the only reason I referred to the speech was because I wanted to put on the record the position of the government as far as regional government is concerned and the remarks I put in the record this afternoon represent the position of the government and I can assure the hon. members of the House that we intend to proceed.

The Department of Municipal Affairs is presently studying the various provisions and recommendations in the report of the select committee. I certainly am not going to stand here and say that they will all be accepted, of course. But they are being studied. I think, hon. members all realize, of course, this is policy as it was in August, 1965, as it was in March, 1966 and as it is here in May, 1966—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): If the hon. Prime Minister can make any thread out of that he is a good man.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I can find a common thread out of it, so I will accept the hon. member's compliment.

Now I would simply say that the regional studies that are under way will continue to be under way and as I said this afternoon, we expect within a period of probably two years or so that these studies will extend right across the province. And I hope this sets the record straight once and for all as far as the policy of this government is concerned in regard to regional government.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, does not the hon. Prime Minister agree that his shortened speech at least gives the appearance of a change of policy?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes. I would have to say —and I meant to make this remark and failed to—on re-reading that speech myself in light of what was said here tonight, I would agree that such a conclusion could be drawn from it. And really, I do not want to get into a debate of a speech that I delivered last March. What I was really attempting to do there was deal with the thing in terms of the audience to whom I was speaking and certain facets of planning particularly.

But I will agree with the hon. member such a conclusion could be drawn from it. I would have to agree that you are not at fault in drawing such a conclusion and I am pleased to have this opportunity of correcting any misconception there may be, because it was not given that such a conclusion should be drawn from it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I can only say I hope that every time the hon. Prime Minister's speeches are shortened, there is not an apparent change of policy in the process.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. Prime Minister to tell us in view of this clarification, what action, if any, the government is prepared to take in relation to the Jones report. Is the study still going to go on?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In due course the estimates of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will be before the House, and I think that question might be proper at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The Legislature is always pleased to have guests and tonight we welcome in the Speaker's gallery students from Thistletown collegiate, Rexdale.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS GUARANTEE ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves second reading of Bill 90, An Act to repeal The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-63.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments that I wish to make with regard to Bill 90, which is now before the House, and Bill 91, which I assume will be before the House very shortly. The two bills of course are closely interrelated and, as a result, my remarks are too. Perhaps, with your permission, I might say everything that I have to say on both bills at this time and thus save the necessity of—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of procedure, because the two bills are very closely interrelated we might have the hon. Minister call both bills and they can be debated at the same time.

ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Hon. Mr. Randall moves second reading of Bill 91, An Act to incorporate the Ontario development corporation.

Mr. Bryden: Bill 90 repeals the bill that we passed in this House two or three years ago which became The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act. It is repealed because, in effect it is being replaced by Bill 91. I suppose the draftsmen have their own reasons for separating the repeal of the old legislation in a separate Act. I would not hazard a guess as to what their reasons are but, whatever the reasons, I think the segregation of this repeal into a separate Act is a significant and meaningful gesture, and I think an important one.

I think that in the years ahead historians will be able to refer back to Bill 90, when it becomes effective, and say: there is the evidence of yet another bubble that burst. I would like to refresh the memories but perhaps I will be giving the Minister some new information—I will be refreshing the memories of other members when I refer back very briefly to the circumstances attendant upon the passage of The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, which is now being repealed. This Act, when it was a bill, was priority legislation in the session of 1962-63. As a matter of fact it was Bill 2 of that session and as all hon. members know, Bill 2 for all practical purposes was the first bill to be introduced. Bill 1 is always a routine bill; it is introduced in recognition of an ancient tradition before the Speech from the Throne, merely to assert annually the right of the Legislature as it sees fit to deal with legislation before it listens to comments from the Crown. So Bill 2 in fact was the first bill introduced into the session of 1962-63.

It was treated as priority legislation at all times. I would not say that it was rushed through the House but it was given preference, it was proceeded with at all possible speed.

The Speech from the Throne of that session referred to it as contributing significantly towards Ontario's economic growth; the speech further stated in reference to this bill that the government—and I am now quoting—"the government is prepared initially to guarantee loans amounting to a total of $100 million, but this limit will be raised if necessary."

The whole context in which it was introduced was that this government, a new administration—not a new party in power but a new administration—was boldly tackling the problems of economic growth in Ontario. This bill which became The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act was their major instrument for promoting economic growth and economic diversification in the province.

The Minister in charge, the then Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Macaulay, spoke very eloquently of it in the context of encouraging economic growth in the province. At one point, the hon. member for Bruce asked him if there would be any limit on the loans that would be guaranteed for any individual project and Mr. Macaulay replied very loftily, and I am quoting from page 24 of *Hansard* of 1962-63:

> I do not think that we have set any such figure. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor yesterday indicated that the government was prepared to consider in the aggregate a total of $100 million. I think I would feel that we would have a greater opportunity and we would have an opportunity to make the most majestic contribution towards the development of our country if we leave this at the moment.

"The most majestic contribution towards the development of our country" was the language used in referring to the soon-to-be-lamented Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act. It has been such an important piece of legislation that I can never remember the title of it, Mr. Speaker.

Another point our friends on the Liberal benches suggested to the government and to the Minister in particular, Mr. Macaulay, was that if the government was prepared to guarantee loans up to $100 million under this legislation, they should put the figure right into the bill to show their intentions.

But Mr. Macaulay in his expansive way brushed such suggestions aside. He said: "Why, you are trying to restrict us by putting a figure of $100 million into that bill. What if we have used up the $100 million and we find several other projects that are worthy, are we going to have to wait around until you fellows stumble back into this Legislature?"—I am not quoting him precisely, Mr. Speaker, but something to that effect. "No, we certainly are not going to wait, if necesary we will go beyond the $100 million, we will go to $200 million."

This was the context. The hon. Prime Minister also was carried away by the enthusiasm of the moment.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: An optimistic, enthusiastic group.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the froth, all right, that is what you call Tory froth.

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps the hon. Minister of Economics and Development knows what I am talking about when I refer to yet another bubble that has burst. At any rate, to go back to 1962-63, that was the one year I think when we had a fall session and then a recess over Christmas. We resumed in the new year, and shortly after we resumed, the hon. Prime Minister was moved to rise in the House before the orders of the day to make the following announcement which I am quoting from page 598 of the 1962-63 *Hansard*:

> It is a pleasure for me today to be able to announce what I think is a very major breakthrough in our effort in this province to create employment opportunities for our people, and to stimulate the growth of our economy. I am very happy to be able to report to the House and to describe the first provincial guarantee which we have made under The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act.

He then went on to describe in some detail a guarantee that the government had made on behalf of a company which was then known as H. J. Fairfield Company of Owen Sound. In my merciful spirit of tonight, Mr. Speaker, I will say nothing more about H. J. Fairfield Company, or about the first guarantee under this Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Down the drain.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Well, not altogether!

Mr. MacDonald: All that went down the drain. Yes sir, every bit of that went down the drain.

An hon. member: Macaulay was being constructive.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Macaulay went down the drain some time ago. This bill is going down the drain now, although it really did not get far enough above water level that it could manage to get down the drain. It hardly was ever in any other position but down the drain.

Mr. MacDonald: He came out in the lake once again, though.

Mr. Bryden: Somehow or other, it never did happen that loans amounting to $200 million were guaranteed under this Act. In fact, there were not loans of even $100 million. To be precise, and I am now going on a statement the Minister made not in this House but in a speech in the province not long ago, that the total amount of loans guaranteed under the Act was precisely $5 million. Now, that's a five per cent performance on the government's minimum objective, and a 2.5 per cent performance on their maximum objective. I suppose we could say this is rather a good performance as far as the government's general record is concerned. My friend from Essex North, who is more generous than I, says it is about par. I thought it was a little better than their usual performance. However, we will not argue about it.

So now, we have a new bill, which as far as I can make out from the quite lengthy statement the hon. Minister made on first reading, represents a fairly significant change of direction in a couple of ways. First of all, implicit within the bill is a recogniition that all the headline-catching talk of a few years ago was nothing but a lot of baloney. There was nothing in it, no prospect that the legislation would make any significant contribution to the economic development of the province. The Minister has recognized that by saying, in effect, that he is going to become a sort of mortgage broker for some small firms in the outlying parts of the

province outside the metropolitan areas. I think that will be about the sum total of his purpose in this new bill. The original one was to provide guarantees, and I do not think it was restricted to short-term capital either; it was couched in the broadest possible terms. It was to provide guarantees to businesses in all parts of the province, but apparently the Minister of Economics and Development has now written off that objective. He has discovered, he claims, some small businesses in some remote parts of the province who are at the end of the line as far as loan capital is concerned. Just as they get up to the trough, they find the trough is empty. So the government is going into the mortgage business on their behalf and make loans to them.

The fact that the government is indeed getting into the mortgage business is also something of a reversal of the policy of the original legislation. Mr. Macaulay was very precise in stating, when the original bill was introduced and also when it was considered at second reading, that the government was not going to lend any money itself; it was merely going to guarantee loans made by traditional institutions. He said: "I think it is undesirable that the government get into the financing of industry directly, even if it can be done by the private organizations in which the government believes." Then he went on a little later to say that if the government did that it would be undermining the private enterprise system in which the government believed and in which he personally believed.

I do not know if the government's belief in the private enterprise system has been shaken a little bit now that it is entering one of the traditional areas of private enterprise. But it is pretty obvious from the original legislation and from this new legislation that there are many respects in which the private enterprise system has fallen down. One of those respects is that it does not really make adequate capital available to small businesses. They have the greatest difficulty getting it. A great deal of our development capital actually does not come through lending institutions at all. It comes from large corporations which manage to monopolize a significant part of the capital of the country through their undistributed profits and through their depreciation reserve. This is where the real development in the province takes place. This bill, and the Act which it replaces, actually are purely marginal pieces of legislation.

I am not going to oppose the bill. It is an innocuous, harmless sort of thing. It will do a small amount of good. I am sure that there will be some small enterprises in some remote parts of the province which can make a useful contribution which will be assisted to stay in business, will be put on their feet, as a result of this legislation. That's the best that happened under the old legislation. I would not say that Fairfield was a worthy enterprise, but I have no doubt that there have been some worthy enterprises that have been assisted under the old legislation —marginal enterprises, small ones, operating on the fringes of the economy. But as for dealing with the real problem of the economic development of this province, this legislation just has no relevance to the situation at all. I think the current Minister is now taking a much more modest position than the government took a few years ago when it got all those blazing headlines about how it was moving in to assist in the development of the province. I do not think he regards the bill as anything more than marginal—

Mr. Singer: Would it be possible to be less marginal?

Mr. Bryden: I do not know. Whatever his views are he will have a chance to express them, but I am assuming he regards it as purely marginal, not as the previous legislation was alleged to be. However, we still have to face some of the major problems of the financing of economic development. We face, for example, the problem to which I alluded briefly a moment ago, that most of our investment capital is in the hands of a very small number of people—mainly large corporations. They do not have to go to the money market; they can finance out of their own reserves. If they go to the money market, of course, the existence of those reserves puts them in a very favourable and preferred position. A very small number of corporations have control over the economic life of our country. When we are faced with the possibility or the opportunity for further development of our resources, it is usually undertaken by those large corporations because they are the only ones with the access to the funds to do the job. Not only do they have a very strong position at the present time, but their position is getting stronger and stronger all the time. They get more and more under their control with their undistributed profits and their depreciation reserves. They buy up control over still further segments of our

economy, they get control over still further areas of our natural resources, and, of course, they are in almost all instances controlled from outside the country—almost without exception. I do not think there is a major corporation operating in this province now that is actually not controlled from outside the country. There may be one or two, but certainly not more than one or two.

Slowly they gobble up more and more existing enterprises and slowly they gobble up all the real opportunities for the development of the province. Canadians are permitted to be hewers of wood and drawers of water in the little enterprises they are permitted to undertake. The government manfully gives them a handout to keep them afloat or to get them started so that they can undertake very worthy little enterprises, but enterprises which really have no significance in terms of our total economic situation, either in terms of development or control of our economy. The government does absolutely nothing in this context; it does nothing to affect the control that is exercised over our economy by outsiders. It does nothing to ensure that at least future development will take place in a situation over which we have control.

It does nothing to mobilize such capital as might be available in the hands of our people to use it for the development of the province. It is going to borrow $7 million which will be put into a mortgage fund, into a quasi-mortgage company, and make it available to borrowers whom the regular lending institutions will not look at. That is its idea of economic development. That is its idea of how to develop this province into a strong, flourishing and independent economy—independent, let me say, within the context of an independent Canada.

There is just nothing, absolutely nothing, even in conception, that could be compared to the types of policies that are now being developed in the province of Quebec. There, genuine efforts are being made to mobilize the financial resources of that community, the money in the hands of the people, to develop their economy for the benefit of their people under their own control, and not for the benefit of coupon clippers in New York and other places. This sort of thing is completely beyond the conception of the government in power in Ontario today.

I would imagine that there is nobody in this House who would agree with everything that the Quebec government has done in the past years. On the other hand, I would doubt if there is anybody in this House who, on the basis of facts, could challenge the proposition that the government of Quebec is the only go-ahead government in the whole of Canada today at either the federal or provincial level. At least the government of Quebec is giving some evidence of its desire to develop the resources of the province of Quebec for the benefit of the people of the province of Quebec.

This government continues, as always, to allow these resources to be exploited exclusively, or primarily—exclusively would be too strong—for the benefit of coupon clippers all over the world, very few of them in Canada. It takes no steps at all to do anything about it.

It comes forward this evening with a bill that works on the fringes of the problem. It does not really attack the problem at its core at all. This bill is in replacement of a piece of legislation which, like so much Tory legislation that has been presented to us over the years, was really going to revolutionize this province. This young, energetic government, with its fine new young premier, was going to take the province by the tail and drag it forward.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. gentlemen applaud as tonight we preside over the funeral rites of that tremendous effort which was symbolized in The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-63. Somehow I feel that it is inadequate merely to repeal that Act. I suppose we have to repeal it since the Minister has admitted that it was a total flop; it just did not do even a tenth or a twentieth of what it was supposed to do. But I do not think, really, it is adequate to repeal it.

I think it should be edged in black, placed on a plaque, and set out on the lawn in front of the Parliament buildings along with all the other extinct volcanoes out there—as a symbol of the failure of this government to take any effective steps in relation to the actual economic problems that face Ontario today.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): But the hon. member is going to vote for it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on looking back at the debate concerning an Act to authorize guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario—which was chapter 40, of the statutes of Ontario, 1962-63—I could not help but

be attracted by the words of the hon. Prime Minister, which were typical of the words of the government of that day, and words still of the government of this day. This is what he had to say about the almost late lamented bill—and I quote directly from the hon. Prime Minister's remarks on page 509 of that report—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: February 11, 1963—the Prime Minister had this to say:

> We have through this Act introduced a completely new, direct and a very effective approach to our programme of assisting Ontario's industries.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I am still quoting the Prime Minister:

> I do not think hon. members will find anything to equal this in any place else in Canada—in fact, I rather doubt any place on the North American continent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Some three years later, Mr. Speaker, we have a very simple bill before us, Bill 90, in this present session, that says without very much ceremony: "The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-63, is repealed."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Replaced by Bill 91.

Mr. Singer: No, it does not say—if the hon. Minister will look at Bill 90, it does not mention anything about replacement. We will come to that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does Bill 91 say?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Singer: I would expect, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry, that the members of the Cabinet council do not take the trouble, when they pass on these bills when they go through Cabinet council, to recognize what they say. I would refer the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management to the wording of Bill 90.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: That is all it says. The effective section is that it repeals this old Act that the Prime Minister waxed so eloquent about. We will come to Bill 91 in a minute. I would think that, as a learned man, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management should have spotted the difference between Bill 90 and Bill 91.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I would like the hon. Prime Minister—I am sure he will—to explain to us this very fascinating paragraph in his remarks on that February night just three years ago. Because we would like to know why he has changed his mind and why he has put this stamp of approval on the revisions of Bill 90. I would think that either he or his colleague should explain to us and give the people of the province of Ontario a full account of what happened under Bill 90.

How much money did the province of Ontario in fact guarantee? How much money did they in fact lose? How many dollars did the people of the province of Ontario put into what was perhaps the greatest piece of legislation in North America? How much money did the people of the province of Ontario lose, notwithstanding the fact that this was the greatest piece of legislation that the whole of North America had ever seen?

I think, before we go any further in this, we should get a full and complete and absolute accounting from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development who is introducing these bills, 90 and 91, as to the balance sheet. Was it good? Was it bad? Did it fulfil the most eloquent dreams of the Minister, of his predecessor? Did it fulfiil the remarks of his leader? If not, why not? Well, let us have an accounting before we move on too much further tonight.

Then, sir, I think that we need, and we need in detail, an explanation for the different approach. Bill 90 has failed. The old Act that is being repealed has failed, and we must recognize the government has concluded it has failed because they bring us Bill 90. Then we have to know, and I think it can only come from the hon. Minister responsible for introducing Bill 91, why Bill 91 is a substantial improvement.

Looking over both these Acts, the former bill, now being repealed, seems to differ from this one in one major aspect. Bill 91 allows the government to loan directly; the previous bill, the bill being repealed, allowed the government only to guarantee. The new Bill 91 allows the government to guarantee other lending institutions, but allows direct loans as well.

I think the hon. Minister owes the people of Ontario an explanation as to why the scheme—and this seems to be the major

scheme in the two Acts—as to why the previous scheme did not work. Are the banks and the lending institutions of the province of Ontario no longer prepared to accept the guarantee of the province of Ontario? Why must we now differ from the scheme in the previous bill and put the province in the position where it must put up the money itself, or must be prepared to put up the money?

Very briefly, I say this, and without rubbing the government's nose in its failure to do it to any greater extent than has already been done:

1. We need an accounting of what happened; the people of Ontario demand and have the right to have a complete bookkeeping statement as to what happened to the provisions of the late lamented bill that is now on its way out.

2. Why has the scheme set up in the previous bill failed and what advantages has this bill got that the previous one did not have?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the principle of this bill. I cannot understand why the hon. Minister would not see fit to make this into the kind of development corporation in which the people of the province of Ontario would have some opportunity to participate. It seems to me to be perfectly ridiculous to call this an Ontario development corporation and then to provide that its capital will be limited to shares of the value of $1,000.

Surely this only has sense if what the government is insisting on doing is to provide that the government will own all the shares in this corporation and it will engage in the dubious proposition of financing, in one way or another, marginal operations throughout the province of Ontario.

I would think that there may very well be a role for the government of the province of Ontario to finance marginal operations if, in fact, it was also participating in the developmen of effective economic units throughout the province and were taking its part in the development, in an overall way, of the economic industries and activities throughout the province.

I do not see why this government needs to perpetuate in this bill the typical clause which has been in every similar Act, except in the province of Quebec, since the time of the founding of the industrial development bank, that this corporation will only be able to provide assistance if everybody else in the financial community throughout the province of Ontario is not prepared to go along and make an effective contribution to the development of the province.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the margin in the province of competition for financial assistance is, for practical purposes throughout all the institutions which are in that field, negligible.

There is very little, if any, competition in rates for financial assistance. The terms under which financial assistance is granted, if you go from one bank to another bank to another bank, or from one lending institution to another lending institution are the same. You cannot, in fact, make any real distinction in the rate at which the financial assistance will be provided. They will make roughly the same rules as to whether or not the facilities will be made available to any industry.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the government really wishes this corporation to function in an effective way, it would provide that the government would own 51 per cent control or an effective control of this corporation. It would provide for public subscription to shareholding in the corporation by making arrangements for the shares to be reduced to either a $10 or a $1 par value, so that everyone could participate in it.

If it is going to go to the public by the issue of debentures to raise further funds in order to develop this development corporation, in order that it will have sufficient capital to take an effective part in the economic development of the province of Ontario, those debentures should be available to the public. There should be provision by which convertible debentures would be sold by this corporation to the public so that the public could, if they wished, transfer a debt obligation into an equity and a participating right in the overall operation of the corporation.

I notice, for example—and these are relatively minor points in terms of the overall purpose which this bill should accomplish—but it seems to me that even this kind of a bill should be subject to certainly a large part of the provisions of The Corporations Act of Ontario.

Much time has been spent on The Corporations Act to provide that companies operating under that Act will perform their functions in an open and in a public way. There are elaborate provisions and we are engaged in discussion of additional elaborate provisions to make certain that there will be adequate financial disclosure, and we find that because the government sets up a corporation to act in the business community, it is going to find

itself exempt from those provisions of that Act.

Another point that we raised in the course of the debate on The Loan and Trust Corporations Act—and again, it is excluded from this bill—is that those persons who are going to be directors of this corporation, are going to be under no obligation whatsoever to declare any interest which they may have in activities or undertakings to which loans or other advances or other support may be given under this bill.

I think, again, that this government when it sets up this kind of a corporation, should have enough confidence in its laws of general application to other people in the community that a large part of those laws of general application should be made available and applicable to this kind of corporation.

Those points, as I say, Mr. Speaker, are relatively negligible in terms of the minor objective which this bill has set for itself. I know that the hon. Minister is wedded to the proposition that if the free enterprise economy can do all the things that are required of it, government has no place in it.

My proposition is a very simple one, and our party's proposition is a very simple one: there is no place for public funds in the economic development of this corporation of this province if participation is going to be limited to marginal operation. Those marginal operations are matters with which a corporation such as this could take part and could invest funds, if in addition to that, they had an effective public participation and were also engaged in providing financial assistance to other economic operations in this province, other than marginal ones.

I think that the hon. Minister should seriously consider revising the provisions of this bill, so that even if at this time it does not meet with his philosophy, at least at some point should he decide that this development corporation can play an effective part and the kind of role that we want it to play, at least the facilities and the framework of the corporation will be available to meet that need.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions posed by the hon. members, I would say that the difference between Bill 90 and Bill 91—

Mr. Singer: Not Bill 90; the bill of 1962-63.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right, the bill of 1962-63. I think that if the hon. member will read it, he will see that that bill provided for the loan of working capital only, guaranteed through the applicant's own bank. That is what the bill provided for, there was no other provision.

Legally, we could not take mortgages; we could not do a lot of things with reference to purchasing and holding debentures on machinery without getting into some difficulties because we are operating an agency, not a corporation. That was very carefully checked out with the legal minds around here and for that reason, we felt that we should have a new Corporations Act. Now, we have it—our new bill.

I would like to remind hon. members of the House that when that original agency was set up by my predecessor, I recall the facts. I was chairman of the Ontario economic council. My advice was asked. I can recall the conversations that were going across the province. Everybody was setting up $100 million, $200 million, $300 million. I said, "You need your head read to set up the taxpayers' money on this basis; it is not required."

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): The figures the hon. Minister's predecessor announced?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not care what he said, I told Mr. Macaulay it was not required, because we had a better way.

Mr. Singer: His hon. leader said—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute. Let me tell the hon. member what the better way is; now just a minute. He should take his time. He had his say, now just a minute.

We talked about a $100 million development corporation and I said we could even go better than that. We could put the entire credit of this province into the agency on the basis I suggest, whereby the province will guarantee any loan made to an applicant through a bank, and so there was no limit on the amount of money that could be loaned, if people had come to us for the money. There was no loan. We gave the guarantee.

Now, you talk about the number of guarantees given, and when this legislation was set up, it was a tight money situation. Small people were being hurt and they would come to us and say: "What can you do to help us?" We brought up this programme and it served its purpose and let me tell you what it did—you asked a few questions, now just listen for a moment and I will tell you.

We have, through this agency, attracted people who were in difficulty and all we asked them to do was bring in their financial balance sheet and let us see how bad or how good their situation was. You could not walk into any bank in the land without taking in a balance sheet and telling the man that you wanted to borrow $2 from what your situation was.

That is all we asked. And when the applicant brought his balance sheet in, we were able—and are still doing it—to get him $16 million in money through the private banks by fixing up his balance sheet, by giving him management, by changing his accounting, by helping him with his product through the Ontario research foundation, and the taxpayer did not have to put up a five-cent piece.

Now, I do not know of any other corporation in Canada that was able to raise $16 million on this basis.

Now, the loans that we have made direct amounted to about $4.8 million and they have been paid back. I think when I make my presentation of the estimates in the next week, it will be down to less than $1.5 million that has not been paid back.

Mr. Singer: Did the hon. Minister make direct loans?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Through the guarantees I am talking about. Through the guarantees we have made about $4.8 million of loans and the companies are very successful with the management services we gave them. They reduced their indebtedness at the moment to less than $1.3 million, I think it is at the moment.

Mr. Singer: How much of the $1.3 million is good and how much is bad?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is all good. Now, just let me tell hon. members that there were no losses last year, so you are talking about the statement I made in this House at the same time last year. I gave you a report on the losses, and I said the losses at that time were $487,000 total. Now on $487,000 my friend, get your lead pencil out, and just start doing a little figuring.

On a $20 million loan directly and indirectly through guarantees and through the way we helped them get loans at the private banks, we have provided or maintained almost 7,000 jobs. If you talk to any economist he will tell you that when a man gets a job in this province, he pays approximately $470 for the provincial taxes annually. Now, if I have got my pencil work done, 7,000 multiplied by $470 is $3.29 million in taxes that we have been able to provide to this province through these loans and guarantees and I think that is a pretty good record.

Plus the fact, I do not have the figures right now, but I think there is something like $4 or $5 million worth of imports that we stopped from coming into the country by assisting people to finance and manufacture those products here.

Also we helped companies get into the export market. That is another $3 or $4 million. The accomplishments of the development agency to date, in my estimation, have been remarkable with very little obligation, or very little guarantee on the part of this government and any use of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Singer: If you mention the amount of money—

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have not made any money. We did not operate a profitable company. We did not have any funds to start with. We started without a dime, as hon. members well know.

Now, we have changed the situation. We have counselled over 4,000 small businessmen and I have a stack of letters in my office—and not testmonials, we did not ask for them. If you want to take a week off and come up, I will be glad to turn them over to you. These are confidential, I do not want to bring them into the House, I do not want to publish them in the newspapers, but come on up and I will let you read them, it makes wonderful reading of the success stories. Wonderful reading!

Now, this is only a few things we have done plus the fact that we have been able to get 45 new products, new inventions on the market, through the agency, that perhaps would never have seen the light of day.

Mr. Whicher: I wonder if the hon. Minister would name two or three of those products? Surely that is not confidential.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, there is one, a hockey helmet for the pee-wee hockey players that is being sold. I think there were 50,000 made—up to the other day there were 50,000 produced. There is a mouthguard being used all over the world. We sell more pee-wee hockey helmets in California, which

surprised me, than we do in Canada, and the mouthguard has been approved and is being sold all over the world. In fact, the Russian hockey team took both the helmet and the mouthguard back with them. I do not have them here, but I will be glad to give you a list of the 45.

Mr. Bryden: They will be underselling you on the world market.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well they probably will, but we are pretty good salesmen ourselves.

Well now, I think that the original bill, Mr. Speaker, we have had some experience with it, some good, some not so good, but we have been able to find out our difficulties and point them out to others and we have explained to the House on the last two occasions when my estimates went through where we were weak.

We corrected our management problems. We have a follow-up staff and we have a group right now that is, in my estimation, doing a fantastic job and we have the testimonials and the letters and the press to prove that they are doing a good job.

Now, this bill, you will remember, this legislation was originally put through to provide only one thing, and that was working capital, either through the guaranteed loan, or by helping a man get it off his own banker. The credit of Ontario was backing that agency bill, so there was no limit as to how much we could loan if people came to us. But the tight money market evaporated in the latter part of 1963 and the people who we assumed would need assistance did not have to come to us, they were able to get it from the private moneylenders — and you are right, the private moneylenders right now are having a difficult time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Surely.

Mr. Bryden: Is the hon. Minister suggesting that we do not have a tight money situation at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You did not let me finish, no. I would be glad to answer your question. I think we have a tight money situation and when I am making my estimates speech I will comment on that and I think you will be interested in the comments.

But the new bill, Mr. Speaker, is put into effect to do a number of other things. Legally we were not in a position to hold mortgages, and when you say why do we want to go into the mortgage business—

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, may I ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! There are far too many questions on second reading of the bill and I would ask you to allow the Minister to complete his second reading remarks and then if you have a question you would like to ask the Minister, I am sure he would be pleased to answer it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members will let me finish on the difference between the two bills so we are all clear.

This new bill, as I say, was the result of the experience we have had in the past three years with operating the agency. We have, I think, perhaps more experience than many of the provinces. We have looked at what they are doing. They had different problems entirely to some of the problems we face in Ontario and we have tailored this new legislation to look after the problems of the small businessmen in the province of Ontario.

Now we have any number of small businessmen come to us and say: "I would like to open a plant in a certain part of Ontario, but I cannot get mortgage money," and nobody is putting up plants on spec and I do not think I have to spell this out.

Hon. members can go to Rexdale here, and the developers are putting up factories like Carter produces liver pills and you can walk in there tomorrow and get a lease-back on a plant of any size that you want.

But this is not true in towns like Bowmanville, and Carleton Place, and Smiths Falls, and Stayner, and all the other places up in the north country, where the private developer will not take his money and put it into commercial properties.

Now through the connections we had and the conversations we have had with the various municipalities—"Can you provide a means where if somebody walks into our town and wants to build a factory, can we get mortgage money to put this plant up?" —that was the major reason for turning this agency into a corporation, plus the fact that we felt if we had a corporation we could also do something with regard to loaning money on equipment.

You are well aware of what is happening in the automotive field. Most of these people in the automotive business have to retool their plants. They need extra equipment. There is some assistance being given through Mr. Drury's department in Ottawa, but there are many others who do not qualify on that basis and we think that through the corporation we can fill that need.

So we are filling a need with this new corporation that exists. We know it exists, because we have been familiar with it for the last two or three years and I hoped this year to get it into operation before the Legislature closes.

I listened to the hon. member for Woodbine when he said we should participate in the development of Canadian industry. Well, I just want to say to him that I am in sympathy with this. The Canada development corporation, I believe, is going to come about, that is what their intention is. I see some weaknesses which I am not going to discuss here, but this corporation right now is empowered to take equity stock out of any company that comes to us for assistance, so we can become an equity partner, taking preferred stock or debentures or bonds in a Canadian corporation if it is desired and if we find it essential to fulfil the needs that this bill is being prepared for.

So we are going to be able to take an equity position in some of these smaller companies that may need that kind of a partner.

Now the government is going to be the owner of all the shares in this corporation for good reason. I have studied what GIC have done in Quebec. I think if you read the financial statements it has been a fairly reasonable successful story in Quebec. There are some doubts about where it is going now, the price of the stock on the market, the people are not rushing in to buy it. The steel company they predicted they were going to build, there is some doubt now they will build that.

I think perhaps the GIC corporation has done what Mr. Lesage wanted it to do. I would suggest if you check the earnings you will find that the earnings are primarily from the capital that was made available which was reinvested.

I will have that information when my estimates go through, it certainly was not made on the operations of companies to date and I think rightly so, they have not been in business that long, they have to have an opportunity to make an investment, help these corporations get on their feet and see if they can help them make money. But we in this province do not believe that we have the same problems they have in the western provinces, nor the same problems they have in the province of Quebec. They are up to date, and there has been ample money for our resource industries. They can finance on Bay street. As I pointed out in my statement to the House, we estimate that the top loan will be $200,000, but already we have one we are considering for $400,000. We are elastic; we will move with the times. If a man needs more than $200,000 I am quite prepared to go before the Cabinet and present the story. I am sure that we are not going to limit the $200,000, but we do not believe we should be financing $25 million or $30 million pulp mills; that kind of money can be found in the private sources.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that when this corporation is in operation, we will get an opportunity to use the funds available in the areas where we think they are most needed—that is, in the financing of commercial mortgages to provide manufacturing facilities in areas where the private lender will not go. Again, I just want to emphasize that last year the private lenders had most of their money loaned out in the first ten months of the year. They were not going to take chances going into the apparently offbeat areas or offshore areas, as we say. They want to stay right here around Metro Toronto where they can rent their money out at the highest price. As far as I am concerned, if I was an investment man, that is probably what I or any of us would do. But this bill, in my estimation, with the money we have to start with, will do two things. We still have the $7 million available to handle mortgages at the same rates as are applying in the city of Toronto, in Metro, or anywhere in Ontario; we also have left into the bill the guarantee portion so that amount of loan that is available to provincial guarantees is still there. So we are not talking just about $7 million, we are talking about what we had before plus. When this money is used up—if it is used up faster than we anticipate—we can get more money from the same source, or we have developed a corporation that is earning money. I think we can go to the money market ourselves as a corporation and raise money through bonds or debentures.

So I do not believe that there is anything left out of this bill in order to help small industry. As far as I am concerned—and I think the record proves that we have been highly successful with the development agency—I cannot see any reason why we cannot be more successful.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister promised an elephant and produced a flea.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I listened to the hon. member's comments today. I appreciate that he has a different opinion than I about private industry, but I want to remind him that I have just finished reading a book by Robert Tyer on 17 years of the abundant life promised in Saskatchewan by Mr. Douglas. I read where Mr. Fine went to New York and borrowed $450 million during his term of office, paid twice the interest that the other provinces paid and then, when he got his abundant life, he took off to parts unknown. So I do not think all the capitalists are crooked.

Mr. Bryden: We did not say anything about capitalists.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, the hon. member makes those comments.

Mr. MacDonald: That is completely irrelevant.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, they are not irrelevant at all. Every time the hon. member gets on his feet he finds fault with private enterprise. There is nothing wrong with private enterprise. We are going to help private enterprise all we can.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I suggest the hon. member read—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member has a point of order.

Mr. Bryden: I want to point out to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, that I did not say anything at all about private enterprise. I talked about his legislation—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I have covered the points I think the hon. members brought up. In my estimation, this is good legislation for the province of Ontario. If it needs amending, I am quite prepared to bring it back. If we have left anything out, I can assure you that we will be back to get it amended as quickly as we can. I find that the Cabinet and my associates in Treasury are quite in accord with what I have suggested, otherwise I would not be here with the bill. I feel that this bill is going to be just as successful, if not more so, than the original bill for the development agency. I would think a year from today we will find that perhaps some of the doubts that our friends have across the way about the financing of mortgages and equipment will dissipate, and we will have as many success stories a year from today as we have now on the agency.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask something of the hon. Minister? Did he ever consider that this type of bill should apply to the poorer areas of the province, designated areas, or whatever you may call them, and that what we call the richer areas could be excluded? As I said this afternoon on the other bill, I have nothing against this great city of Toronto at all; I am very proud of it, but on the other hand any of us will acknowledge that Toronto has enough industry now.

An hon. member: Never!

Mr. Whicher: He may say that, but in comparison to the rest of the province they have. Did the hon. Minister ever consider that perhaps this would cause industry to get out into the rural areas of the province if they were financed and if industry coming into the larger areas looked after their own financing through private enterprise?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that is a good question. We have gone around this one a number of times. Let me suggest that I think there is sufficient money to finance in both areas. The main purpose of the development corporation is to provide small industry with sufficient money to employ people, to stop imports and to help with exports. The first job is to employ people. Whether they are employed in Toronto or 100 miles from Toronto makes no difference to me. I would think that hon. members will find as we go into the months ahead that the majority of the money is going to be channelled. We do not have to give mortgage money in the city of Toronto; I can take hon. members out to 100 plants that are vacant, ready to be rented. The mortgage money certainly will not be used in Toronto, but I would hesitate to say that we will not use some of this money for equipment for a small manufacturer in Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor or Cornwall, wherever the case may be.

I think the question is a good one. Certainly I think our money is going to be channelled into the areas to help decentralize industry. To my mind, from what I have been able to gather from my experience in talking around the province, the greatest problem is to find the bricks and mortar.

Either that you can rent from somebody or, if they have to be built, where do you get the mortgage money? I do not know which comes first—the chicken or the egg. But I think that the money we will provide for bricks and mortar will help decentralize industry into the areas that the hon. member talks about.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question before this bill is carried? Is any of this money going to be available for new industry—that is, new companies in formation? Or does the company have to be in operation before any of this money would be made available to them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, this will be available for companies that are in business, or for new companies coming in.

I might just say this. The hon. member asked a question about our investment opportunity missions to the United States. If an American company says we would like to come over, and we need some equity capital, we are in a position, if they will go into the areas we are talking about, of putting up some equity capital.

Motion agreed to; second reading of Bills 90 and 91.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 93, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: I would like if I may, Mr. Speaker, to have one brief comment on Bill 93. I question the provision in section two, which provides that in the case of a duly qualified medical practitioner, if it is held by the court that he should not have been called to the court, the person who has called him will suffer a penalty in costs.

It seems to me that this is quite an unreasonable position to put anyone in who is engaged in a lawsuit and determines, in the best of faith, that it is best to call the qualified medical practitioner. At least if he is called, it provides the other side with the opportunity to cross-examine the person on his vive voce evidence. I do not see any reason why The Evidence Act should now place the duly qualified medical practitioner in a preferred position and in some way assist him in avoiding having to appear in court. This appears to be the purpose of that section.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps inform the House that the provisions of this bill, An Act to amend The Evidence Act, really arose as a result of the report of the Attorney General's committee on medical evidence in court in civil cases.

This report, a very substantial study, was presented during the last session and was tabled in the last session of this House. Dated February, 1965, the report was prepared as a direction to a committee to make a complete study of the matter of medical evidence. The committee originally, the basic committee, was the Hon. James C. McRuer, the former chief justice of the high court, and William B. Common. To those two were added, at the request of the law society, Mr. Joseph Sedgewick, Mr. G. Arthur Martin, Mr. Brendan O'Brien, and then from the medical association, Dr. R. J. M. Galloway, Dr. W. Hurst Brown, Dr. J. C. Richardson and Dr. Glen Sawyer, and then on the death of Dr. Brown, Dr. Fred A. Jaffey.

This report made the recommendations which are incorporated in this bill and they will be found, I think, on page 87 of the report.

One of the recommendations at page 87, and I read now from the report:

> Statutory provisions should be made for the admission in evidence in the discretion of the trial judge of medical reports when signed by a duly qualified medical practitioner authorized to practise in Canada without the author of the report attending in court to give evidence.

Then the report goes on in the nature of the legislation proposed.

Well, we were not just prepared to accept the recommendation only of this committee, but we referred the matter upon receipt of the report of the Attorney General's committee to the law reform commission and this was done a few months ago. That commission, of which you know the composition, considered the matter and reported back favourably on the recommendation of the Attorney General's committee.

As I say, the committee was made up not only of eminent counsel, but of doctors as well, and actually two studies have been done in the matter, one an original study, and

one a very thorough review. The same remarks which I am making now, I perhaps anticipate, and may say apply to the next bill, which is the amendment to The Judicature Act. I might just add this, that there are, as you can tell from this report, perhaps some of the hon. members may have read it, there were a number of recommendations. They have all been dealt with, or are being dealt with.

Certain of them required legislative action, which would come from this bill and the amendment to The Judicature Act, the others can be effected by the rules committee and those things are being carried out.

So all the recommendations of this report are being dealt with in one way or the other.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. Attorney General has pretty well anticipated what the general tenor of my remarks is going to be. I rather enjoyed this report. I thought it was a good one, I thought it made some very excellent recommendations and I just did not think that the amendments to The Evidence Act, or the one amendment to The Evidence Act, captured even a fraction of the substantial recommendations in the report.

I am satisfied to wait now until I see the amendments to the rules. The hon. Attorney General has said, if I understood him correctly, that substantially all the recommendations are being implemented either in this Act, The Judicature Act or in the rules of practice.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Mr. Singer: Because, as I say, I think this was a very good report and it is certainly a field of law that can be substantially improved and if we move generally in line with the substantial tenor of these recommendations, it will be a good step forward.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps have added that these bills—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder if the Minister would wait until all the members have spoken and then perhaps he could recap all the remarks that have been made.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I see a great weakness in this particular amendment, not so much in the main, as the hon. member for Riverdale stated, but in another regard.

The amendment with reference to medical evidence leaves a wide loophole in my respectful submission, Mr. Speaker, in that it presumes that every doctor, simply because he is a licensed practitioner, is competent to make a clear and concise report.

There are many reports made by doctors which have crossed my desk which are a lot of gibberish and therefore it becomes necessary to call a doctor to determine exactly what he was trying to say. I have had some in handwriting which I have actually had to mail back to the doctor and ask him to type it out.

Furthermore, if this particular amendment provided that it would be compulsory for a doctor who is to be called as a witness, or who could be called as a witness, or who would be a competent witness, to submit a medical report, a report in writing, so that the court could then determine from looking at this written report whether or not it would have sufficed, I could then see the validity of the amendment in section 2.

But for a judge merely to state that in his opinion it was unnecessary to call a doctor as an expert witness, that the same evidence could have been submitted in a report, then I believe it is presuming that every doctor is competent to make a report, and knows how to make a detailed report. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is a false assumption and it is going to lead to much abuse.

I can understand the principle which inspired the hon. Attorney General to introduce this section. He is trying to cut down on the high cost of litigation, where lawyers bring in doctor after doctor and all they do is repeat the same evidence given by the first doctor.

In many cases the evidence could have been in the form of a medical report. But unless the hon. Attorney General is prepared to deem every medical practitioner to be in a position to make a good report and makes it compulsory for such a report to be submitted to the court in addition to the oral evidence so that the court can determine whether that report was, in fact, sufficient, I respectfully submit that this particular section has absolutely no meaning whatsoever.

Now while we are on amendments to The Evidence Act, I am wondering when the hon. Attorney General is going to bring down an amendment which is going to make it unnecessary for so many affidavits to be sworn, especially on documents for registration or for submission to the court.

Surely the legal profession should be enabled to simply sign a certificate that they

certify that the contents are true and their word should suffice to that extent. If they make false certificates, then I suggest the law society is there to look after them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, just a final word perhaps with respect to the remarks made by the last hon. member. I do not know that I can do anything about his apprehension as to the qualification of doctors. This Act provides for the submission or the admission of a written report by a doctor and his remarks seem to be directed to the qualification of the doctor making the report.

Mr. Ben: Qualifications to write a report!

Hon Mr. Wishart: The qualifications will not be any better if the doctor appears in court. That is not going to improve his status or his standing. It is true it gives an opportunity for cross-examination but I think the hon. member has not read the report to which I referred, because there are further provisions and provisions related in the next Act which we will be dealing with. The committee recommended: "Statutory provisions should be made for the admission in evidence in the discretion of the trial judge of medical reports, signed by a duly qualified medical practitioner authorized to practise in Canada."

Now, his qualifications are determined by his scholastic standing and his training in his profession by the college of physicians and surgeons. Then a further recommendation: "Where in the opinion of the court a doctor is required to attend in court to give evidence which could have been satisfactorily received through a medical report, the court should have authority in its discretion to assess appropriate costs against the party calling the doctor."

Those recommendations come from the doctors, and from very eminent counsel and I think they are good recommendations.

I would just say this, that it really is for the benefit of parties in civil actions and their counsel and to save the time and expense of those parties. Because, as I am sure all hon. members are aware, there are so many cases where doctors, physicians and surgeons find themselves engaged in very necessary work in hospitals, perhaps in serious cases engaged in the midst of operations; they are subpoenaed but they cannot leave; if they are able to come, quite often by the very nature of proceedings in civil actions they are summoned to come at 10 o'clock and it may be 2 o'clock in the afternoon before they are reached, by the very nature of proceedings in our courts. This cannot be helped.

In the taking of these reports and in examination and in the further extended type of examination which we are providing in this Act and in The Judicature Act, the legislation will enable another doctor to be present, will actually in some cases enable counsel to be present at the examination; it will enable other members of the medical profession to be present to represent the other side of the case, if I may make that point clear.

So, a report by the medical men on either side received in these circumstances will have been reviewed. The subject, the party, the patient will have been examined by other medical men and I think when you understand that these precautions and safeguards are provided, that this is a very worthwhile recommendation.

I would just say this further, Mr. Speaker, that all the bills on which I will be moving second reading of this evening, it is intended they shall go to the committee on legal bills. At that point, we may discuss this further.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid the members are getting away from—will the member please be seated—getting away from the true intent and procedure in the second reading of bills.

First of all, the member introducing the bill may speak twice if he has the unanimous consent of the House just to sort of recap what the other members have said. Other members are to speak once only to the bill.

Lately I notice the trend, because we have been doing so much committee work, that we get into a question-and-answer type of debate of which much is not relevant to the bill in question. It has nothing to do with the principles incorporated into the bill before the House.

As the Attorney General just mentioned, these bills are intended to go to the standing committee as well as coming before the House in committee of the whole and there is plenty of opportunity at that time if members have questions that they want answered, that may be either relevant or perhaps irrelevant to the particular bill in question. So I would ask the members to try to get back to the true or the proper debating form in second reading.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I understand the bill is going to the committee on legal bills, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is correct.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 94, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on Bill 94 and at the risk of requiring the hon. Attorney General to comment again on the very same report, I would point out that I do not think that anyone is going to object to the principle embodied in section 2 of the bill, that a qualified medical practitioner would be entitled to ask questions arising as a result of the examination which he is conducting.

I think that such a section as this deserves at least the direct protection of the person who is being examined to make certain that he is entitled to have counsel present and that he does not need to answer any questions unless he has the benefit of counsel.

Here we have a certain situation under this bill, as I understand it, where first of all under the preceding bill the medical report can be signed by the medical practitioner stating the results of his examination and under this bill you then have a provision that included in that report can be a series of questions and answers which may be very wide of the mark as far as relevancy is concerned.

It seems to me that during the course of the question-and-answer part of the examination, even though it takes place either subsequent to or immediately preceding the actual physical examination, the person being examined, if he is going to be questioned by the medical practitioner, should be specifically told that he is entitled to have his counsel present at the time the questions are being asked and answered.

It is all very well, and I note the report to which the hon. Attorney General refers is a first-class report, but it is also true that was a report drawn up by highly qualified members of two very specialized professions. I think in the course of that kind of examination of these very technical questions on the admissibility of evidence, it is sometimes lost sight of that there should be specific provision that the person being subject to this examination or the person doing such an act, should not be required as in the previous instance, to bear the costs or in this second instance to be subject to an examination without a specific right to be told that he is entitled to have counsel present during the questions.

Mr. Ben: With all due respect to the hon. Attorney General, I do believe that in this particular instance, as with the previous bill introduced, that the medical profession needled him into making these amendments.

Now, as pointed out by my friend, the hon. member for Riverdale, this amendment makes a medical practitioner next to a saint. It imposes no protection against improper questions and makes him completely infallible. Any duly qualified medical practitioner may, in connection with an examination under subsection 1, ask the person being examined any question that may be relevant to the purpose of the examination.

In a previous piece of legislation it was presumed that every medical practitioner knew how to make a comprehensive and accurate report of his findings. Now here, he also becomes a legal expert and is permitted to decide which questions and answers may, or may not be, relevant. There is no provision in this amendment that the questions and answers taken down verbatim in shorthand—it is going to be sufficient that his power of recall in a medical report will enable the judge to accurately decide what the weight of this evidence is.

In 1 (c) it prohibits a solicitor or counsel of the party being examined being present to advise his client whether these questions are, in fact, relevant, and whether or not they should be answered.

I fail to see what has possessed the hon. Attorney General to bring in these amendments. I made some criticisms of a private bill the other day, saying that it was half-baked—and with all due respect to the Attorney General—I can only use the same phrase here. He waves a red book at us saying, "It is in the book," as if the book was the Bible itself.

Now the recommendations may be in that book, but I do suggest that the hon. Attorney General being the chief law officer of this province and if not himself, through his staff, should be able to draft proper legislation. It is his job to protect the rights of the citizens and of the individuals. I suggest that here he is actually completely disregarding protection for the people he is supposed to be protecting.

I do not know what influence the medical profession has over this hon. gentleman, but

obviously he has gone off into a dream or something because although I have great regard for him—I sit here and watch him give frank and honest answers—I cannot believe that the hon. Attorney General of this province actually thinks that these amendments are adequate for the purposes for which he intends them to be. I would strongly suggest he give consideration before these matters go to committee to the objections that have been made by the hon. member for Riverdale and myself, and bring in amendments to maintain the principle he is trying to introduce, but with safeguards for the subjects of the Crown.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, with great respect for my colleague, the hon. member for Bracondale, I cannot share the alarm that he brings forward in connection with this matter. I would think that anyone who has practised before the negligence bar would have some understanding of the problems that are faced in presenting matters of medical evidence and the great difficulties that face counsel in these cases.

I would commend to my colleague, the hon. member for Bracondale, the report that is there and which I am sure he has never read, and commended to him, subsequent to that, the reading of these bills. I am sure that he will agree that with the caution mentioned by the hon. member for Riverdale, there is some good sense in what is brought forth.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 95, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 96, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 98, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE POLICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 99, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, with reference to subsection 2—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member remember that when he gets speaking about sections and subsections, he is really into a discussion of committee of the whole House?

Mr. Ben: It was the principle I was about to discuss.

Mr. Speaker: The member would have to speak on the principles involved in the whole bill.

If the member is going to deal with a subsection, I respectfully suggest that as the bill is gone over in committee of the whole House, section by section and subsection by subsection, the member has plenty of opportunity to cover those minor points.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, in order to find a principle, one has to look at the bill. I would think it would be logical to look for a principle in a section. If one is going to speak about a principle, he draws the attention of the House to a particular section to point out where a principle may be lacking. But as the Speaker sees another—

Mr. Speaker: If the member now wants to speak to a principle in the bill, I am not denying him. I thought that he was trying to get down to a small section on some detail that he was going to ask a question about.

Mr. Ben: With all due respect, I think that Mr. Speaker has been jumpy tonight.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CONSUMER PROTECTION BUREAU

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 100, An Act to establish and provide for the duties of a consumer protection bureau.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is possible to call Bill 100 and Bill 101 together, as the two of them are really the same? I acknowledge that you do not want the second reading passed, or are you going to second reading on 101?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: For passing, too?

Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine.

BUYERS OF CONSUMER GOODS

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 101, An Act to provide for the protection of buyers of consumer goods and for the fair disclosure of the cost of credit.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, before this is called, the hon. Prime Minister at the conclusion of business last night listed a certain number of orders. I do not think that order number 22 was listed in that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, it was.

Mr. Singer: Was it? I am sorry.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with regard to both of these bills. As far as they go, they are satisfactory, but in both instances, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that they do not go far enough.

Certainly in the instance of Bill 101, the government is not going far enough in that it does not intend to put the Act into effect this year, for reasons that I do not think are valid.

Let me deal first with the consumer protection bureau, as outlined in Bill 100. The basic criticism that we would have of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it appears to be designed to deal primarily, if not exclusively, with consumer problems or with credit problems. For example, I draw to your attention section 1, part 2, which reads:

> (2) The consumer protection bureau shall
>
> (a) disseminate information for the purpose of educating and advising consumers respecting lending and borrowing procedures;
>
> (b) promote and assist existing counselling services in respect of consumer credit;
>
> (c) receive and investigate complaints of conduct in contravention of legislation for the protection of consumers;
>
> (d) enforce legislation—

so that in (c) and (d) you move into references to what Bill 101 includes.

However, I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that consumer credit is not the only problem that consumers have to be protected against in today's marketing conditions. You have not only the frauds that are related to credit problems and others, as we shall see in Bill 101, but you have the quasi-fraud conditions that today are practised by many of our big corporations who market a great many products and put them on the shelves for purposes of attracting the attention of the consumers. You have the problem that we dealt with so many times in the House, so I will not take any great length of time tonight to detail it—the problem of odd weights and odd sizes, so that it is virtually impossible for the consumer to get some estimate of what he is paying per pound or per ounce. You have related to this misleading advertising. You have another field that I suppose, because of this government's basic philosophy, they would be very hesitant to move into—but I suggest to the hon. Attorney General that if we are really going to protect consumers, that it a major area of concern—and this is the whole field of administered prices. Certainly nothing is done at the Ottawa level in any of the supervisory agencies there in terms of effective policing of administered prices, Mr. Speaker, which result in consumers being fleeced unnecessarily in today's marketing conditions.

So that as far as the bill goes, it is fine, but it does not go far enough. Conceivably some of the vague phraseology we see in (e) "perform any other duties given to it by any Act" means that the door is open for the Attorney General either now, through regulations, or later through the passage of another Act, to add further responsibilities to this protection bureau. My plea to him would be that the deficiencies in the range of its responsibilities already suggest that the hon. Attorney General should be giving consideration to it.

When we get to Bill 101, Mr. Speaker, the items listed for legislation here constitute virtually all of the major recommendations of the select committee on consumer credit of which I had the honour of being a member.

All of them, sir, are important areas in which consumers have been facing difficulties for quite some time. Indeed, for so long that one wonders why this government did not move years ago.

And that being the case, I am very puzzled as to why the government is seizing on the excuse that the consumer protection bureau needs a year to get established and to work out the machinery before they can put this law into effect.

In effect, what the government is doing is giving those now active in the field in terms of gouging the consumer or defrauding the consumer, another year in which they can pursue their practices.

I think that this is unnecessary; indeed, I received a call just a couple of days ago; I received another example to illustrate the kind of thing that goes on. When I talked to certain people in the government—I will leave them unnamed—who had had some responsibility in tracking down this problem, I could not help but note that they were looking forward to the day—and I suspect wondering why we had to wait for a year—for such things as the two-day cooling-off period, so that people who had been high-pressured into contracts could get out of that contract themselves intead of finding themselves caught with all of the consequent difficulties.

This was a case, once again, of the old problem of the sale of aluminum sidings. The salesman happened to be from a company—I blush mildly in reporting it—from the town of Weston, which is in my own constituency, but he was operating up in the town of Timmins. He came in with the old gimmick that if this person would let his house be used as a model in the community, that he would not have to pay anything. These were the words that were said to this couple who did not read the contract well. On the contract—and they signed it, so legally they are stuck—the price is $2,200. A little later in the contract it says that they would get $100 for every other home to which the company was directed. Now, I learned that the anti-racket squad in the past year has moved in on this particular company and that the president and two of its chief officers are today spending a little time in the penitentiary.

I congratulate the government on this action. I wish it had taken place years ago. I do not know why it took all this time to come to grips with one case, and test it in the courts and secure a court judgment that this is a fraudulent practice.

The hon. Attorney General will be painfully aware of the fact that this business of using one family or one home as a model with which to try to get other people in the community to purchase something, whether it be aluminum sidings, Encyclopedia Britannicas or what you will, is a very familiar practice in many areas of retailing.

But the problem does not end there, Mr. Speaker, and this is the reason why I wonder why the hon. Attorney General wants to let these problems multiply unnecessarily. This man has paid something like $500 or $600 in the last 18 months on this contract, but he now finds that he still has the original $2,200 plus $1,100 in finance payments, a total of $3,300, even though he has paid some $500 or $600. He has quit paying them, but the finance company, which happens to be a Toronto-based finance company with a branch company in Sudbury, of course is going to be going after him.

So here you have this whole chain of circumstances. I was told when I was discussing this that the general retort of people in the hon. Attorney General's department to finance companies who lament their problems where the company making the original sale has been convicted and its top officials are in the penitentiary, that the comment to the finance company is, "Well, if you are going to deal in hot paper of this nature, you can expect to lose some money."

This is all very well but it does not provide any protection for the person who was caught in the first instance and who is likely going to find himself in the courts.

Now I will say to the hon. Attorney General—I appreciate that officers in his department are going to look into this to see what can be done.

But, Mr. Speaker, between now and a year from now you are going to have hundreds, indeed thousands, of people who are going to be caught in door-to-door selling, in various other practices which are listed in Bill 101 and to which we now see the prospect of some ending. And I do not know why you have to wait.

If there are bugs in the legislation, if there are difficulties in the administration of the legislation and its enforcement, I suggest that the quickest way to find out those bugs and to seek out these difficulties is to put the legislation into effect. Let's get the show on the road, so to speak. I repeat, I see no reason for this delay and I would like the hon. Attorney General to give us some more convincing explanation as to why he feels he must wait for this time, because the net result of his action is going to be to tolerate the practices of these people for another year unnecessarily.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I was delayed coming into the House tonight but I understand we are discussing both the bills together, is that it? There is not any doubt I think in the mind of anyone in the House that there has been a great need for legislation of this kind. That has been demonstrated by hon. members of all parties, I think, over the last number of years, who have given instances

where an injustice was made by an unscrupulous buyer or seller and I think the reasons for legislation of this kind have been set out rather clearly.

I think the government is to be congratulated, Mr. Speaker, on the move they have made toward the implementation of legislation that will erase some of the difficulties that have been experienced by people throughout the province for many years.

Now, in the first Bill, 100, I do not know that there are any grave differences of opinion; it might be argued, of course, that some of the provisions do not go quite far enough, perhaps others go too far, but as we move into the establishment of the setup under Bill 100, surely then we will be able to find out and to determine if there are deficiencies and they can be remedied.

Then in respect to Bill 101, as the hon. member for York South has said, I think it is to the credit of the government that they have included in this bill all the major recommendations of the committee and those recommendations were very far-reaching in character. They invaded new fields of legislation, so far as this province is concerned, and went a long way towards providing the machinery for erasing this difficulty in this problem.

As my hon. friend from York South has said, the one thing that bothers me—and I suppose bothers most hon. members of the House who are concerned about this matter—is the apparent delay that accompanies the implementation of the recommendations in Bill 101. I cannot for the life of me understand why the government fails to move in this session by passing this legislation. If we do not pass it this session, it simply means that we will have delayed action in this very important field for at least another year. I cannot for the life of me understand why this is necessary.

I was not on the committee during the first year of its operation, but I was during the latter months of its work, and I am quite sure from my knowledge of that committee's work that it was a very exhaustive study of the whole problem.

We interviewed people from far and wide, people whose interests will be affected by the provisions of this bill. They knew exactly what the provisions in the recommendations were going to be. It was all hammered out and their objections were heard. Some of them were heeded, others of them were argued down by the members of the committee. There was ample opportunity for all concerned to be heard, for all arguments for and against the recommendations to be presented. We went down to the United States, to California, to New York, to other areas where this legislation is in effect at the present time. We examined the legislation in those areas, we brought our conclusions back here to Ontario, talked those conclusions over with the interests that we are concerned about in this bill. I cannot see for the life of me why the public are not prepared for the passage of this bill and why the interests, who might be affected by the terms of the bill, have not been fully made aware of what the bill contains and are fully prepared, I would say, to meet the consequences and to meet the letter of the law as it is written in this bill.

There is not any need whatever for another year's delay. Why can we not, Mr. Attorney General, through you, Mr. Speaker, why can we not pass Bill 100 and Bill 101 and in 101 say that this bill shall not come into effect until, I do not care when, July 1, or sometime about that time, so there will be an opportunity for the administrative machinery to be set up and the operation commenced in an orderly manner?

There is not any need whatever from an administrative point of view, as I see it, for a year's delay in the implementation of the provisions of this bill. And if we simply carry it through, as is suggested here, to second reading, and then let it lapse until the next session of the Legislature, then I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Attorney General, that then you will come to us and ask what we are suggesting to you tonight. You will ask at that time, a year from now, that an opportunity be given three or four months hence, in order to bring the bill into effect. We can do it this year, as well as we can do it next year. There are no obstacles, I suggest, in the way of bringing this bill into operation.

The need for bringing it in is apparent. It is everywhere recognized that there have been great difficulties in the field in which this bill operates, or seeks to operate and any delay on the part of the government beyond that point which is necessary for the establishment of administrative set-up, I would say is not warranted in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I was—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Ben: I am always out of order.

I was very interested in hearing the remarks made by the hon. leader of the NDP because, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the very situation that he described is not covered in this bill.

That is the situation where a seller, itinerant seller, whether he be selling siding or books or something else, has a conditional sales contract executed, to which is attached a promissory note, either perforated, or how have you, and that note is subsequently detached and is assigned or sold to the holder in due course.

Subsequently the holder in due course sues the maker of the note, because the maker, the chap who signed the contract, having found out he was swindled has stopped paying the company from whom he has bought these goods. Because of that, he finds himself in court on this promissory note.

Now there are provisions in this legislation which allegedly compel the seller to give a statement to the assignee and there is a provision in this proposed bill to impose a heavy penalty for failure to give such a statement, but the maker of the note is still liable to the assignee.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Subject to the equities between maker and assignor.

Mr. Ben: No, he is not, with all due respect. He is liable to the assignee, to the holder in due course, because I could understand the hon. Attorney General's predicament, promissory notes come under federal legislation. The maker is still liable to the holder in due course on that note.

There is a provision here that if the lender, or the seller, did not provide to the assignee, or if he was an assignee to the subsequent assignee, certain statements containing certain information, that under those circumstances the maker—that is the person who purchased the goods and got taken by these sidings or what-have-you—has the right to indemnity from the lender or seller.

But who uses these kind of tactics? The fly-by-nights. The kind that the hon. Attorney General would like to put behind bars, but most often cannot because they are limited companies with straw directors, who swarm into an area, sell sidings or pots and pans or encyclopedias or what-have-you, in the space of three or four weeks or three or four months, or half a year, and they are out before the finance company starts suing the people who bought them.

Now, what good, may I ask, what good is it having an indemnity, the right to indemnity? What good is it having the right to file the indemnity order in a court office, if there is no one against whom that indemnity order can be enforced? How much better off is that little Joe who got taken by these fly-by-nights under this bill, than he was before it was introduced, or if it goes into effect after it is passed? There is still no protection for the little man. He has a little order, it is called an indemnity order that he can go waving around, if he can find somebody to enforce it against, if this person that he does find has any assets whatsoever.

Now I admire the principle that the hon. Attorney General tries to introduce here, but I submit that it fails utterly to protect that one individual, the common man that is taken by these high pressure itinerant salesmen, and I think that the Attorney General should give some consideration to that.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I want to simply raise my voice against the idea of delay of Bill 101 for the extra 12 months. Some years ago, we were discussing the subject of this bill—I think the first year I was in this House. It was the matter of very active discussion. We have been talking about it each year since and we have felt right through that some action ought to be taken and I think that we are in agreement on all sides of the House that that action should be taken here.

Those of us who are representing developing ridings find ourselves in constant difficulty because of this. People are coming to us constantly because a salesman has taken them, promised them certain goods and then those goods turn out to be something different.

Not long ago a salesman showed a sample of a rug to a constituent of mine and the next day the people moved in to put the rug on the floor. They protested that this was not the rug that they had bought, it was not like the sample, but the contract specified a certain rug—the name was right and the rug was put on the floor according to the contract but, unfortunately, the sample did not correspond with the name on the contract.

This kind of thing is happening all the time, in this field, and in many fields. So all of us, in that kind of riding where new houses are being built all the time, and where people are moving constantly, find that problem.

It seems to me to be nothing more than sheer political irresponsibility on the part of

this government to postpone Bill 101 for another year.

It may be that certain interests want to make representations. Well, send the bill to the committee and let them make the representations this year and get this bill back to this House and have the second and third readings and make it legislation, so that the people who are looking to us in this Legislature for protection against this kind of skulduggery in the province can be protected.

It is senseless to wait another year in which thousands of our people will be taken in the way that they will be taken. Perhaps they were a little too trustful, but they take people at their word and then they find themselves in real difficulty.

We can end that this year, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to end it, and that this bill should be legislated in the year 1966.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the government has taken on to itself a variety of approaches insofar as the reports of select committees have been concerned. In my time in this House, the government has received, I think, a number of very excellent reports from the select committees. Most of them have been unanimous or near unanimous, and each time one has come in, sir, the various Cabinet Ministers — the various government leaders — have, from time to time not only in this House, but outside of it, taken credit for an advance in thinking, comparing the progress of this province with other provinces.

As late as this afternoon we saw government spokesmen patting themselves on the back and heard them taking credit for the advanced intelligence that led to bringing in the select committee report on municipal affairs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We get tired of waiting for the hon. member to pat us on the back.

Mr. Singer: Well, I patted the hon. Minister on the back many times for whatever role he and his colleagues took in bringing in the report on automobile insurance. I have been begging them to implement that and we have not had too much luck with that request.

But there is another instance, the Stewart report—and my friend, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions should be familiar with it—another unanimous report, the Stewart report on reform institutions, which made some excellent recommendations which have been gathering dust on the shelves for many, many years now.

But back to the select committee report on consumer credit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member pats me on the back again, but he has a knife in his hand.

Mr. Singer: This was a report of a committee that sat for two years—a good committee, a committee representing all the parties of this House, a committee which received all sorts of briefs, a committee which lent eager attention to the task that had been assigned to it and a committee who brought in a near-unanimous report. The hon. member for Eglinton disagreed with one particular point, insofar as the effects of the recommendations were concerned, but substantially, he was in agreement with most of the recommendations in the report.

During the hearings of that committee, the persons affected, the credit associations, the large department stores and all of the various facets of our economic system that were concerned with this, came before the committee and made representations after substantial study of the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how the government can resist the plea made by my colleague, the hon. member for Grey South. He was a member of that committee and he with his colleagues on the committee joined with their deliberations and heard all the representations that were made. He was one of the draftsmen of that report.

The people for whom the hon. Attorney General wants to wait, know full well what was in the report; they know full well what the statute that is before us tonight contains. Has the hon. Attorney General received further representations from these people to delay, and if so, what is the nature of those representations?

My friend knows the representations that were made to the legal bills committee the other morning, by an association, against the enactment of The Securities Act, and if you take one particular brief at face value, the proponents of that brief suggest:

1. That The Securities Act is unconstitutional, and if that does not work,

2. Let us wait until everybody in Canada enacts the same Act at the same time; and if that does not work the three or four new principles that are of substantial value in that bill are no good for the particular reasons that they set out.

It was obvious, sir, when that brief was submitted—and we are going to hear more about that as the discussion on that and other

pieces of legislation come forward, that the people who put forward that brief do not want the new Securities Act.

Now, if there are objections to Bill 101, it would be my submission that those objections are about as important as the objections that have been brought forward to The Securities Act. The people who are putting forward the objections, if they make them sincerely, are putting them forward in order to forestall the enactment of this Act now, next year and ever.

If the government believes that this is a good report—and I think they have to pay very much attention to the recommendations of the committee—if the government believes that the remarks included in His Honour's speech at the beginning of this Legislature had any value, if the government believes that when they charge their Attorney General with bringing forward Bill 100 and Bill 101, they are speaking with one voice, then I say, sir, that the government has the duty and the responsibility to bring forward this legislation now—not next year, the year after or several years after, but now.

The words of my colleague, the hon. member for Grey South, are so obvious. If you need time to set up the proper administrative machinery, take one month, two months, three months—but let us make the commitment that apparently the government has decided it is going to make. Let us not postpone it and let us not keep pushing off the evil hour until this government is prepared to face up to the situation that brought forward the select committee that brought forward its report and that brought forward this legislation.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on these two bills. Like other speakers, I would like to compliment the government on a first and much-needed step in this regard and I certainly feel that this will be appreciated by most of the business people in our province and the various chambers of commerce and other associations that from time to time have to deal with problems of this nature.

I would also like to underline the position taken by the hon. member for Grey South in that I would like to see this enacted during this present session. In reviewing the principles of this bill, I have found two areas that possibly are not covered. I have tried to determine whether they are or not, and I would like to point these out to the hon. Attorney General in the hope that possibly they can be included in the regulations and, if not, in the principle of the bill.

There is an area covering itinerant salesmen, and I feel that there is a differentiation between itinerant salesmen and transient traders.

In the rural areas of Ontario, many of the small communities are beset by people who move in for short periods of time and actually set up shop, operating under a municipal transient trader's licence where such is in force. Often these are under the guise of auctions with the blitz advertising of an area and the transient trader moves on, and basically has no permanent base of operation. And I would hope that the hon. Attorney General will take a second look at this area and see if some inclusions could be made in this bill.

Under section 13 there is the principle concerning false advertising, but I do feel that possibly embodied in these bills there should be guidelines to an advertising code for the business people of our province. It is not enough simply to enforce infractions of false advertising but there possibly should be some leadership in this area and guidelines laid down.

Again, I would reiterate I would like to see this enacted this session and I feel that this is very worthwhile as far as it has gone.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my few comments to this bill in support of the bill in asking that it be passed at this session and not be delayed for another year because it is so sorely needed throughout the business community.

The bill does cover unethical salesmen, it covers the cost of credits and so forth, the cost of borrowing money, but it in my estimation leaves out or does not cover sufficiently truth in packaging. I think this is a field that is needed today because not only do you find these slick salesmen but you also have big reputable manufacturers who use unethical practices when it comes to packaging their merchandise. You even get a big organization like *Reader's Digest* that will come along and say "Free."

Free for what? Free for inspection. That is all. But the individual who looks at the advertisement assumes that he can get the article free of charge.

I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Attorney General some of these modern packaging approaches used. For an example, there is the method of concealing

net content. You would have on a package or a bottle—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think—I am very interested in what the hon. member is apparently about to say, he has indicated it will be on the matter of packaging and description of goods. I would, however, point out that both these two bills that we are talking about have to do with credit.

Mr. Bryden: They have to do with more than that. One of them is entitled, "An Act to provide for the protection of buyers of consumer goods." Admittedly it does not cover what the hon. member is trying to raise and that is one of the criticisms.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let me make my point. The bill he is talking about, at least the one that has provisions in it about the sale of goods, has to do with credit buying. But I do not think the packaging comes in this bill.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I cannot discuss truth in packaging, then I will probably bring it up at some other time. However, I would like to conclude my remarks in saying that the need for the protecting of the consumer is very, very essential. Senator Hart of the state of Michigan has been attempting to have legislation passed in the U.S. Senate that would cover not only the part of the remarks that I had made, and that is truth in packaging, but also the borrowing of money.

This interest in safeguarding the public, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. The old slogan that is used: "Let the buyer beware," surely is outdated today. Buyers or borrowers should beware, but they should have a proper chance to protect themselves by adequate laws and information.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I did speak on the cooling-off period in a Budget debate last year, I thought perhaps I would just say a few words concerning this legislation.

As has been said before tonight, we welcome this legislation, we think it is good legislation, there are a number of things—and I do not want to repeat any more than possible, but I think there are a couple of points that we should underscore.

The one thing is that it would seem to us that the logical move would be to bring the bill into being and make it operative immediately or upon passage in this House. I think the period of a year to determine from the business community and all interested parties their reaction of the bill is needless and unnecessary. I hope the hon. Attorney General will reconsider his position in this regard.

Relative to the cooling-off period, I mentioned in my speech that I felt—and this was borne out by experience in other countries where they do have this type of legislation—that the necessary cooling-off period should be at least 72 hours. And I notice here in this bill it is a 48-hour cooling-off period and I would ask the hon. Attorney General to perhaps reconsider that point.

However, I will have more to say in that regard in committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker, I re-emphasize again that this is good legislation, we feel the need for it is obvious, but we beg the hon. Attorney General to reconsider his position on Bill 101.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee which studied this, I would certainly like to support Bill 100 that is before us.

Now, it has been indicated we are going to set up a consumer protection bureau. This has a lot of merit, it is overdue. Certainly it is needed in a city such as Toronto, particularly where we have had lots of reports of unscrupulous dealings. This will help a lot of people to get information, it will give them advice as to what they can do, how they can avoid certain transactions and it has a psychological effect upon a certain type of operator who does act improperly and in an unscrupulous manner.

As far as Bill 100 is concerned, I think there is a lot of merit in it and I am glad to see that it is before the House now, and, as I say, I think perhaps it is somewhat overdue.

In connection with Bill 101, I do not share the opinion that has been expressed by some of my hon. colleagues in the House. It seems to me that there is a lot of merit in waiting for a period of one year. I think it could be argued that most of us in the consumer credit committee wanted to see some type of a consumer plan of this nature that would be helpful to all people. The thought that has been expressed and has been expressed even in this House tonight is that everybody in business or a lot of people in business operate in an unscrupulous manner. I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are very few people in business who operate in this

way. Most people in business operate in a manner that is most respectable. And as far as the two-day cooling off period or three-day or four-day, in many instances this exists now, particularly with large places such as Eaton's or Simpson's or many large merchandisers.

Mr. Bryden: This does not apply to them.

Mr. Reilly: Oh yes, this applies to anybody who is operating a business.

Mr. MacDonald: Door-to-door.

Mr. Bryden: Just itinerant salesmen?

Mr. Reilly: Oh no, there are several phases of it in this particular bill and a two-day cooling off period is only one—the hon. member refers to the itinerant salesmen, they are included here along with other facets of consumer protection. Many of these things are worthwhile and should be incorporated in the bill and we should try to protect these consumers. But let us not leave the impression that everybody who is in business is a crook.

Mr. MacDonald: Who is saying that?

Mr. Reilly: I said let us not leave the impression.

Mr. MacDonald: Because we have laws with regard to murder does not suggest that the whole society is made up of murderers.

Mr. Reilly: It is all right for some hon. members in this House to stand up and say they are going to allow them to continue to gouge and defraud the public. Well, now, people in business, legitimate business, are not out to gouge or defraud because they would not continue for very long in legitimate business.

Mr. MacDonald: So you let those who do go on their way gouging—

Mr. Reilly: Now, I hold no brief for the unscrupulous merchant. Absolutely none.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right. We want the bill in there to catch him—

Mr. Reilly: What the hon. member for York South is bringing to the attention of this House is not covered by this bill. He, himself, earlier tonight admitted that the anti-fraud squad dealt with the situation that was fraudulent, and it is already covered and the bill has not been introduced.

Mr. Young: But the guy is still caught.

Mr. Reilly: Yes. Now, my friend from Yorkview, the hon. member for Yorkview has used an illustration from the standpoint of somebody putting down a rug, and coming back 24 hours later with an improper rug, that has nothing to do with this bill at all.

Mr. Bryden: Well then, the bill is even more inadequate than we thought.

Mr. MacDonald: It should be.

Mr. Reilly: Are hon. members of this House going to try to protect consumers from purchasing things they want? In some instances they may want to blame the merchants because they have made wrong decisions. People who are grown up, and are 21 years of age, and who have made certain decisions cannot be protected from themselves all the time.

Mr. Young: Salesmen put down—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reilly: No, I do not think so.

Now, it has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, in this House too, that there are some of the jurisdictions throughout United States which have put interest disclosure into effect and it has been very helpful. It was even suggested by the hon. member for Grey South that this is in effect in California and New York and places that we have visited.

Mr. Bryden: Much better legislation, I can tell you.

Mr. Reilly: I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that interest disclosure is not in effect in some of these places. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any place where it is in effect except California. It certainly is not in effect in New York city. For five years they have been debating this in New York city, and some of our hon. members have been talking about whether we should delay it for one year.

Mr. MacDonald: Why should we delay for five years?

Mr. Reilly: Because they found that it has effects, perhaps ill-effects, upon the economy, for one thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, nonsense.

Mr. Reilly: Oh, it is nonsense, my friend?

Mr. MacDonald: This is not your finest hour, my friend. I have heard you much better on other occasions.

Mr. Reilly: You know, Mr. Speaker, they say what we should do is adopt this holus-bolus and put it in here. The one objection particularly that we have argued in committee, and I would like to make sure the people understand my viewpoint in connection with it, is from the standpoint of disclosure.

Mr. Bryden: Now we are getting to the crux of the matter.

Mr. Reilly: From the standpoint of disclosure, should we disclose the cost on a percentage basis, or on a basis of a dollar? Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that there are several reasons why I have suggested that we should show disclosure on the dollar basis. The dollar basis is what we understand, what every member in this House understands. That is how we earn our money.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Reilly: All right. The hon. member for Yorkview says percentage we understand. Do we?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure!

Mr. Reilly: All right. So if we were to ask many people what is $10 on $100, most hon. members in this House immediately would say ten per cent.

Mr. Renwick: Ten per cent.

Mr. Reilly: That is right; he says so. But on the contrary, the way we pay this in blended payments in most instances, it represents 18 per cent, not ten per cent.

Mr. Bryden: That is right. That is why we want it disclosed.

Mr. Reilly: And that is why people do not understand it; it is confusing to people.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is arguing the wrong way, I think.

Mr. Reilly: Another very important point the hon. members of this House should know is that the banks have been advertising money for as long as I can remember at a maximum rate of six per cent. It has been pointed out to the committee that it was not six per cent, but on a blended payment basis it was closer to 12 per cent.

An hon. member: The member is out of order.

Mr. Reilly: Oh, am I?

An hon. member: He is a banker, that is why he says that.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, I will be guided by you. I am sure if you would like to refer to this bill you will see that disclosure of the true cost of credit, and whether we have jurisdiction over the banks or not, has effect on whether we should pass this or whether we should hold it for one year. It is entirely in order. Nothing could be more in order.

Mr. Singer: Sounds like the Canadian manufacturers association.

Mr. Reilly: If there is anything—

Mr. Singer: —from The Securities Act—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reilly: As a number of suggestions have been made, Mr. Speaker, I say if there is any wrong-doing, or any fraud, the introduction alone of this bill will help clean it up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends on my right are interested in my presentation in this House. Because they are in disagreement with some of my viewpoints is the reason why they are heckling me, but if I vote alone in connection with this, I will vote alone. I think that as far as the businessman and the consumer is concerned, it is not fair to say the banks can charge six per cent and can advertise six per cent, and turn around to business organizations and agencies and financial institutions and say you must advertise 18 or 24 per cent.

Some of these hon. members have been talking about what it costs. We have a small loans bill and it shows how much we pay on one per cent, two per cent, and three per cent, and is governed by Ottawa, the federal institution. Under these circumstances, we have no jurisdiction and no control over it. I say to you that if we had control and it was universal and it was province-wide, all right; I am prepared to accept it. This is a good idea generally, but until we do have control, and there is some definite understanding, let us not give benefits to banks and penalize lesser and smaller institutions.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member is right, but make them include the banks.

Mr. Reilly: All right. If we have any jurisdiction for including the banks, this is a different situation entirely. There is a number of situations in this bill made by the committee that are worthwhile. I think a cooling-off period is one. The prohibition against taking certain contracts and allowing those contracts to be used at any time, without specifying how they are to be used and when they are to be signed, are things that we discussed in committee and are worthwhile ideas. They are a form of protection to some of our consumers. I, as a businessman and as a consumer, want to do as much as I can to protect the consumer, Mr. Speaker. In this bill, I think we are showing wisdom if we postpone any of the drastic action that could have ill effects upon the economy of our country, that could have ill effects upon business, or could have ill effects upon the consumer, such as interest disclosure charges on a percentage basis. This is no problem for people who have all kinds of auditors and computers; there is no difficulty in connection with this.

Mr. Ben: Why haven't they been doing it, then?

Mr. Reilly: They have to an extent, I suppose, in their own bookkeeping. It is not difficult for them to do this, because they have machines and they have help. There is no problem from the standpoint of expense. I have brought to the attention of the House that it is very difficult for the smaller businessmen to be able to compete in instances like this. It is added expense, and I have told the hon. members of this House about the extra forms that have to be filled out for government purposes at extra expense.

This is extra expense, of course, to the smaller businessman and it is going to be reflected in extra costs to the consumer, make no mistake about it. He cannot absorb it and he must pass it on. He is not in the same position as a larger organization that can come along and institute all kinds of computerized methods and policies and put them into effect with the same kind of help and overhead that he has.

Mr. Ben: Education costs money.

Mr. Reilly: There is real merit in connection with delaying this for a period of a year, and I thought that I should stand up and tell the hon. members of this House how I felt about it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on this discussion pertaining to these two bills. I would like to say that I was not inspired until the last gentleman spoke. He has put me in a position where I could not sit here and listen any further without telling you what I think of these particular bills, and I believe that the majority of the committee will support me on both sides of the House.

Bill 100 was designed for a very good purpose and I think it is going to do a good job for us. This is an Act to establish and provide for the duties of a consumer protection bureau. We have talked about some of these things that did not happen in New York, and the speaker before me said, in a very vague way, that it did not happen in California. Let us put the record straight.

In New York state they have a fraud committee under Mr. Lefkowitz, the Attorney General of that particular state. People can walk in off the street—I think it is 100 Church street—anyone who felt that he was taken by someone can walk in there. Immediately he makes out a form, he tells his story and immediately someone gives some attention to that thing. At that time, when we were there, as some of you may remember, a family bought $1,600-worth of furniture on credit. After they made $500 or $600 worth of payments on this furniture, they did not and could not pay any more. The furniture was taken from them. Once the furniture was taken from them, if you will recall—the members on the committee there—they were again billed to pay the balance of the debt. It amounted to $2,500 with costs.

In the first instance, the furniture was only $1,600. They paid $500 and now they wanted them, after they took the furniture from them, to pay $2,600. So I say that the hon. Attorney General did the right thing by bringing in a bill like this to protect our people. He not only protected them, but in Bill 101 he states that when an article is paid for up to the tune of 66 per cent, or two-thirds, then you cannot take it from that individual without taking the individual to court. One of two things happen, I understand by this bill. They either get the radio, or TV, or whatever the furniture might be, or they get their money, but they cannot have both.

And so I think our people are being protected. Now I was told, as I gathered from the speaker before me, that nothing like this happened in California. They do have a fixed amount of interest dollars and interest in their bill.

This was—it will come to me in a little while—it was brought in by a member of the

Opposition and they thought so much of that particular bill, that it was unanimously endorsed. It spelt out the interest and the amount that was paid in that particular bill.

I wanted, Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee to remember our experience, and we did acquire a lot of good information, and we brought it home. I might say too, by way of compliment to the hon. Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, a report was brought in and it was acted on within a very few months and this is a feather in the hat of the government.

Having said that, I think we should pursue this a bit further. Within the last couple of weeks, three young ladies came in from the little city of Niagara Falls, not quite as big as Toronto, you see. They established a nice home in one of the apartment buildings and they had a high-pressure salesman come to them. A very fast talking individual, he sold them each, two of the three girls, $250 worth of pots and pans. Now Lord knows what they need pots and pans for, especially nurses.

Some pans they may need, but I might say to you, Mr. Speaker, to think that this high-pressure salesman was not satisfied with 66 per cent, he wanted the third young lady to purchase these things also and he is on the telephone and on the door, to the point where I believe he has made a nuisance of himself.

If we are giving people like that an opportunity to operate for another year, this is an imposition on the public that we are supposed to protect, this is unfair to the people that are here in your city, trying to maintain themselves and have some high-pressure salesman come to their door.

I do not know what method he uses, but he did a good job, he got two out of three, and this is what we are trying to protect the people against, and this bill should come into effect.

It has been thoroughly aired and I am fearful of only one thing, Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that some of our business communities, who approached our committee—and I might say our committee had the courage to stand up to them—and said that we want to reveal to the public the cost in dollars and in interest. We have had this debate many, many times, again the speaker before me and myself, and I say to him that our people are not as ignorant as he would have us believe they are—that they do not understand percentages. Because I borrow my money by percentages, and I have said to the committee and I say to you here now, that if you have the necessary collateral, you can go to the bank and you can get money for 6 per cent, period, because you pay on the unpaid balance monthly, so it is 6 per cent.

Now then, if you have this other method of repayment, yes, it runs into 10 and 11 per cent and if some of our stores admittedly say 1 per cent per month, this is very good. I think that is two—Hudson's Bay and Morgan's—and if, Mr. Speaker, they can do this, and they say they will and would like to if others do it, I do not know why we have to wait for others to bring in briefs to try to persuade the government to bypass the interest rate and only reveal it in dollars. Because we believe that the people can eventually be educated to look at both sides of the ledger before they purchase.

Now I cannot see anything wrong with it except we had 18 recommendations, 17 were agreed on by the committee as a whole, except one, the 18th, and this is the interest bit.

For the life of me I will never be able to understand my good Irish friend in all his fairness saying that people do not understand and the business community have to be protected.

I say to the hon. member as he has said about the businessmen, they are honest people in 98 per cent of the cases, or 95 per cent, and they do not care. They will put interest and principal, and dollars and cents, in their books, and be glad to do it. We are protecting the people against a small majority who have been gouging us for many, many years, and we want this bill put into effect and we want it put in now.

Let us say, as the hon. member for Grey South did say to you, Mr. Speaker, and he made his point very well, that if a few months are needed for them to set their schedules, the argument was put up that they cannot calculate. Our actuary or the man, the auditor, on our particular committee said there is no problem at all. You can get a schedule set up that you can immediately follow across any particular line, and tell them immediately what they have to pay in dollars, and what the interest will be. So this is not the obstacle we thought it might be, put by many of the people who came before our committee, and said: "The reason we do not want you to is because it is going to make it too hard for us in our office to do our paper work."

If the indivdual working in an office cannot follow a line across for the amount of dollars, the monthly payment and the interest rate indicated on the top of that

schedule, then they should not be working in that office. This is not a problem.

I am pleased, again, as I said before, that this government has taken steps and taken them very quickly to bring in bills. We can support this simply because—oh yes, we can support the bill, we must—something is better than nothing. But it would be better for the people of this province if it was done today, and not a year from now.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, like the last hon. member, I did not come here prepared tonight to get into the debate on the principle of these bills, but I am afraid the remarks of the hon. member for Eglinton goaded me into it.

I think it is rather a curious thing, and I think if the hon. members of the House, Mr. Speaker, will sit back and just realize just what has transpired tonight, we have had a couple of government bills come into the House. We have not yet had an hon. member of the Opposition parties speak in opposition to the principles of the bills. One of the main principles of the bill that has been opposed has been opposed by an hon. member on the government side. Now, I do not hold this against the hon. member, because on occasion I have been in the same boat that he has been.

However, my purpose in standing before you this evening, Mr. Speaker, is to assure you that all of the principles—and there is more than one principle, of course—all of the principles in these two bills were decided upon and agreed upon 100 per cent by all of the members of the select committee on consumer credit, with the exception of the disclosure by interest section, which was opposed strenuously all through the committee hearings by the hon. member for Eglinton. He has been consistent, and I give him full marks for it, in opposing this principle here this evening.

But I wanted to stand up as a member of the government party, to indicate to you that the views of the hon. member for Eglinton, were not those, and I trust are still not those, of the government members who sat on that select committee.

There are a couple of points that have not been touched upon by some of the hon. members this evening, and perhaps I may be allowed to do so.

The first point touched upon by the hon. member for Bracondale was in regard to executory contracts and their assignment, and I think that I can assure him that the views which he expressed and the intent which he expressed tonight in attempting to prohibit "hot" paper or "non-recourse" paper—as I think it is known in the trade—is one that was shared by all members of that committee.

I think that this intention has been expressed as one of the principles of Bill 101, but when he says that it does not go far enough, and when he says that it cannot apply at the moment to an organization that has gone out of business, I would agree with him.

But we did discuss this in the committee but we could figure no way of getting around it. How in the world today can you attack an organization that is no longer in existence? How can you attack a legal entity, such as a corporation, that has gone bankrupt or has been dissolved, or the charter has been surrendered?

If the hon. member can inform us of that—and he will have the occasion to do so in committee, of course—I for one, as a member of the committee which helped to bring about this bill, would certainly be interested in hearing his views, and I am certain that the House would be.

There is a difficulty there; there is no doubt about it, but if the legal person is no longer in existence or has gone bankrupt, there is not very much anyone can do about it at that late, sad stage. It is unfortunate. Perhaps the hon. member thinks that it is a defect in the bill and I may think it is a defect in the bill, but I think also that it is a defect that cannot be cured.

The main point is that that legal entity cannot continue in the same scheme and in the same programme and policy that it was continuing before.

The hon. member for York South indicated a practice that is still continuing in the aluminum siding business and, of course, we had much evidence in that committee of some very well-known and very large corporations whose agents were carrying on certain activities that certainly, I would trust, would not be allowed to be carried on by the administration and the powers under this bill.

The important point to remember is that if and when this bill goes into effect and it is enforced, no longer will those large corporations or any corporations for that matter, or person, be allowed to carry on that type of activity in the future.

We can attempt to cure things that are

curable at the present; we can attempt to prevent some of these things from being carried on in the future, but if they do not fall under those two categories, I fail to see how any remedy can succeed against those corporations that have gone bankrupt or defunct, or which now have no assets or that their principals are in the penitentiary, as the hon. member for Youth South indicated.

The point is that we have attempted here to ban non-recourse papers and this, I believe, is a pioneering step on this continent in any event. And this is a matter, quite frankly, that could affect the business community and the business economy in Ontario in an unforeseen way. I believe that this is one of the reasons why the government does not intend to have this bill passed into law at this session, because this is one of the pioneering sections, and the ramifications of this may be very great. We do not yet know, and perhaps caution, in these circumstances, is the best policy for one year.

Now, the government's intention is known and elucidated in the bill, because quite frequently, the government policy may be quite different from a select committee's intention.

Another matter calling for caution, quite frankly, on this is a constitutional question and it has been brought up in regard to banks, again, by the hon. member for Bracondale.

Now, I think it was agreed by all members of that committee that the proposal requiring disclosure both in monetary terms and in simple annual interest is a valid and an enforceable and a desirable policy in this type of legislation—with the exception of the hon. member for Eglinton.

The reasons for this are going to be attacked, are being attacked and have been attacked, by certain segments of the financial community, there is no question about it. I receive a brochure or a pamphlet, I suppose about once a week, because of my interest in the matter and because I was on that select committee, and I am sure that the hon. member for Grey South is also receiving the same material as I am from some of these organizations and they are, quite frankly, afraid of this particular proposal.

Now all of them had the opportunity, and most of them took advantage of the opportunity, to present these arguments to the select committee. The select committee, I thought, had very full hearings in regard to this particular proposal and all sides of the arguments were presented pro and con. At times, there was very vigorous, informal debate not only among the members of the committee but from the proponents of certain views from the "finance community"—if I can use that phrase to the House.

The great defect, in my mind, in regard to these arguments still being proposed by these people, is the fact that they do not take an overall view of the whole picture as far as the consumer is concerned.

It was agreed by all members of the committee that these proposals should not be applicable to any single segment of the financial community—and I think I am fair in saying this—that they should be enforced and, indeed, are only enforceable if they apply to all granters of consumer credit in Ontario, right across the board.

The hon. member for Bracondale mentioned banks, and one of the other hon. members mentioned banks. You can see what a ticklish, constitutional grey area we are getting into here. It may well be—and as a matter of fact, I have been led to believe—that this is one of the main reasons why the government is proceeding quite cautiously in this field.

We have attempted to rectify it, in any event, by placing the regulation and the restriction on the advertisement, as far as the granters of credit are concerned. During the committee hearings we received legal opinion that this was certainly intra vires for the province, as far as the controlling of advertising of these granters of credit is concerned.

Here, of course, I think, is the ace up our sleeve when we start talking about banks and federally incorporated and federally regulated granters of credit—and there are many of them. As a matter of fact, I believe —I am not too sure—but I believe that the majority of the granters of credit in this province are federally regulated or controlled or incorporated, rather than provincial.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Are these federal matters of credit not governed by The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act, in accordance with the fairly recent decision of the supreme court of Canada?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I think they are and, as a matter of fact, it was a very happy occurrence that that decision came just about in the middle of the deliberations of the consumer credit committee's hearings, because there were numbers of us who, at that time, thought that we were getting into an

area over which, regardless of our intentions and our purpose and our hopes, the province would have no jurisdiction or authority at all.

Happily, that decision was made and quite happily, I think, this is the rack upon which we are hanging our hat in regard to this particular bill.

Mr. Singer: Would the hon. member not agree if you can control unconscionable transactions—interest in them—surely you can control a mere declaration of interest?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: No, I would not agree that necessarily follows. But in any event, the hon. member appreciates as well that there are still many people in the bench and bar in this province who do not necessarily believe that decision in regard to the unconscionable transactions was necessarily good law.

Mr. Singer: They might not agree with it but it is a good law.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Unfortunately, precedents can be upset and decisions can be overruled in some matters.

In any event, The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act is there, we are following it and we hope if Ottawa—at least this is my hope and I am speaking personally now, but I think I echo the views of other members of that committee on all sides of the House—our hope is that before this bill comes into force and perhaps even passes this House, perhaps the federal government will move into this field in a like manner.

It is no secret at all—I do not think the information was given in any confidence—but there are certain members of both the Senate and the House of Commons at Ottawa who have sat on a similar committee to Ontario's committee and who have given certain undertakings to the members of our select committee, that if once more Ontario would lead the way in this field, specifically the select committee recommendations, then if they were given the opportunity, they would bring in a similar report.

Unfortunately, that committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of Senator David Croll, does not appear to have been too busy lately. I am not even too sure, quite frankly, if it is still in existence. In any event, I hope that the members of that joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons have brought their own individual pressures to bear on the government at Ottawa, so the government will move into this field.

But because it is a grey area, because there are certain large doubts about the enforceability of certain sections of this bill, and in any event because—I am sure all hon. members of the House can appreciate this—it would be far better if there was concurrent legislation at Ottawa in this field, I am sure hon. members can see the desirability of having a cooling-off period in regard to the legislation itself. I am not saying that I necessarily agree with this policy but I am sure the hon. members can see the desirability of it, and the argument against it.

Mr. MacDonald: That is being on both sides of the fence at the same time.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I do not think the hon. members over there have to talk about any mugwumping philosophy at all; they are experts at it.

There is one other matter that may call for caution here, quite frankly, and that is the point attempted to be brought before this House by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville in regard to packaging. This is a matter quite frankly that, in any consumer protection bureau or any legislation, to afford protection to consumers, passed by this House, should be looked at and should be controlled or regulated in any manner, shape or form. The request was made to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that perhaps he was out of order, because that did not deal with consumer credit and this did.

I should point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that of course Bill 101 does not relate only to credit transactions, it relates to all sorts of executory transactions, whether credit is being advanced or not—especially in regard to the itinerant salesmen provision. There is no restriction in the registration of itinerant salesmen—if so, I would like to see it deleted—saying that only itinerant salesmen who grant credit should be licensed.

The whole of part 2 does not necessarily relate to only credit transactions; it relates to executory contracts and the two are not the same. But this is another argument, in a way, for relaying full enforceability of this legislation. I, for one, am quite happy the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville brought the point about regulation of packaging to the attention of the House; so that, perhaps by the time the bill comes back next year, that point will be covered in the legislation. I would certainly like to see it done.

I expect to have further comments, Mr. Speaker, on the sections of the bill in the committee of the whole House. But in any

event, I again congratulate the government on the principle. I would want to point out to the hon. member for Grey South that he was wrong in just one major point. Not all of the major recommedations of the select committee are incorporated in this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment briefly on the remarks of the hon. member for St. George. I am surprised that, in some way or other, by a delay in the passage of this bill, that the constitutional problems to which he refers are going to be solved. There is no known way that we have of solving constitutional problems by discussion or by amicable agreement between the provincial government and the federal government.

The only way in which constitutional issues can in fact be solved is to have the matter dealt with by the courts. Any bill this Legislature passed is fraught with the danger that at some point some constitutional issue will be raised. It is also a well-known proposition that a court is very reluctant to strike down the whole of a bill on the basis of a constitutional defect. It will do its very best to limit the area it strikes down in the bill. And, because of this way in which the courts will operate on a constitutional issue, it would be quite proper for this House to pass this bill, to have it enacted into law.

The government itself has control over what parts of it it can bring into force at any given time. It could, if it wished, delay some particular part of the bill if it saw fit to do so. It has any number of ways available to it, once the bill is passed, to bring it into operation. It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that certainly part 1 of the bill, and certainly part 2 of the bill, are clearly within the authority of this Legislature and would provide a very substantial area of the protection with which all of us are so concerned.

It may be that part 3 of the bill, which deals with the credit aspects of this transaction, does raise important constitutional questions; but, as the hon. member for Downsview has pointed out, The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act has been upheld within the jurisdiction of this Legislature. It is quite certain that, if at some time or other this bill were passed and the whole of it were proclaimed now, if someone wanted to attack the credit provisions of part 3 as infringing on the constitutional rights of the federal government, then that matter could be brought before the courts. I fail to see in all the discussion which has taken place about the questions of the constitutional difficulties of the Act, how one year's delay or two years' delay or a further consultation with other interested parties is going to resolve that particular question.

I think that there is absolutely no need whatsoever for a bill, drawn in such simple and clear terms as this bill is drawn, after the exhaustive study which has been made of the subject, should now, for a constitutional reason—if that is the only reason—be delayed in its enactment.

There are many ways, as I have stated, in which this bill can be brought into force. If by chance someone attacks the principle of this bill in the court, and part 3 of the bill were knocked down, the court is not going to strike down the rest of the bill. The rest of the bill contains very valid and protective provisions to protect the citizens in the province of Ontario.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the government is now moving into the field of consumer credit legislation. Those of us on the committee will have a much better opportunity later on of involving ourselves in a debate on the consumer credit report. I would like to say that nothing included in these bills before us tonight, or for that matter, any of the recommendations contained in the consumer credit report, will have either a dangerous or detrimental effect on our economy.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the more I have listened to explanations by government spokesmen—starting from the hon. Attorney General's explanation on first reading—as to why these bills should be delayed, the more I am convinced that they should not be delayed. I have not heard a valid argument yet.

In any case, as my hon. friend from Riverdale has pointed out, the way that the government has presented the bill: It is to come into force by proclamation. Even if it should receive third reading at this session and be assented to, it is to come into force by proclamation. I believe that, under The Interpretation Act, that means that any section or sections can be proclaimed—it does not have to come into effect all at one time. So, if there are problems with regard to specific sections, or parts of the bill, that makes the government feel that it would like to delay, it does not have to proclaim the sections; but let us get ahead and proclaim some of the others.

Surely, the one on the cooling-off period is a straightforward matter that does not require any significant administrative machinery, that could go into effect almost immediately. With some of these other, more complicated, legal problems there may be some excuse for a certain delay; but, frankly, I cannot see how this could be an excuse for a delay of over a year in any of them. But there might be an excuse for some delay.

However, apart from the one on the cooling-off period, there is one that I would like to see brought into force immediately. That is the one requiring disclosure of interest rates, as well as of amounts of money paid on loans. We might as well face it, Mr. Speaker; our big, friendly, smiling boys at Household Finance, and all these other places that are so good to you, are going to fight all the way down the line on this. You might as well face it. The last thing in the world they want is for the consumer to know what interest rate he is paying.

The hon. member for Eglinton said that the consumer does not understand the interest rate. The consumer understands interest rates all too well, and that is the reason why our friendly boys at Household Finance do not want him to know what interest rate he is paying. They feed on him, Mr. Speaker, by deceiving him.

It is quite true, as the hon. member for Eglinton said, if you have a loan for $100 and you pay back $112 over the course of a year, the consumer would normally assume that he is paying 12 per cent. And he would think that on a personal loan 12 per cent is not too bad; but, in actual fact, he is paying well over 20 per cent. The one thing that Household Finance and other similar institutions do not want is for the consumer to know the exorbitant interest rates they are charging —20 per cent and 25 per cent, or whatever it is—they vary. In some cases credit goes up to 30 per cent, and 35 per cent.

If the consumer understood that he would not borrow—or a great many of them would not borrow.

Mr. Reilly: Are they not operating under The Small Loans Act now?

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am saying that if the consumer knew what rate of interest he was paying, he would not borrow, but the rate of interest is concealed from him. That is how these boys make a killing. So they are going to fight; we might as well face it. So what are we doing? We are giving them a year in which they can really dig themselves in and think up all the angles. Then, shall we say a year from now, this bill is reintroduced. Let us say it is passed. We have no guarantee that these things will happen. Maybe they will have browbeaten the hon. Attorney General into forgetting the whole thing in the meantime.

But let us say that the bill comes back a year from now and is passed and is assented to; and it still has a clause in it that says it will not come into effect until it is proclaimed. I am sure they will obstruct and delay well enough to stall it off for another six months before it is proclaimed. And when we finally get it into force, then the first time that you take action against them, they will have you in court. There is no doubt about it at all. They will tie you up in court as long as it is possible.

My experiences in observing the operations of the courts is that the one thing they are very useful for is slowing anything down to a dead walk. By the time you get the thing to the supreme court of Canada, it will be another two or three years before it is settled. If we are going to have to go through that process in any case, why not get started at it?

The hon. member for St. George suggested that we should wait a little while and see if we cannot cajole the federal government into passing similar legislation so that we will catch them one way or the other.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Hope springs eternal in the human breast!

Mr. Bryden: Well, the hon. member for St. George is an intelligent and realistic man. He says, "Hope springs eternal." Hope maybe does spring eternal, but is he so naive as to think that there is the slightest hope that that is going to happen in the next year or so? The Parliament of Canada is so completely bogged down they are not going to get the stuff, that is on their order paper right now, through in less than a year. And they are not going to bring any new stuff down.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Has the hon. member seen the new Bank Act?

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am suggesting to the hon. member that it is not going to happen, and he knows it as well as I do. I think we might as well go ahead. We have used devices which some legal advisers, at any rate, think bring the matter within our jurisdiction; so let us try it. How else can we find out whether this thing is within our jurisdiction or not, except by having it tested? So let us

get it where it can be tested. Let us not just leave it there for them to—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Woodbine if he agrees with the remarks the hon. member for York South, made the other evening, that nothing very much is accomplished after 11 o'clock.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it is a cinch that nothing very much is going to be accomplished after 11 o'clock tonight because we have a couple of bills in front of us that are just window-dressing. They are going to go through second reading and that is where they are going to die; so we can take it as given that nothing is going to be accomplished after 11 o'clock tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: One of the difficulties is that the hon. Attorney General is not trying to accomplish anything on these bills so we might as well go along with non-accomplishment before or after 11 o'clock. Mr. Speaker, there is one other aspect of the legislation, taking the two bills together that I would like to refer to. It has been referred to briefly by one or two other hon. members and I could perhaps pick it up from the point where the hon. member for St. George left off.

In legislation, which purports in its title and elsewhere to be legislation for the protection of consumers—in the one case we are setting up what is to be called a consumer protection bureau, although I do not really see that it is going to have much to do for the coming year, and then we have another bill which is described as, An Act to provide for the protection of buyers of consumer goods and for the fair disclosure of the cost of credit.

When we bring in legislation, sir, that purports to be consumer protection legislation, I think we should do a job, and there are important areas which are not touched by this legislation.

My hon. friend from Eglinton said that not all businessmen are crooks. I would agree with him entirely. I do not think all businessmen are crooks. But on the other hand, I do not think we have to assume either that the crooks are only the itinerant sellers or the small men. There is more fleecing of consumers going on day in and day out by huge corporations that ought to know better, more going on by them in terms of losses to the public, than all these little fellows together have ever undertaken.

Deceiving the consumer deliberately, chiselling him out of his money by misleading him into what he is getting—if you want to see the gentle art, or the fine art, of skinning the consumer going on day in and day out, just look in at any supermarket. The old five cents off racket, or ten cents off racket—there are products that have beeen on the shelves of supermarkets, coming from major companies, such as General Foods, one of the biggest companies in the world, on the shelves of supermarkets that have never been in any other form, except as five cents off! What they are five cents off, heaven only knows; but if a product is being advertised right on the label as being reduced five cents, I think that the seller should have to show where the reduction took place, when it sold at the higher price and how it is now, so as to show, in fact, that it has been reduced. They deliberately make their packages larger than the contents. They do not break any laws because they show the true weight on the outside, but they have an enlarged package, with a hollow part at the top, to create the illusion that they are actually providing the consumer with more goods than they are.

They deliberately confuse the issue in showing the contents of their packages. Federal laws require that they must show the weight, but they deliberately do it in ways that make it almost impossible for consumers to compare prices. Instead of putting up a package as a pound, one of them will put it up as 14.5 ounces, another 15.5 ounces, another 14 ounces. You have to have a slide rule to be able to compare prices. And then by George, if you do have a slide rule, there will be one of them that will fix you—he will show it in grams. I once tracked them all down. I was trying to compare a unit price, but the fellow who showed it in grams had me stuck. I did not know how to do it. I think we should go onto the metric system in this country. But until we do, I think they should show the contents in terms of units that people understand, and they should be even units that are comparable.

All these matters come within the area of consumer protection. I am not saying they are problems that can easily be solved; people have been working on them in the States for years and have not come up with final answers at all. But if we are going to have a consumer protection bureau, we should not give it that name unless it is prepared

to move into that type of field and try to work out methods of protecting the consumer.

Still another area is that the bill provides an itinerant salesman may not make false, misleading or deceptive statements in advertisements, circulars, pamphlets or similar material. Why should this prohibition be restricted to itinerant salesmen, who have to be registered under the Act? As I see it, only people registered under the Act suffer under this prohibition, so that General Foods, General Motors and all these fine little examples of the private enterprise system can go along in their own merry way, with their standard line of deceptive, misleading and often false advertising. Why do we not make the advertising clause apply to all advertising which originates in this province?

Mr. Reilly: Making a good argument for deferment.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I must say that this statement from my hon. friend from Eglinton is on much the same line as the statement of my hon. friend from St. George—that because the bill is only half a loaf at the moment, we should defer the thing. If we followed this principle, Mr. Speaker, there would never be any legislation passed in this House, because anything the government brings in, in almost any field is usually, at best, only half a loaf. I would say that there are some provisions in here that are good; let us get them into force, but let us not assume that we then have adequate consumer legislation. Let us go on from there and bring in additional provisions and give additional powers to this consumer protection bureau.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like once again to make an appeal to the hon. Attorney General. I can see he is very tired and I guess he has been—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, no, I am not.

Mr. Bryden: I am not criticizing him for that. He has had quite a heavy evening this evening. He has listened very patiently, and as is inevitable, some of the argument has been repetitious. But I would appeal to him again to let these bills go right through, bearing in mind that he still has all the control he wants over the situation, in view of the nature of the coming into force clause.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, an hour ago I might have made some remarks, but at this hour I think I shall not weary the House with saying anything further than that my motion was that these two bills, 100 and 101, be read a second time.

As I have listened to the debate, which has been very informative and helpful, very sincere and earnest, it seems to me that everyone has supported my motion.

I am much indebted to the hon. member for St. George for covering the points which I might have dealt with, and also to the hon. member for Eglinton. I am almost persuaded by the remarks of the hon. member for York South and the hon. member for Grey South—so vehement, so sincere, so earnest. But I will only point out that the delay is not likely to be a year. We are now into May; we are still in this session, and if we keep on talking we will probably be here through this year, and we will probably yet pass it this session. At least, the year will be out in another seven months.

Motion agreed to; second reading of Bill 100 and Bill 101.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue in the morning with second readings and there will be the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No Budget debate tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Might be. Yes, we will add that, if you like.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.20 o'clock, p.m.

No. 100



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 6, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 6, 1966

Statement re citizenship court ceremony, Mr. Yaremko 3137

Questions of Mr. Dymond re Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, Mr. Gisborn 3138

Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading 3139

Establishment of the St. Clair parkway commission, bill to provide for, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3139

Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading 3146

Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading 3146

Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 3147

Jails Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 3147

Industrial Farms Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 3147

Registration of and disclosure by public finance companies that hold shares in private loan companies, bill to provide for, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3147

Juvenile and Family Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 3147

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett 3147

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3161

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the Speaker's gallery, a group from the women's liberal association; in the west gallery, students from Fairmount Park school, Toronto; and in the east gallery, Deer Park public school, hosting students from St. Foy, Quebec.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an announcement which I believe will be of interest to hon. members of the House.

Canadian citizenship will be formally conferred upon 30 Metro Toronto and region persons of 17 different ethnic origins at a citizenship court ceremony to be held in the main rotunda of the Parliament buildings, Queen's Park, Toronto, on Wednesday evening, May 18, at 8 p.m.

In announcing the event, I note that it will mark a unique occasion, for it will be the first time that a session of the court of Canadian citizenship will be held in the Parliament buildings. The court is normally held in the federal government building at 55 St. Clair avenue east, Toronto.

The holding of this special session of the citizenship court at Queen's Park will focus public attention in Ontario upon citizenship week, which is being observed across Canada during the week of May 15 to 21. Some 300 invited guests, representing government, and community leaders, are expected to attend the ceremony.

Following the court ceremony, the Prime Minister of Ontario, Hon. John Robarts, will address the assembly. A reply to the hon. Prime Minister's speech will be given by one of the new Canadian citizens, Carla Meulmeester, 17, of Willowdale, who is a grade 13 student at Northview Heights collegiate institute. Born in the Netherlands, she came to Canada with her parents in 1951.

The court ceremony will be presided over by His Honour Judge W. M. Cory, QC, with the clerk of the court, Mr. L. E. Fox, assisting. Greetings from the federal government will be tendered by the Hon. Judy LaMarsh, PC, MP, Secretary of State, Ottawa.

During the evening's programme, the Irish choral society, conducted by the Rev. Father P. M. Fleming, CSSP, will sing to the assembled guests. A presentation will be made to Mrs. Douglas Jennings of Toronto, chairman of the co-ordinating committee on citizenship receptions of Metropolitan Toronto, in recognition of the committee's long and active work in the field of citizenship. Subsequently, the guests will retire to a reception to be tendered by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario.

All hon. members and, of course, their wives, interested in attending this ceremony and the Lieutenant-Governor's reception following, should write or telephone as soon as possible to the citizenship office, that is room 415 in the north wing, or telephone 365-2285. I would appreciate an early reply so that suitable arrangements for the reservation of seats may be made.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would thank you for allowing me to speak on a matter of general interest.

While Canadians generally are well satisfied with the final result of the national hockey league games, which leave Montreal Canadiens as this year's champions, there is no doubt that Roger Crozier, goalie for the Detroit Red Wings, has outshone all the great players of the league this year.

The trophy for the outstanding player of the final series is normally awarded to a member of the winning team, but not this year. Late last evening, after the overtime period, President Campbell, of the NHL, presented this trophy to Roger Crozier.

In the series, Roger Crozier was judged the number one star of the first two games, and then suffered a painful injury in the third

game; but, in spite of this handicap, he played out the fourth and fifth games. This is Roger Crozier's first full season in the NHL, though last year he was considered the most prominent rookie of the season. He had first come to general prominence in the realm of hockey when playing with the St. Catharines team.

Every career has its beginning, and Roger Crozier is a product of minor hockey instruction at Bracebridge memorial community centre, sponsored by the Kinsmen's club of Bracebridge. I think particularly of such hockey players as Chub Downey, Stu Reid and Danny Poland, who trained and encouraged Roger throughout his boyhood years, in his home town of Bracebridge.

But, more than this, let me speak of Roger's home and the respect which is so generally felt in Muskoka for the good character and dependability of the sons and daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Crozier. Roger Crozier, the most outstanding player of the NHL finals, is the fourth of a family of 14. I have known his father, Lloyd Crozier, all his life, and his mother, a member of one of Musoka's old-established families – the Austins – for many years. I will recall that some years ago teachers at the Bracebridge school began to notice that children of the Crozier family were never absent from their classes; and, when they looked up the records, they found that most of the family had, without thinking anything about it at all, achieved perfect attendance records for several years.

At this time, sir, when Muskoka people are so proud of Roger Crozier, I go on to pay tribute to his parents for having maintained a good home environment; they have taught and still teach their family the principles of good citizenship. And I want to say this: In our day, the good and true qualities of quiet, happy Canadian family life may not be given much notice, but nevertheless these are the important things for Canada, the qualities which must be honoured; and, insofar as we can do anything about it, they must be protected.

So here in this House, I congratulate Roger Crozier. He and his wife are making their home at Utterson in Muskoka, and I am pleased to have had this opportunity to pay tribute to this fine young Canadian, a Muskoka man, a native of Bracebridge, the town where I live, and as well commending his parents and family.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, unfortunately I was unable to be in the House yesterday, but a question was asked by the hon. member for Wentworth East. The question was in three parts, Mr. Speaker. I would answer as follows:

There have been a number of changes in respect to the medical staff at the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, in the past few weeks. We are aware of these changes and have been attempting to deal with them as best we can. The statements to the effect that there was only one psychiatrist to look after all patients in the hospital is incorrect.

Prior to these developments, there were 14 full-time doctors on the staff of the hospital. In recent weeks, one of the psychiatrists has been absent due to illness but is expected to return to duty very shortly. Another psychiatrist resigned from the full-time staff to engage in private practice in the area, but is continuing to give part-time service to the hospital. A third psychiatrist resigned, having decided to withdraw from active practice at this time. A fourth member of the medical staff, who wished to take further training, left the staff and went to England.

At the present time, in addition to the superintendent and the assistant superintendent, there are two fully qualified psychiatrists on the full-time staff working on the inpatient service, two psychiatrists who have fully completed their training but have not yet obtained specialist certification, one first-year resident and three full-time general practitioners. In addition to the full-time staff, there are two part-time psychiatrists, one part-time general practitioner, who provide services on the inpatient programme. A full-time general practitioner was appointed to the staff last month. An additional full-time psychiatrist will join the hospital staff on completion of his postgraduate training in June, and arrangements have been made for additional part time help beginning in August.

We are naturally most anxious to obtain additional psychiatrists for this and other hospitals, but they are not available to us; nor indeed are they available, as I stated in this House a few days ago, anywhere that we know in the world.

As indicated to this House, there is a general shortage of professional personnel in the mental health field. I have previously described the efforts being made to encourage doctors to take postgraduate training in psychiatry, and to recruit medical personnel from other countries. The new programmes which will go into operation in the

department this year should be further incentive to doctors to specialize in psychiatry.

Regarding the number of sudden or accidental deaths, last week a patient was admitted to the hospital in an acutely ill state and died within an hour of admission. I understand that an inquest is to be held; and again, I repeat, it is mandatory, under the law, that we report every death in our hospitals—then the decision as to whether or not an inquest is held must lie with the coroner. There have been no other sudden or accidental deaths at this hospital.

Regarding the third part of the question. concerning brutalities and cruel disciplining of difficult patients, I know of no incidents wherein patients have been subjected to brutality or cruel disciplining in this hospital. Such treatment of patients is not tolerated in any of our hospitals. We are acutely aware of the possibility that it might occur, and are continually on the watch to see that this is prevented, or dealt with vigorously, should it come about.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I do not feel the question has been answered. If the Minister looks at the question, the question says: Does the hon. Minister intend to investigate the situation in the Hamilton Ontario Hospital, as outlined in the Hamilton *Spectator*, of May 3?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, no specific investigation is necessary. We have all of these things continually under review and control.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the hon. Minister? Does the Minister intend to hold a special meeting of the standing committee on health and welfare to deal with the situation in Hamilton, as announced by the hon. member for Hamilton centre in the Hamilton *Spectator* last night?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have no authority to call special meetings of this committee. I believe the hon. member to whom you refer is chairman of the committee; this would be her privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE REGISTRY ACT

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) in the absence of Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 97, An Act to amend the Registry Act.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, there is no principle to this bill, but I would like to ask one question on it. In section 1 I note that the repeal is for the purpose of bringing Ontario into line with all the other provinces in Canada. Is it a fact that from now on the registrar will not make any notifition of the cause of death in the certificate that is filed with him?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): This is Bill 97, The Registry Act. We have not come to that bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ST. CLAIR PARKWAY COMMISSION

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways) moves second reading of Bill 102, An Act to provide for the establishment of the St. Clair parkway commission.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker if I may make a few comments on this.

We on this side of the House are pleased to see the introduction of such a bill, but we are a little concerned with the fact that now we have a St. Clair parkway commission which, according to the bill, is going to set up a series of parks and recreation areas. This parkway commission will be under The Department of Highways. We have a St. Lawrence parks commission now under The Department of Tourism and Information, and we have a Niagara parks commission. Surely, if this is going to be an addition to the parkways system of the province, or to the parks system of the province, it perhaps should come under The Department of Lands and Forests, rather than under The Department of Highways. In keeping it under The Department of Highways, it is hoped that the parkways commission does not end up by being a body with which the employers do not have the right to bargain—as in the case of the Niagara parks commission.

Another thing that does disturb us, from the Essex county area, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this is going to set up a parkways system only in the counties of Lambton and Kent. Surely, if the department were interested in setting up a system, and we know that they cannot implement this whole project in any short period of time, it will take years, it would probably have been a little better to call this a Bluewater parkway commission and have that start from Amherstburg in Essex county, extend along the Detroit river end up in Sarnia, for the time being, but with

the hope of extending that along the shores of Lake Huron and up to the Bruce peninsula.

The idea of the parkway is nothing new. It was advocated some 36 years ago by a Tory Cabinet Minister by the name of the Hon. Paul Poisson. It has apparently taken this government 36 years to act on this suggestion. It was a very good suggestion.

If this is to set up a system of highways, then I would say that it would have been better to have the parkway commission start at Sarnia, follow Highway 40 to Port Lambton, and then stay within a reasonable distance of the water—possibly crossing over to Walpole island, coming by Mitchell bay, and then joining with the present highway system at Jeannettes creek and extending along Highway 39 right through the city of Windsor and going down Highway 18 to Amherstburg. At Amherstburg there is Highway 18 and 18a, which carries on and eventually joins the Highway 3 system and carries right through to Niagara Falls.

One of the sections of the bill mentions the implementation of tolls. We certainly hope that this does not mean that we are going to start setting up a toll system in Ontario for the use of our highways. I know that it says for the use of parks and works and so forth, but surely we now have a system of tolls for our parks? I cannot see why there would be the necessity of having a second set of tolls when The Department of Lands and Forests charges a toll to enter our parks.

We commend the Minister for introducing the bill; we like the fact that it has started some place; but we do hope that this is just the beginning of a parkways system and this does carry on, eventually ending up at the town of Amherstburg.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, in accord with the proposition of making more parks and parkways, but the thing that bothers me about a bill of this character is that we are continually and progressively setting up dynasties, you might call them, in certain areas in our province for parks. My thought has always been that we should have a parks board in this province, as indeed we have, and that all parks in this province should come under the supervision of that board.

How, Mr. Speaker, does one park gain the right to be set apart from its fellows and have a commission to run it, while others are under the direction of the parks integration board? I thought we were moving toward getting all parks under the board. This is a bill that suggests we are moving further away, that we are going to decentralize still more and that we are going to set up these areas throughout the province and have commissions with powers of their own, perhaps distinct and separate from other powers of other commissions. The only way we can ever bring this thing to a place where there is a uniformity of effort and direction is to put all parks in this province under one board, and stop this business of setting up dynasties throughout the province for certain specific areas in the province of Ontario.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to support the principle of this bill. I realize that the enactment of this is possible only because of the relocation of the building of a new highway in this area and this available highway being turned into a new service.

Last Friday evening I had occasion to drive the route of this proposed highway from Sarnia south into my own riding. I feel that it is certainly an excellent choice and will be a wonderful asset to our province. Over the years there have been a lot of efforts by a lot of people, and various chambers of commerce—particularly the southwestern Ontario chambers of commerce, which is composed of people of several counties—all pushing for the establishment of this parkway. I think a lot of credit must be given to them for their efforts in the past to draw this to the attention of the government.

Like the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, I trust that this is just the start and that plans can be laid that this parkway or another parkway can be added to this around the shores of Lake St. Clair, following Highways 18 and 18a and eventually Highway 3 along the Detroit river and the north shore of Lake Erie, and possibly extending as far as Rondeau provincial park. I think this was the concept envisaged by the members of the southwestern Ontario chambers of commerce.

At the present time in my riding, and I believe in the riding of the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich, there are plans for the widening of Highway 18 which parallels the Detroit river. I know that there have been land acquisitions and certain construction already begun.

There is some zoning along this particular route, especially south of the town of Amherstburg. The municipality made a wise decision several years ago and put through

a zoning bylaw whereby the residents could not build a structure which would rise more than three feet above the level of the highway. Thus there are very few things obstructing the view of the river and the shipping and the very pretty area along Highway 18.

In the Amherstburg area for a great number of years, it has been mooted that possibly a new bridge could be built into Michigan, connecting down the turnpike systems to open up the midwest, bypassing the downtown sections of Detroit and speeding-up traffic. Possibly this could all be retained as a thought for the future.

Continuing along the shore of Lake Erie to the resort area and Holiday provincial park is Highway 18a. This particular highway, in the mind of The Department of Highways, has been like an unwanted child. From time to time they have tried to give it back to the county of Essex, but nothing has been resolved in this matter, as this highway has a great number of problems. Possibly this could be incorporated into a parkway system.

Certainly along Highway 3, from the town of Leamington through to Rondeau provincial park are the only areas where Lake Erie can be viewed. There is a great number of vacant spots that could be acquired or zoned for future development into parks.

When I was looking at this bill, I wondered what a parkway meant. I had to go into four dictionaries before I found a definition of this. It was not listed anywhere, but it simply states "a broad landscaped thoroughfare." This, possibly is the concept of a parkway in a great many minds, but there are a lot of principles and concepts that possibly should be drawn to the attention of various people who are promoting parkways in other areas of our province.

Possibly the municipal councils in the areas through which parkways are proposed should be informed and encouraged to apply zoning, such as I have mentioned, or restrictions, and possibly start acquiring lands between the highways and the body of water, along which a parkway will eventually be built we hope.

If, as we hope, there can be an extension to this St. Clair parkway, or possibly a Detroit river parkway, the area municipalities in this particular area should be told of the financial involvement expected of them to pay for the maintenance of roads and parks. They should be told as to whether a parkway commission will pay to their councils property and business tax, and if businesses should be established by the commission. They should be made aware now of details of all fees that could be charged for the use of the parkway.

These to me are some of the principles of this bill which I do not feel have had sufficient airing to make our populace, as a whole, aware of its involvement in this parkway that is coming into southwestern Ontario.

In conclusion, I reiterate the fact that I support the principle of this bill. I am just sorry that the hon. members for Lambton West and Kent West are not in the House to say a few words on this because I know they are proud of this parkway coming into their area. But I do have these two major reservations: that it has not included the whole length of the parkway that has been proposed for many years by the southwestern Ontario chambers of commerce and that there apparently has been little or no advance direction and information given to municipalities in which this parkway could be extended.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, in using this term "parkway" it means parks. In the usual term as applied to the department it probably means it is going to have picnic tables here and there and a couple of benches. But if it means parks in the proper term, the proper sense of the word, then I agree with the hon. member for Grey South that the problem of parks, I think, ought to come under one of the departments —I think probably under The Department of Lands and Forests.

Now if these parks are going to be along, for instance, Highway 40, I can think of no more barren spot in our part of the province to put a park than on Highway 40 from Chatham into Wallaceburg.

I do not imagine everyone here will agree with that statement but in the easterly part of our county, Essex, we have been striving not for one year but for many years, to get a park, any kind of a park. We have had the honourable, amiable Minister of Lands and Forests come up there and put on his tin helmet. I took off a whole day—and mind you, I would not mind spending a whole week with him because he is such loving company and pleasant company—driving him all over the place and had a nice day, of course.

But after driving him all over the eastern part of Essex county, and visiting many, many hundreds of acres of beautiful parkland, then he goes and builds the park in Essex South, or goes somewhere else.

When we would view a property, on each and every occasion it either was too small or

it was too big or the railroad was too close to the lake or there was not enough frontage or this or that. You know, you oftentimes wonder if you have a problem; you oftentimes say that even your own best friends will not tell you what is wrong with you. But in any event, we did not get a park.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is the point, is it?

Mr. Reaume: That is the point. Now, if we can establish here just exactly what this parkway means and why any portion of parks should come under this department, I would not know. But I understand coming from Sarnia, along that beautiful drive along Courtright and in that area, in this particular part of the highway, I should think that this would be a very beautiful spot for a park. But whoever thought up the brilliant idea—unless of course again that it is only going to be a couple of tables and a chair, if that is what is called a park, fine—but the most beautiful part of that drive is certainly not on Highway 40 from Chatham into Wallaceburg. There is nothing beautiful about that highway. The people are all right, the land is good, but the looks and appearance of the place is not much and certainly would not be a place that I would think would attract outside people to come to a park.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That description fits a good many of us.

Mr. Reaume: Oh, the hon. Provincial Secretary is all right, he is doing all right. I thought his announcement this morning was a very apropos one and he was thinking along the proper lines when he organized that one. I had always thought in the immigration ceremonies that you should try to impress people, not with politics, but with courtrooms and things, but I think he is doing all right. He should keep up in this way and he will go a long way.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reaume: Now, getting back to parks, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the hon. Minister, are there any plans for an extension of this parkway or is this something going to be like the Noden causeway? You started 20 years ago and every election, if you vote properly, you will keep on going ahead with it; so, in another 20 years, you may have another five miles. I think it is a good start. I think the idea is a good one. But I am just wondering: Have you any plans to carry out the parkway on the most beautiful and scenic part of the route?

Carrying it along, you are calling it the St. Clair parkway and you do come along the edge of the river, but when you get to the mouth of the lake you go away from it again. Are there any plans in carrying this parkway along the edge of Lake St. Clair? Because, in the establishment of a park, which after all is a very picturesque and beautiful idea, I think, you must always bear in mind one thing I think, and that is Windsor.

The port of entry at Windsor attracts more people from the U.S.A. than any other two ports in the the whole of Canada. And so when you think of ports of entry and you think of attractions, you think that the only place is the Falls probably, or places of that kind. But there are other places; there are more people who enter Canada at Windsor than at any other port of entry in Canada. So there would be nothing finer, I think, than a beautiful parkway. But if a parkway means a couple of picnic benches on Highway No. 40 from Chatham to Wallaceburg, well, good grief, you might as well go and build it in the bush.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): We would be glad to get it up in the north.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reaume: The hon. Minister is doing all right; he should not worry too much. I mean the Minister personally; he never had things so good! Some people have never had it so bad, but the Minister, personally, has never had it so good.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: It is very enjoyable there.

Mr. Reaume: Very enjoyable. I know that the hon. Minister is very happy.

I wonder, in the explanation of the bill, if the Minister would mind telling us whether or not he has any plans for the extension of the parkway and if so, which way does he have in mind that it might go?

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me this morning to have the opportunity to rise and speak to this bill. This bill applies in the great county of Lambton and in the county of Kent which I have the pleasure of serving as the member for Lambton East and a portion of Kent county.

I am sure that the hon. member for Lambton West has given many years of his life toward hoping that this dream would come true. I want to take the opportunity, at the moment, to congratulate the hon. Minister

of Highways for his efforts on behalf of the people of western Ontario in trying to make this parkway possible.

He has had the co-operation of the council of the county of Kent and the council of the city of Chatham, the county of Lambton and the city of Sarnia; they have all worked together, and I know that the Minister feels as I do that some day this will possibly extend far north into Huron county, probably to the town of Goderich and far south into the city of Windsor.

However, this is one good start and I think the name St. Clair parkway is a true name for this parkway. Along the route of Highway 40 from Point Edward—this parkway actually starts north of Sarnia in the little village of Point Edward which is situated on the corner of Lake Huron and the St. Clair river and is surrounded on the other side by the city of Sarnia—there are five or six parks already in this area which have been instigated by the local municipalities.

The city of Sarnia has a very large area and the county of Lambton has a large area, the township of Moore and the village of Point Edward.

There is another small park that is operated by the ex-wardens of the county of Lambton. I am a member of that organization and we are very happy to think that we are going to put all these parks under one commission and I just want to congratulate the hon. Minister and all of those who have assisted in this project.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I think I have been able to recover from that vision of the hon. member for Essex North and the hon. Minister of Land and Forests, spending a "loving" week together, sufficiently to enter the debate on the topic of the bill.

I want to return, Mr. Speaker, to the argument that was being advanced by the hon. member for Grey South. Some two or three years ago, he and I were members of the select committee that was chaired by the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, that select committee that drifted out into limbo and has not been heard of since, in terms of a final report. It was charged with the responsibility of examining the organization of government; and one of the problems that we wrestled with at considerable length, was the apparent confusion, indeed, the growing confusion, in our parks structure in the province of Ontario.

I think we were tending to come to the conclusion that all parks should not be brought under one administrative unit, because there are some parks—such as, for example, the small ones in The Department of Highways—roadside parks, picnic tables and things of this nature—which are looked after by the normal maintenance staff of The Department of Highways in the course of their looking after the highways, and the same may be true in terms of some parks in The Department of Lands and Forests.

However, I do not think that even the exceptions that were emerging in the thinking of that committee and which never found any realization in a final report, would exclude the basic points that the hon. member for Grey South was making—namely, that when you were establishing another large parkway of the nature of the St. Lawrence parkway or the Niagara parkway system or this new one, that they should not all be established in separate little dynasties and empires. I think this is precisely the kind of thing which, in a government structure, we want to try to avoid. There is too great a tendency for this kind of proliferation.

Now, implicit in the hon. member's use of the term "dynasty" is the kind of thing that was unveiled to some degree two or three years ago when I presented some evidence to this House that the government reacted very strongly against and went even to the length of setting up a Royal commission to look into the Niagara parkway. There was evidence of it being operated, if I may use the phraseology of the previous Prime Minister, as a "little family business."

I complained in one instance in this House and it can be found in *Hansard* records, about the procedures of not tendering for materials or equipment that they were buying and the Prime Minister interjected and said: "Well, let us not make too much fuss about it. Everybody in the Niagara peninsula regards the parkway as sort of a family affair." The kind of "family affair" that had been deplored in a report, for example, investigating the dairy industries in regard to the handling of the purchasing of land by the cheese board. In other words, not doing it on a strict, businesslike basis, which opens the door to the kind of local patronage setup, the kind of little local dynasty which I do not think is conducive to good administrative procedure and the best kind of expenditure of public funds.

In short, my point is simply this, Mr. Speaker: when establishing a new park system it should be integrated into a general

park structure. Then the surpluses that are available in some instances when you have fully developed a parkway—such as, for example, the Niagara parks commission with its more than normal revenues—would be available to develop park systems elsewhere in the province of Ontario.

There is no reason why, when you have really developed one to its fullest extent that it should have much more money than perhaps usefully can be used, when it might be made available for sharing this kind of development across the province of Ontario.

I would like to have the hon. Minister comment on what the thinking of the government is in terms of this proliferation, rather than the unified development of the parks in the province.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, there is a fair amount of comment here to discuss. First, I would like to point out to the House and particularly to the hon. member for Essex North that the principle associated with the establishment or proposed establishment of this parkway between Wallaceburg and Point Edward—and those are the precise southerly and northerly limits of it at the moment—are related to the fact that, as he properly pointed out, it could not have been contemplated under any circumstances if we were not going to build a new road facility, north-south just immediately to the east of the present Highway 40, to meet the demands for commercial and industrial vehicular traffic.

The present Highway 40 is a narrow, winding road—a very beautiful road along the St. Clair river—but it has run out of capacity for the traffic that is using it today. Consequently, a controlled-access freeway over about an 18- to 20-mile route to serve the Wallaceburg-Sarnia communities is shortly to get under construction. It is under design and in the process of engineering at the moment.

Now, I point that out to the House in terms of the principle associated with the bill because I think it would be obvious in that sense to anyone that until the alternative facility was provided or at least contemplated, the matter of converting this present 20 miles of river road, if you wish, could not have been considered under any circumstances.

Now, I am obliged to disagree, of course, with the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Grey South and the hon. member for York South. There is no dynasty being established here. It is not a matter of dynasty. Rather this is a very sharp departure in principle from what is being done, and I must say I support it, as do those who have collaborated with us for the best part of two years, in the formulation of the statute that is before you for consideration today.

That is simply this: this bill, to those of you who have read it thoroughly, provides for a number of things that are somewat unique. It provides for active and financial participation by area municipalities, the counties and cities of Lambton and Kent and Sarnia and Chatham.

I say active and financial participation, and I think this is important, Mr. Speaker, and I would so say to the House. Nobody knows the advantages of a parkway or a park complex in an area, better than the people that live there themselves. Nobody knows how to protect the scenic beauties of an area such as the 20-mile corridor that will be the new facility and the parkway better than the people that live there themselves. Nobody knows the extent to which zoning, if you like, to protect property requirements should be implemented than the people who are involved and have an idea of what the property requirements should be, than the people that live in those communities and represent them on the municipal councils.

This is the unique feature that is associated closely with the principle of the bill, that it draws together the people of these communities who can have a greater and a more specific interest in the development of these things, than anyone else.

Now then, this particular principle or philosophy will be supported because of provision in the bill for similar participation by the province. Certainly we recognize there are limitations in the financal ability of the area municipalities in the principle that is involved here, and that extensive financial help from the province is going to be required. Provision is made in the bill for just this.

I like to think, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to emphasize the principle involved here. I think, as do many people at the moment, that this can provide a model piece of legislation for similar development in other areas of the province, where emphasis can be given to these important things associated with local interests.

The matter of extension of the terminal points of this particular facility have been

referred to here today. There is no reason, and there is nothing in the bill, that says they cannot extend the mileage of this parkway—none. And that is why the bill has been written in that manner. But I suggest to you—

Mr. Reaume: I wonder if you had any thoughts on that. I know that there is no provision.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I could not agree with the hon. member more, that it would be folly to pursue Highway 40 any further for parkway purposes. But there is nothing to say that this could not skirt the south shore of Lake St. Clair and get in the direction of Windsor that way. I do submit to the House that the best place to start anything, as I have said before, is at the beginning. Where better do you start?

Mr. Oliver: No question about that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, there can be no argument about that, the hon. member for Grey South says. I simply submit again, in support of the principle of this bill, that a start has been made. And whether something was thought of 36 years ago or not, I frankly do not care. We are doing this today. It does not matter, and we are going to get on with it.

Now there is no reason to assume that we cannot go northerly from Point Edward. I suggest to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that the particular and precise route of Highway 21 does not serve this particular purpose either. It is far better to be close to the shoreline of Lake Huron than it is to follow Highway 21 through Forest, and through country like that, because you cannot develop parkways there.

Now to get back to the matter—

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was going to answer the question you posed before. You have already asked several, you see. The hon. member for Essex North was concerned, and properly so because he lives in this area, with the principle of whether this would be a few picnic tables and highway park sites. I wonder if I might request the attention of the member for Essex North—thank you very much.

If he refers, and I do not want to be specific here, in the strict sense of things, but I am using a section of the bill to illustrate the principle that is involved and associated with it, and it is a new type of legislation.

Subsection (b) of section 3, I think, contemplates all those things that we hope to do, that you are concerned about:

> To acquire, construct, operate, maintain and generally manage and provide recreational facilities, archaeological and historic sites, restaurants, refreshment booths, stands for the sale of souvenirs and other wares, shops, sanitary and toilet facilities, buses and other vehicles for use in connection with the parks, boats and boat lines, camp sites and all other facilities or conveniences incidental to or necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the park.

I think that is comprehensive. I think that means a great deal more than a park bench here and there. I frankly do.

Just to conclude any further remarks I might have on the principle of what I am inclined to call a rather forward type of legislation, let me say that this can be a model for a similar parkway along the Ottawa river. Representation has been made to us already by people in the Pembroke-Renfrew area to examine this statute and see if it could not be applied along the Ottawa river. Similar representation has been made by a committee of municipal representatives from the Niagara peninsula who see this bill making it possible for them to get the long-awaited Niagara escarpment parkway—and this has been talked about for many, many years. But they see this as a possible vehicle upon which to develop a parkway along the Niagara escarpment, and we have had a meeting with them already. We have sent them copies of the bill.

I do not think this is setting up a dynasty or a series of little dynasties. It is simply involving the interest of local people who know their requirements and can administer the operations of parkways in their areas better than anyone else. Now this is basically the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker. I hope it receives second reading here this morning.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask this? I know that you gave long thought to the terminal points. Were there any other terminal points that you thought about? Did you ever think that probably it may have been a good idea to have had one of the points at Windsor, working east—which I think would have been an equally as beautiful parkway as any that you probably could have picked out? He indeed

would have built it then in an area where there are lots of people.

Had you thought of Windsor working east at all, as a terminal point? Had you thought of Belle River as a point? Stoney Point as a point? Or any of those areas in there. Going on east, did you only think of Point Edward, going toward Wallaceburg and Chatham? Were they the only points that you had in mind, or did the fact that Essex North, or one or two of the other areas in there having a Grit representing them, have any effect on your thinking?

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. Reaume: Well it might be a fair thing to ask if you thought of any other areas at all. It is obvious.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is associated with the principle of the bill at all—

Mr. Reaume: It could be.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —and I do not think it requires an answer.

Mr. Reaume: It could be the whole thing, the whole bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill 103, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, the question that was asked in error a few moments ago by the hon. member for Riverdale, I would like to ask at this time. Is there any significance in eliminating the cause of death from a burial permit, as provided in section 1 of the bill? What is the reason that this has been eliminated?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, actually the cause of death does not appear in any document which is available to the public. The cause of death does not appear, for example, in a death certificate which is issued. It was brought to my attention that the cause of death appears on a burial permit, which is a public document in the sense that it can appear somewhere—for example, in one instance where a body of a deceased person was being shipped, the burial permit was attached to the coffin. It disclosed the cause of death which, in this particular instance, was suicide.

We are removing the appearance of the cause of death in this document, which is something that can be out in the open and does not appear in the death certificate—which is also again a document which any person can apply for and receive. There is no useful purpose being served in having this appear. The cause of death does appear in the proper records, in the records of the public as contained within the official circles, and this was brought to my attention and we deemed it proper to have it eliminated.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves second reading of Bill 104, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see this bill before the House and, of course, hope it will go through and get Royal assent just as soon as possible.

The bill now makes official the establishment of the Hamilton region conservation authority. I can see the principle in the bill, and many may not. I think the principle entailed in this bill is the fact that large municipalities participate with the smaller surrounding municipalities in the very important work of conservation.

For many years, some people in Hamilton have supported the efforts of the Spencer Creek conservation authority to have the corporation of Hamilton join with them in forming a larger conservation authority to take in the Hamilton and Saltfleet areas. I was incensed, along with others, because the council of the city of Hamilton took a rather dog-in-the-manger attitude toward their responsibility in this regard. And I was happy to be one of the Hamilton district labour council who studied the problem and was able to convince the Hamilton district labour council to add their support and urge the city council in Hamilton to join with the Spencer Creek authority in the enlargement of this conservation region.

Certainly there were some snags to iron out in order to bring about the agreement, and I feel that they are now satisfactory. Of course, they must be, or the bill would not be before the House. To enlarge the conservation authority in the way this bill does will benefit the people in the district. Cer-

tainly the citizens of the city of Hamilton will get much benefit from the enlargement of the authority inasmuch as the conservation and protection of the surrounding areas does belong to the people in a large area such as the Metro Hamilton area.

I am happy that the bill is now before us, and I am certain that it will do much good for the Hamilton area. There is a lot of work to be done in the Saltfleet township, and the Lake Ontario section, and I am sure that the members will now apply themselves much better with the financial support afforded by the participation of the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PENAL AND REFORM INSTITUTIONS INSPECTION ACT

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves second reading of Bill 108, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JAILS ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 109, An Act to amend The Jails Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INDUSTRIAL FARMS ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 110, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PUBLIC FINANCE COMPANIES

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 106, An Act to provide for the registration of and disclosure by public finance companies that hold shares in private loan companies.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 107, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming, in the west gallery, students from Brantford collegiate institute, United Nations debating club, Brantford.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, in rising to present the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management for the fiscal year 1966-67, I should like to review briefly for hon. members of the Legislature the policy the government is following with respect to our water resources management and to set forth some of the progress we are making.

Our policy, in general, can be simply stated. It is to assure adequate water supplies for all uses and to maintain the quality of these waters to a high standard.

Supply of water is not really a problem for us. Our annual precipitation of approximately 30 inches is more than sufficient to supply all our needs. However, planning and management are required to retain this moisture for when and where it is needed because, in many areas, about one-third of our annual precipitation runs off in the spring of the year and is lost to our use. It is this loss our flood control and reservoir policies are designed to prevent. In so doing, such waters are held for our use during the remaining months of the year.

In 1964, a policy of encouragement was offered to conservation authorities to increase the construction of small reservoirs. Under this programme, 27 reservoirs are now under construction and an additional 39 are in the planning stage. The extra construction and planning has been the result of the government assuming 75 per cent of the capital cost of reservoir construction. This accounts for the considerable increase this year in the capital estimates required for this programme.

There are already indications that the cost of reservoir and flood control construction is rising and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. The increasing demands being made on the construction industry have

brought about much higher tenders than earlier estimated. It is likely, therefore, that the high cost of construction will retard to some degree the progress planned for the coming year under the small reservoir programme.

When this programme was announced, it was to have a life extending to the end of December, 1966. Prevailing conditions during the next few months will be watched carefully to determine whether there will be a need to slow down construction, and under what terms the policy might be extended.

In the past year the government adopted a policy to assume major responsibility for the maintenance of dams. We have agreed to pay a 75 per cent grant toward the cost involved to keep the dams in a safe operating condition. Following an inspection procedure, grants were paid on 20 conservation authority dams last year. This year, 65 will be inspected by our engineers and it is expected all will be eligible for grants.

We have also assumed major responsibility for the engineering work required up to the point of calling tenders for water conservation projects and for the mapping of lands along our rivers subject to flood conditions. In both programmes, we have increased our provincial grant from 50 per cent to 75 per cent.

In the fiscal year, 1965-66, the total money allotted for provincial grants to conservation authorities for all conservation projects was $8.6 million. An additional sum of $3.7 million was available from the federal government under The Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act. I feel it is of interest that 83 per cent of the provincial capital grant to conservation authorities was for the purpose of water conservation projects such as large and small dams, channel improvements, and flood plain land purchases.

This year, I am asking the Legislature for capital grants for conservation authorities totalling $14,665,000. About 93 per cent of this has been designated for water conservation. It is anticipated that $3.9 million will be contributed in 1966 by the federal government for major flood control projects.

For the past two years, staff members of my department have been holding meetings with their counterparts in Ottawa reviewing the flood control agreements operating between the province and the federal government. Just recently I met with the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister of the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, to discuss the policy to be followed in future agreements and to co-ordinate pollution control work between our two governments. I should like to indicate to the Legislature that our discussions have been very fruitful and that it is always our policy to co-ordinate our programmes with the federal administration and to seek Ottawa's assistance wherever possible.

We welcome the establishment of two new conservation authorities – the Prince Edward region and the Rideau valley. The Napanee region authority was enlarged last year by the addition of the Salmon River watershed. Plans are being made to form a new one in the Hamilton region, embracing the area covered by the Spencer Creek conservation authority, together with the city of Hamilton and some of the surrounding municipalities. At the present time, the new Grand River conservation authority is organizing under special legislation just recently given Royal assent. There are now 36 authorities, embracing 545 municipalities and covering nearly 26,000 square miles.

At this time, 20 years after The Conservation Authorities Act was passed, we are rapidly achieving our plan to have most of the municipalities in "old Ontario" take advantage of its provisions. It is encouraging to note the pace of organizing new authorities is not slackening. This indicates that the original concept of regional resource management on a watershed basis was a sound one and has continued to be so. Despite difficulties which arise from time to time, the principles of organization established in 1946 are still acceptable and applicable to conditions in 1966.

While initiation for organization and reorganization continues to come from local municipalities, it is our policy to give encouragement and assistance to keep objectives and organization up to date. It is my strong feeling that those many small areas of the province lying adjacent to organized conservation authorities but not falling within any major watershed should be brought into existing authorities.

At the same time, many small authorities are recognizing that more adequate work can only be accomplished by combining with others. Such amalgamation will be encouraged by the province because the development of larger authorities with a broader tax base provides greater opportunity for the effective management of our water, land, forest, wildlife and recreational resources. In this way, costs of administration can be reduced,

efficiencies achieved, and the interests of the people in a region can be better served.

The government policy to aid private land owners to establish farm ponds has continued to be actively used. Since April 1, 1965, 506 farm ponds have been accepted for subsidy. Three hundred and twenty-seven received the maximum subsidy of $500, while the average subsidy of all ponds was $358.69. This programme which, in the fiscal year 1965-66, cost $181,498.30, has now been accepted as an ARDA programme and Ottawa is sharing the subsidy on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

An analysis of the use to which farmers are putting these ponds shows irrigation and livestock watering far exceed all others. In some rural townships in southwestern Ontario, local fire departments have mapped farm ponds as available sources of water with which to combat fires. This is a commendable practice.

Our policy to increase water supply and to control pollution calls for close co-ordination of plans and activities between the conservation authorities, the Ontario water resources commission, municipalities and industry. The Ontario water resources commission, since its establishment in 1956, has achieved remarkable success and I should like to record some of these accomplishments at this time.

Since the commission's programme commenced, over $1 billion has been spent in Ontario by municipalities to construct sewage and pollution control works. These have been done under certificates issued by the commission and include some works in which commission financing has been arranged.

Over $133 million of municipal sewage works are presently in operation, under construction or development where all of the financing is being arranged through the commission. Another $110 million of capital investment has been made by industry in the past nine years. This is an encouraging development and one that shows that industry by itself is playing a major role in pollution abatement. Some major industries in Ontario are investing amounts varying from $2 million to $8 million to reduce pollution.

The latest statistics on requirements for sewage works in Ontario indicate that of the 977 municipalities in the province, only 26 with sanitary sewer systems have no sewage treatment facilities. Only ten of these have no active plans to make provision for them. The commission is working with these and they are being required to develop and construct the necessary treatment works.

From 1957, when the OWRC programme commenced, until the beginning of 1966—a period of only nine years—the commission completed construction of 81 sewage treatment plants on behalf of municipalities. An additional 16 are presently under construction. In the same period, 45 plants were constructed by municipalities on their own and an additional 59 treatment facilities are under active development. This means that, in total, 201 sewage treatment facilities have been constructed in a period of nine years. By comparison, during the 37 years preceding 1957, only 57 sewage treatment plants were built in the province of Ontario.

Approximately ten per cent of Ontario's municipalities still require sewers and sewage treatment works. Lack of adequate financing has been a major factor in their inability to undertake a programme. I should like to comment on the policy of the government regarding provincially financed water and sewage works. Under the normal type of agreement between a municipality and the commission, most municipalities were able to assume regular project financing. However, a number of municipalities which could not proceed either through their own financial arrangements or under commission financing because of their inability to incur further capital debt, were still not able to undertake water and sewage works.

In 1964, the government extended the commission's authority to allow construction of provincially owned water projects for the benefit of a municipality and, in 1965, the same policy was extended to include sewage works. Water and sewage works are therefore supplied to and paid for by the municipality under a service contract with the commission.

The first of these projects undertaken is the Lake Huron water supply system, a 30-mile pipeline from Lake Huron to the London area. This line, estimated to cost $18 million, will have a capacity of 67 million gallons per day and will serve the city of London and other municipalities.

The second such pipeline was approved in 1965 to bring Lake Erie water to the city of St. Thomas and the surrounding areas. Three other systems have been recently recommended, one for the county of Lambton, one for Kent, and another for the Napanee-Deseronto area. Surveys are under way investigating similar possibilities in the township of Bucke, the lower Grand river area, and in the southern part of Peel county. The latter proposal is concerned with the integrated development of water supply and sewage disposal.

This programme has considerable advantage to a municipality. No capital debt as such will be imposed on it. The province's investment will be recovered over a 40-year period from rates levied on a usage basis. Future growth is allowed for in the oversizing of plants, the cost of which will be carried by the province until the added capacity is utilized. The type of construction and the degree of treatment can also be fully controlled by the province. This policy has already brought forth approximately 100 applications from municipalities desiring to enter into such agreements.

The province of Ontario is now being recognized as one of the leading jurisdictions on the North American continent with respect to its pollution control programme. It is my opinion that the backbone of Ontario's pollution problem has been broken and that with the increasing co-operation from industry and the citizens of the province, the next ten years will see a vast improvement in the qualities of our provincial waters. Ontario legislation respecting pollution and sewage control is very comprehensive and complex, and while it is not our intention to take advantage of this legislation to unduly enforce control programmes, we will not fail to use it whenever co-operative action cannot be attained.

I should like to make a few comments on the programme of our department concerned with energy. Ontario continues to be a heavy consumer of energy from all sources. As a matter of fact, on a per capita basis, it has one of the highest consumption rates in the world.

The consumption of natural gas has increased 14 per cent over 1964. Residential use accounts for 35 per cent of the gas consumed and 91 per cent of the users. Industrial consumers account for only one per cent of the users but for 48 per cent of consumption.

Estimates indicate that, by 1980, the market requirements for natural gas will have expanded from the present 220 billion to 500 billion cubic feet per year. For this reason, the Ontario government is watching with interest Trans-Canada Pipe Lines' applications to the national energy board and the U.S. federal power commission to construct extra transmission facilities to supply greater volumes of western Canada gas for the eastern market.

The consumption of propane in Ontario has also increased rapidly. Last year we used 25 to 30 per cent more than in the previous year. Export commitments of propane from western Canada, combined with our increased demand, have at times left some local suppliers in a much tighter supply position than was the case a year ago.

Ontario's refining capacity has increased about six per cent and this section of the industry can now process 319,000 barrels of crude oil per day. The enlargement of refineries continues each year to keep pace with our expansion.

Since Ontario is such a large user of energy, our concern within the department is principally with the safe utilization of oil, natural gas and propane. The present Energy Act and its regulations lay out in specific form the standards we require for the safe use and transportation of these products. Codes which are normally accepted today by industry as installation guides are more widely being adopted by regulatory bodies.

These codes, as they are kept up to date, reflect new techniques, the use of new materials, and new standards of safety. We take the view, and it is supported by industry, that in a province with such a huge appetite for energy, the revision of installation codes is of utmost importance.

We are developing our own Ontario codes which we will adopt as part of the regulations supporting our legislation. At the same time, we are hopeful that revised installation codes will become standard in all provinces. To this end, we are supporting, through the use of our staff and with our finances, the Canadian standards association in its responsibility to provide codes suitable on a national basis.

The same modern safety requirements are now envisaged for the use of gasoline under the new Gasoline Handling Act. Many of the Act's provisions parallel the handling provisions in The Energy Act so that the transportation and distribution of gasoline will be maintained at a high standard.

The transfer of the administration of The Gasoline Handling Act to my department has meant we are now able to combine the licensing programmes of it and The Energy Act in one operation involving over 40,000 licences a year. This operation is now being mechanized and streamlined.

Since the establishment of the department in 1960, the responsibilities of the energy branch have progressively increased with respect to natural gas, propane, oil, and now, gasoline. We have been able to accomplish this by working closely with industry, by providing realistic legislation and regulations

—and through our attempts to keep our codes up to date as I mentioned previously. We have, on staff, five field inspectors in addition to the number employed in 1960. We have added specialized and technical personnel to our Toronto office and have increased our engineering capabilities.

In co-operation with the Ontario water resources commission, the department is working to decrease water pollution in some of the oil- and gas-producing areas of Ontario. This type of pollution is occurring in those areas of the province where the oil-producing industry had its early beginnings in this province.

In addition, each year we are called upon to plug abandoned gas wells in southwestern Ontario. For the most part, these occur in areas where the production of gas took place around the turn of the century. Due to a lack of concern on the part of the operators and the lack of supervision at that time, these wells were either not plugged at all or were plugged improperly.

In some instances, these now create unsafe conditions, sometimes in our towns and cities. In the interests of safety, they must be plugged. Where ownership can be traced, the cost of plugging becomes the owner's responsibility. Where ownership is unknown, the greater part of the plugging cost becomes a charge on the provincial Treasury. I should like to point out that we are not attempting to replug all of the old wells in Ontario. Many of these are in out-of-way places and do not cause conditions considered to be unsafe.

Some fascinating developments have taken place during the past year when our department, in concert with the University of Western Ontario and the oil- and gas-producing industry, has developed the use of computers as an aid to oil- and gas-exploration work. While the knowledge of competent geologists is still required to interpret the output of the computer, the speed with which computers can produce information places Ontario among the foremost in Canada in this field.

The report of the Ontario energy board for 1965 has been tabled in the Legislature.

The board is working on an important special project which will enable it to carry out more efficiently its duty of determining just and reasonable rates for the users of natural gas in the province. At the last session of the Legislature, power was given to the board to prescribe a uniform system of accounts for gas companies. Since then, the board has been devoting much of its time to this matter.

This long-range project has required close attention to a great deal of technical detail as well as to some important principles of accounting and regulation. The work is now nearing completion and it is expected that the regulation prescribing the system will be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor in council at an early date for his approval.

During the current year the board will hold public hearings on rates which have not previously come before it for review. These will include the rates of Lakeland Natural Gas Company Limited, Provincial Gas Company Limited and Grimsby Natural Gas Limited, as well as the storage rates of Tecumseh Gas Storage Limited and the storage, transmission and wholesale gas rates of Union Gas Company.

The Ontario energy board has important responsibilities for controlling the development and utilization of gas storage fields. A number of these fields are in operation pursuant to orders of the board and they assist substantially in providing Ontario gas users with a year-round supply of gas at reasonable cost. During 1965, one additional pool was brought into operation. Following a public hearing, the board granted to the Consumers' Gas Company the right to inject gas into and remove gas from the Crowland pool in Welland county.

The most important pipeline construction that came before the board during the year was the completion of the second section of the Union Gas Company's 34-inch Dawn-Oakville pipeline. The first section, from Dawn township to London, had already been completed and the second section brings the line as far east as Woodstock. The board held 35 public hearings on expropriations, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this section of the line.

In May of 1965, Mr. A. B. Jackson, who had been for the past ten years a member of the public utility commission of British Columbia, was appointed vice-chairman of the Ontario energy board.

With the expansion of the natural gas industry, two of the major Ontario utility companies have extended their operations into adjoining provinces. It is therefore more important than ever that the board maintain close working relationships with utility commissioners in the other provinces. This is being done through meetings and annual

conferences with public utilities commissioners across Canada. The province of Quebec will be host to the conference this year.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to, not only the hon. members of this Legislature, but to all departments of government as well, for their co-operation, and to the members of the several commissions for which I report to the government, the Ontario energy board, and the members of my immediate staff for their loyalty and support.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, although there are other hon. members of our party who are more familiar with the short history of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, the task has fallen to me to lead off for our party in the discussion of these estimates.

As other estimates have been studied and debated in this House over the past two months, I have tried to equip myself with a knowledge of the workings of the department. One basic difference continually appears between this department and the others we have examined. In other departments, the Minister concerned has had a direct responsibility for the activities and programmes of his specific estimates, whereas in this area the Minister appears to have little or no control over a great portion of that for which he is responsible. The inclusion of the OWRC, Hydro commission, Ontario energy board and the Ontario Northland Railway under this portfolio appears to be for no other reason than administrative convenience. The actual control and planning remains with the commissions or boards concerned, and the Minister acts only as a rubber stamp for their recommendations and activities.

Even in the committee of the Legislature dealing with government commissions, the Minister takes no active part such as is taken by other Ministers in other committees. For example, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and the hon. Minister of Mines are present and participate in the activities of the wildlife and mining committee. This is not meant to be a criticism of the hon. Minister, but rather of the method of administrative responsibility set up by the government itself.

I would add here, however, that I hope the Minister will be more co-operative and informative during these estimates this year than he has been in the past, according to the *Hansard* reports.

The inclusion of the estimates of The Parks Assistance Act under this department is out of place when you consider its close association with The Department of Lands and Forests. I think this goes along with discussions we had earlier today on the bill. The Department of Lands and Forests operates similar establishments across the province, especially in areas where conservation authorities are nonexistent. During the fiscal year ending March, 1965, the appropriation to be used under this Act amounted to $300,000, but less than 57 per cent of these moneys were expended. This year the appropriation requested is $350,000. Municipalities are not being made properly aware of the availability of these moneys to provide the much-needed facilities for our tourists and travelling public. Perhaps this is one area in which this department could justify its existence by the promotion of the availabilities under this Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a few minutes now on the Ontario Northland Railway, the development road of the north, as it is so often referred to by this government. It now appears that it will shortly become financially stable to the extent that it will no longer lose money on operations, mainly because of the advances made recently in the field of communications, and apparently because of the new mining developments at Timmins, Kirkland Lake and Timagami.

Management problems still seem to be plaguing the operations, however, in spite of attempts made by the commission over the past few years. At the present time, I believe, the general manager is Mr. E. A. Frith, an experienced and well-qualified man in the field of communications, but without background knowledge in railroad operations. The operations of the road itself does not have effective leadership, except for that provided by the chairman of the commission, who, after all, is not expected to perform that function as chairman of the commission.

Some 12-14 months ago, the commission did retain a general manager of railroad operations, a Mr. J. Cahn, but about four weeks ago he left that position to return to the Canadian National Railways. According to press reports, he was called back to the CNR and had only been on loan to the ONR. This, however, was not the stated case when he was first appointed.

The fact still remains, however, that the road does require more leadership in the field of transportation. A permanent appointment should be made if it is to properly perform its function of a development road for northern Ontario. The politically appointed

commission should not be responsible for management.

Labour relations of the ONR this past year were a significant point in the operations, especially in regard to the integration of the Canada pension plan with the then current plan of the employees. There was for some time talk of a strike by the employees over the manner in which the government attempted to force, unilaterally, the integration of the pension on the employees. Negotiations were at first denied the employees by the government itself, not the commission. Queen's Park took the decision completely out of the hands of the commission and made a complete unilateral decision without regard for either commission or employee. Eventually, however, after the employees refused to accept the dictates given to them, negotiations of a type did take place and a more equitable settlement was reached. The government, however, never did bargain in good faith and held the threat of complete removal from the Canada pension plan over the heads of the employees to try to force settlement.

I would like to commend at this time the employees and their bargaining committee for the way in which they stood their ground against the dictatorial attitude of the government and the 19th-century methods they employed in dealing with the labour forces. These people have come of age, and will no longer be submissive to the political and other environmental conditions that at one time governed the conditions of work and employment, as well as promotion in that organization. The Ontario Northland Railway commissioners, I am sure, are aware of the conditions and the changes that have taken place.

Mr. Chairman, I will leave any remarks our party might have in regard to the energy board and The Conservation Authorities Act until those specific votes come up.

The question of water levels in the Great Lakes does not seem quite so urgent this year, but the problem is still with us and will be again in future years. We could have low-level years such as were experienced in 1963 and 1964, or high levels such as in the 1950s. The solution to this problem seems to be a momentous job, but in the opinion of many it must be reached and can be done.

The hon. member for Muskoka has pointed out here in the Legislature that it is his opinion, and I presume that of the government, that, and I quote: "It seems inevitable that the Great Lakes must ultimately be regulated."

Professor G. B. Langford, head of the Great Lakes institute, has said: "Any shortage of water in the lakes in the foreseeable future can be overcome by preventing the wastage which now takes place by outflow. It is apparent that total regulation of the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence system is the logical solution to our dilemma."

Four of five departments of this government have supported this view in submissions to bodies studying the problem under the international joint commission. There seems to be a general agreement that total control of the Great Lakes would be beneficial to all concerned—the shipping industry, power agencies, tourist and summer home owners, shipbuilders and fishermen, both commercial and sportsman. But these different groups require different maximum or minimum levels for the provision of best use. The question now seems to be in the finding of a level with as small a variation as possible to provide the optimum overall benefit to all concerned. Each affected group must be prepared to compromise. The engineering skills and mechanical facilities can be made available to provide the agreed-upon control at a large cost, but it is an essential expenditure.

The problem has been with us for 100 years. It is now past time for action by all governments concerned, both American and Canadian, federal and provincial, before we suffer the costly years of the not-too-distant past. Leadership in this matter must continue to come from Ontario as we are, no doubt, the most interested party in Canada. But the federal government must also be prepared to pay its share for the good of the whole country.

Up to this point, I have not mentioned water diversion schemes or export of our water to the U.S. I believe it is a different subject from that of Great Lakes levels, although the two could be interconnected if it were the only way to provide ultimate stability of the lakes, or if the United States expanded its water diversions from the Great Lakes basin in the future, which I think is a distinct possibility.

Canada requires a complete national water policy, both to govern matters of usage and pollution. The federal government must lead in the development of this policy, although the powers now lie with the provinces. A co-operative policy must be laid out between the federal government and the provinces so that we can finally tell on what course we are headed. A complete inventory is required of our resource and a policy should be developed along with the inventory for control of both the movement and usage of water.

I would like to quote from a speech made by the Hon. John Turner to a national water conference in Washington on December 9 last which, I believe, should outline the policy of the federal government in regard to this problem of water use, and the continental waters theory that some of our neighbours might be considering.

> We want, as Canadians, to look at these waters ourselves, and come up with the optimum use of these waters for Canada, wherever that use may be. We do not agree that continental development necessarily means the increasing of population and industry in already existing centres. We feel that true continental development should include development of Canadian population and industry and its expansion into Canada's empty northland. Before Canada can contemplate export or sale of water we must achieve a better co-ordination among our federal-provincial governments over the use of water. At the federal-provincial conference of July 1965, a document was tabled by the federal government entitled "The water policy of the federal government," presumed to be a declaration of Canada First water policy.

We believe it is agreed now that the policy outlined by the document and by Mr. Turner is the position to be taken. But from that follows the question: When are we to arrive at the answers?

The Dominion-provincial survey of our northern Ontario watershed is a proper step, but the fact that it will take ten to 15 years to complete is most disappointing. This project, along with a similar project that will be established in Quebec, could have the answers for us in a very few years, so that a decision could then be reached on water diversions such as that proposed by Thomas Kierans. I am sure that within a very few years our neighbours to the south will be asking us for an answer. Out of responsibility to the people of Canada and the province of Ontario, the necessary background surveys should be completed to enable a policy to be established and answers to be given.

Earlier in this session we had a debate on two resolutions in the names of the hon. member for Grey South and the hon. member for Sudbury. Both dealt with the supply of fresh water to the people of Ontario. One outlined the fact that reasonably efficient sewage disposal facilities were a right of all municipalities across the province. The hon. member for Sudbury pointed out that it is the ultimate responsibility of the members of this Legislature to provide these service facilities to the people of our province, and that it is not enough to sit back and yawn while reflecting that we have placed the responsibility for our water resource in the hands of an independent commission. The hon. member for Grey South asked the government to provide a water grid system, planned and set out in definite terms for, especially, southwestern Ontario, so that we could see where we were going in a definite pattern.

It was rather disappointing at that time to hear the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin and vice-chairman of the Ontario water resources commission make his contribution to the debate. He spent over ten minutes attacking the hon. member for Sudbury and less than five minutes outlining what he considered to be government successes and policy. It is surprising that a member with his responsibility of supposedly speaking for the government on this most important matter could not have given a more concise insight into the governmental actions and their future policy. The council of resource Ministers, in attempting a rough estimate of losses through water pollution, has set the annual loss in Ontario at $175 million.

In this country, with more than 25 per cent of the world's fresh water, we are beginning to see the abuse we have given our great national resource, and people are worried. Pollution is increasing in Ontario at a faster rate than the OWRC at the present time is able to cope with it, and this is on the industrial level, I think. The commission has, in the past, done a reasonable job with the moneys and manpower at its disposal, or should I say the moneys it was able to have spent by municipalities and industry.

The vice-chairman claims that they are right on schedule and have spent more than $1 billion since 1956. The problem, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is that the schedule did not properly take into consideration at least five factors:

1. The extent to which pollution had taken hold in 1956 after 13 years of complete inactivity when pollution was building up during the latter years of the war and in the postwar boom;

2. The tremendous population growth, especially in our urban areas, over the past ten years with the added need for fresh water and resultant increased sewage and wastes;

3. The industrial expansion that has taken place, especially in southern Ontario, as well

as the diversification of industry which provided a multitude of different pollutant materials;

4. The lack of ability of the municipalities to keep paying the capital costs while the government sat back and directed spending. For some years now, most municipalities have reached and surpassed their ability to tax the homeowner whether the borrowing is done direct by municipal debenture through the OWRC, or at a rental charge to OWRC for facilities—they just cannot afford to pay. In many instances, the Ontario municipal board has pointed this out by refusing approvals to municipalities for provincial expenditures recommended by OWRC;

5. The decreasing value of the dollar and what it will buy in terms of facilities or work.

According to the vice-chairman, the government is moving ahead with its 1956 plan in spite of the increasing pollution and increased need for fresh water. They seem to be completely oblivious to changing needs and conditions. The commission cannot be held responsible for this, but rather the government, which should be at least formulating policy and supplying the moneys to perform a proper job.

Almost every day in the press of the province we see some municipal official taking exception to the OWRC in regard to recommendations in its area. It is becoming more and more apparent that a regional approach must be taken to the whole problem. The responsibility of policing on the local level must be removed from the local health boards and placed in the hands of the OWRC. Officials of the OWRC have stated publicly that local health boards are not checking or doing their job properly at the local level. If this is the case, then the commission itself must accept the responsibility. Regional offices should be established across the province, both to perform the function of control and checking as well to provide facilities and advice on the local level to both municipalities and industry.

As I have stated before, many municipalities have reached their limit in financing, but in a great number of cases where treatment plants have been provided the secondary, and just as important, job of separating storm and sanitary sewers has not even been touched.

Many of the new treatment plants are operating at overcapacity, thereby operating inefficiently and not purifying the sewage, because of the storm waters that are pouring into them. In other cases, storm sewers which have sanitary sewers connected to them are being emptied directly into our waterways and that sewage avoids even the primary treatment it requires.

It has been stated that the city of Toronto requires an expenditure of $300 million to effect a proper separation programme. Other municipalities across the province face the same problem. It is now apparent that the government must act to provide help in this field to an even greater extent than it has given in the provision of treatment plants. The two needs are inseparable, one will never be efficient without the other but many at the municipal level believe their worries are over when the treatment plant is completed.

In the field of municipal water supply and control of pollution then, this government must provide an inspection service with area offices and representatives, as well as an expanded financial assistance to the water supply's system, to provide treatment facilities and to help in the separation of storm and sanitary sewers across the province. This would entail increased staff and operating facilities, as well as the expenditure of capital amounts to supplement municipal expenditures on a divided basis.

Industrial waste and pollution is today more potentially devastating than that of domestic sewerage and in this area the OWRC has only begun to take action over the past few years, mainly, I believe, because of financial reasons and lack of staff.

The fact that industry contributes the most potentially harmful types of pollutants such as organic chemical exotics, mineral and chemical substances, sediments and radioactive substances makes for especially difficult treatment and a much more toxic effluent sometimes of unknown power when mixed with other wastes.

The application of control measures to an industry demands a knowledge of both the type of chemical involved and production processes which, in most cases, only the specific industry concerned has. Hence each effluent must be judged and laboratory tested individually. Process changes and recovery procedures within the induistrial production method itself will often reduce pollutant waste rather than effluent treatment but this is usually an internal industrial function that can only be done by the specific industry itself.

The dead waters of our Great Lakes are mainly the result of the dissolved salts, particularly nitrates and phosphates in industrial waste.

In the annual OWRC report of 1964 we find the following statement:

> The continuous large-scale growth in Ontario, impressive in all types of industry but most noteworthy in the chemical industry, continued to outstrip the capabilities of the branch to provide complete field coverage.

The question now is what advances have been made over the past year to correct this situation by the provision of better facilities and more staff, as well as the production of a provincial-wide set of minimum standards for each industrial effluent as well as adequate policing of such standards.

Early in 1965 the OWRC set out a programme to bring the pulp and paper industry under adequate control and to force the clean-up of pollution in that area. Each company was to provide a primary treatment facility to their effluent by June 1, 1965, followed by a plan for secondary treatment to be submitted by December 31, last year. Progress reports were to be followed on a yearly basis with OWRC consultation when required.

Later, I believe in April or May of last year, other industries were sent letters outlining what the OWRC expected from them in similar stages and pointing out the powers of OWRC to enforce the regulations.

We have heard little of the work in these fields since the pronouncements made early last year. There are numerous questions in this field to be answered. Has the co-operation of industry been good? How many have failed to submit plans as requested? Has the OWRC been sufficiently staffed to handle the problems arising out of this programme?

Industry up to now has known well that the government would not bring action under The Water Resources Act. Up to this time only a few major industrial offenders have been charged. The commission has refused to use the power it supposedly has available under the law. As a result industry has not been convinced of the seriousness of the government. It is time a proper policing and enforcement programme was introduced.

The cost to industry, however, will be tremendous and in many cases more than they can afford under present facilities for borrowing on short-term repayment plans. Here again I believe, it is the responsibility of this government to provide a financial arrangement whereby industry can have the moneys made available to them at a reasonable interest rate repayable over a 20- or 30-year period, just as has been done for municipalities. The government should then be prepared to prosecute where industry does not act and to provide the necessary facilities with the total cost being charged back to industry for immediate payment. An amendment to The Water Resources Act in 1964 allows for this procedure and should be used if required.

New industrial developments are being built at a tremendous rate in the past few years but a complete check has not been instigated to affect the provisions for control when the industry is built. In the future all such buildings should require the approval of OWRC to ensure that proper safeguards are included to provide satisfactory effluent.

In the United States, where a general awareness of the problem is fast becoming more apparent and recognized, the federal government is beginning to take drastic steps. Federal authorities have more latitude over the water resources than in Canada and the government has been given even more powers within the last years to enforce control. A new agency, the federal water pollution control administration, has been established to supervise all federal action in water use and pollution control.

The individual states have been given a time limit to establish proper standards and effect effluent control. If it is not up to standard within a year the federal agency will step in.

Here in Canada the problem is not yet so acute but unless action is taken on a federal level with provincial co-operation our condition will soon reach the same proportions.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to one pollution problem which indicates this government's action over the last good number of years and which has received some specific notoriety this past few days in the press. Why this government did not realize the extent to which pollution had gone in 1956 is beyond comprehension when one reads the debates of this House as early as 1950.

Last week an article appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* entitled "The Story of a River and Why it Stinks" by Mr. Ron Haggart, a reputable columnist whose work is always well researched. I would like to quote parts of this column which outlines the history of a polluted river and the effect it has had on the lives of individuals who depend on it for their living, especially in this case a tourist operator named Earl McKie

who was forced out of business by pollution. I will quote now from the article:

Today, Earl McKie is 72. Twenty years ago there were five tourist camps on the Spanish river; two of them are still operating but, as one of the owners wryly admitted, they don't get any repeat business. The reason for all this personal loss and tragedy is that the Spanish river, in a word, stinks. At Espanola, 35 miles upstream from the mouth, the KVP Company Ltd. (it stands for Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment) operates a huge kraft paper mill which every day of the week pours 16 million gallons of effluent into the river, the equivalent of the water consumption of the entire Toronto suburb of Etobicoke. The KVP Company opened its mill at Espanola in June, 1946 and almost at once began to pour five tons of wood chips a day into the Spanish river, to say nothing of the chemicals.

In 1947, the year after the mill opened, Earl McKie and some of his neighbours started a lawsuit against the KVP Company to stop them from poisoning the river which had been the source of their livelihood for many years. J. C. McRuer, then the chief justice of the high court, smelled the water of the Spanish river and found it "very foul."

In one of his classic decisions from a long and distinguished career on the bench, Chief Justice McRuer recalled that the right of downstream owners to water in its natural state is a principle of law which goes back to the days of Rome and beyond. It would not be sufficient, he said, merely to award damages to the fishermen and tourist camp operators—that would be giving a powerful company the right to expropriate a natural resource, to pay a pittance for the alienation of a river. He awarded Earl McKie and his neighbours $5,600 in damages, all their legal costs and said the KVP Company had to stop pouring its poisonous garbage into the Spanish river in six months.

The Legislature of Ontario might take away a man's rights, the chief justice said, but the courts would not. And the chief justice's premonition is exactly what happened. In March 1950, after the case had been appealed through two other courts and the injunction against the KVP Company ordering it to stop poisoning the river had been upheld throughout, the Conservative government of Leslie Frost introduced a little piece of law called "The KVP Act," which at the stroke of a pen dissolved the injunction which three courts had affirmed.

Leslie Frost, in other words, had decreed that which the Romans, and the Lords at Runnymede, had refused to concede: Leslie Frost's government said that people can poison rivers if they are big and rich enough.

"The injunction," said Prime Minister Leslie Frost on March 29, 1950, "could be very injurious to the public interest."

The special law lifting the injunction of the court was passed with plentiful assurances from Attorney-General Dana Porter that the Ontario research council would be empowered to search the world for solutions to the pollution problem; their extensive research would be in the widest possible terms.

Some studies were carried out. Two years later, the research council produced a report on pollution in the Spanish river and, later on, when the Ontario water resources commission was formed, it produced studies, once again relating the facts of the pollution, in reports of 1958, 1961, 1964 and 1965.

But the company was not without expert guidance. In 1962, Hon. Leslie Frost, former Premier of Ontario, became a member of the board of directors of the KVP Company Ltd., of Espanola, Ontario—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, surely the hon. member's sense of fairness and justice is going to make him read the reply of the former Prime Minister, as printed in that newspaper earlier this week?

Mr. Smith: If the hon. member will wait until I have finished, perhaps it will not be necessary that I read the reply.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I am not suggesting whether it should be necessary or not, but the member's own sense of fairness should dictate that he include it.

Mr. Smith: If the hon. member thinks when I am finished that I should read it, then perhaps he could bring it into the House and read it.

Bill 117 of the year 1952, An Act respecting the KVP Company Ltd., in itself was not a bad piece of legislation when one considers the economic implications that would have

resulted if the injunction had been enforced. The working people of the district of Espanola would have suffered from loss of employment and income to the point of disaster. This lever of power was undoubtedly used by the company to formulate local public opinion and force the government to introduce and enact Bill 117.

The fact that the Hon. Leslie Frost became a director of the KVP Company in 1962 is not the disturbing feature of this episode but governmental inactivity since 1950 to force correction of the pollution problem as well as their failure to remove the bill from the statutes is most disturbing considering the reports of the Ontario water resources commission in 1958-61-64 and 65 which all related the pollution in the river caused by KVP as time went on.

When one reads the proceedings of the Legislature in 1950 at the time of the passing of the bill, it is apparent that the government was certainly aware of the pollution problem, not only in the Spanish river but also all across the province. Section 4 of Bill 117 reads:

> 1. The research council of Ontario shall endeavour to develop methods that, if applied by the company, would abate or lessen the pollution of the waters of the Spanish river by the company.
>
> 2. The cost of carrying out its duties under subsection 1 shall be deemed to be a debt due by the company to the research council of Ontario.

Prime Minister Frost at that time said that the findings of the research council could be implemented by repealing the Act.

He went on to say and I quote again: "I am hopeful we can learn lessons we can apply across the province to this matter of pollution, which is immensely serious." And it was serious in 1950.

At the conclusion of the committee study of the bill, the leader of the Opposition remarked: "I think perhaps some of the worst headaches may be before us" and the hon. Mr. Frost replied: "I agree."

The hon. Mr. Dana Porter said during the debate: "We must make every effort to minimize pollution." Later he said: "We have pollution of many different kinds, it affects rivers and lakes, the land, and it affects the air in some places."

Mr. Chairman, these remarks, as I have said, are taken from the proceedings of this Legislature in 1950 and suggest the government's awareness of the problem at that time.

No doubt over the years the KVP have spent considerable sums in attempting to clear pollution and have been more co-operative than many other companies. Also there is no doubt this government is prepared to defend Bill 117 and the position of the hon. Mr. Frost in regard to this subsequent appointment as a director of KVP some ten years later.

But the real shame, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that now, 16 years later, the Spanish river is still polluted to an alarming extent and many other lakes and rivers have joined with it in this mire of filth.

The first real steps to control the pulp and paper industry were taken only a few months ago in spite of the promising words of the previous Prime Minister and his Minister in the year 1950.

In summing up, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the government and the hon. Minister some of the changes and new steps that must be taken if we are to cope with the present situation and those of the future under this department.

A complete reorganization of this department is essential to give it more meaning and bring the responsibility back to the executive council and this assembly.

The Ontario Northland Railway should be placed under the control of The Department of Economics and Development. As a development road it should play a major part in the regional development plans for north-eastern Ontario which that department should be finally undertaking sometime in the future.

Responsibility for the administration of The Parks Assistance Act should be placed with The Department of Lands and Forests.

The energy branch and the Ontario energy board could be shifted to The Department of Mines to provide a Department of Mines and Energy. The staff of the mines department is orientated towards the type of development necessary in the oil and gas industry.

This Department of Water Resources and Control would then become responsible for all the aspects of our water resources, water distribution and management as well as water pollution. The Conservation Authorities Act and the Ontario hydro-electric commission could remain with this department and the responsibility for air pollution could also be brought under this department.

The ministerial control of this department should be increased by either bringing the functions of the OWRC directly under departmental control or the appointment of the Minister as a commissioner to both the OWRC and Hydro.

Some specific points we would make in regards to our water resources are:

The establishment of a national water conservation board at the federal level with the co-operation of the provinces to provide minimum water quality standards across the country. This should provide an assessment, study and co-ordination of the overall policies of water development at the municipal, provincial and national levels. A specific study of the resource availabilities as well as our future needs should be made to establish national policy in regards to future use, diversions and export.

In the provincial field itself we would recommend:

(a) The establishment of regional offices of the OWRC across the province and the removal of certain authority for pollution inspection from local boards of health into the hands of the OWRC.

(b) Increased direct financial aid to municipalities for provision of water services and sewage treatment including sewer separation.

(c) The establishment of a water grid system in those parts of Ontario requiring it with a planned programme of progressive construction as needed.

(d) A plan for industry, similar to that provided municipalities, to provide access to financing over a 20- or 30-year period for capital costs at a reasonable rate. Removal of the sales tax at both provincial and federal level from devices and installation for pollution control.

(e) A stepped-up programme of policing over industry in conjunction with regional offices. A proper enforcement of the law in regards to industry with charges being laid if required.

(f) That the OWRC use their power of approval over all new industrial installations to assure proper treatment of effluent and to correct future problems before they exist.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in the few moments that are left to me this morning, I would like to add a word to what has already been said by the hon. member for Nipissing and draw a certain conclusion from what he has said and from other events that have take place in the province.

The incredibly bumbling approach to this whole problem of pollution, which has been debated time after time in this House, is demonstrated by two fish stories which have been brought to light this year. We have a lot of fishermen in this House and I am sure that they are going to be very interested in these fish stories. We might call them "The tale of the two fishes."

The first part of the tale began when I asked the hon. Minister, on February 15, whether any conviction had been obtained under section 27, subsection 1 of the OWRC within the last 12 months. The Minister informed me that there had been convictions and he named the Matspeck Construction Company Limited, Helmut Matthiss, I think the name is, and John Krauter.

Something of the wide-ranging nature of this police action on the part of the government can be understood when it is known that one of the men named was president of the Matspeck Construction Company; the other was manager of a farm owned by the said company.

The crime was that the farm's silo, perhaps two silos, were leaking and were polluting a brook. Downstream was a private fishpond owned by one B. C. McKenzie, a man who evidently had very great influence. It seems that the silage pollution was troubling the trout in the pond and some of them, according to Mr. McKenzie, were actually dying.

Anyway, the culprits—company, president and farm manager—were haled into court, the men were fined $250 each, plus $57.50 costs, with alternative of three months in jail. The company had gone into bankruptcy at the time the trial was held; it was found guilty, and I presume the trustee has met the obligation to the court since that time.

The second part of the tale of the two fishes came when the OWRC released on December 14 a report on the "study of the flavour of fish from the Spanish river and the adjacent north channel." I have the study here and I am afraid I have not time this morning to quote at length from it as I might have done.

This was a report on a gastronomical exercise undertaken by a government agency to determine how extensive pollution might be in the Spanish river. The report points out that not only does the river water stink right down to the lake, but that the fish in that river still taste like decaying mud, as they did when similar tests were made ten years ago.

The report says that while the company has been doing something to eliminate the river pollution, it still has a long way to go. It says this:

In order to correct the taste and odour

situation in the Spanish river and to prevent an increase in the problem with mill expansion, all malodorous waste must be eliminated in KVP Company discharge to the river.

Well, as we have heard, in 1948 KVP replaced an industry in Espanola which had closed down in 1930. Actually Espanola welcomed new employment, but when the new mill began pouring its chemical waste and wood fibre into the Spanish river, the results were immediate and were startling—and we have heard about them this morning.

Tourist camp operators and fishermen began to suffer and, before long, a suit was launched against the company. It resulted in a judgment against the operators just as did the one in Northumberland county a year ago. KVP was fined, and given six months to clean up the operation. The ruling was appealed through three courts; two other courts, as well as the original one. It was upheld.

Then the Legislature, under the guidance of former Prime Minister Leslie Frost, now a director of the company, passed Bill 117. This Act dissolved the injunction, prohibited the courts from ever issuing another one against the company, and I have a copy of that very interesting bill here. It is one perhaps we ought to study with great care.

The Act still stands and the company still pollutes the river and the fish. It is interesting that Mr. Frost, in Wednesday's press, maintained—and I come to the answer that was asked for. Just to comment on it briefly, because of lack of time, Mr. Frost said that when Chief Justice McRuer issued his injunction there was actually no remedy at that time. But Chief Justice McRuer would hardly have issued his injunction—and I stress this—unless he had been satisfied that a remedy did in fact exist.

It was in 1913 that authorities in the Ruhr valley started cleaning up pollution there; and at the very time that KVP started operations, the clean-up operation was in full swing. The 1955 study, and I have a copy of that here, which I can quote from at a later time, pointed out certain remedies which the plants should immediately undertake—and these remedies were then available—but without result.

I know that perhaps the Ruhr basin, and perhaps the Thames river in Britain, which had cleaned up its pollution at this time, do not have pulp mills on their banks. But other pulp mills in the Scandinavian countries were doing this job, and certainly Chief Justice McRuer knew that remedies were available; that is why he ordered this at the time.

So there we have the two fish stories. In one case, a little operator was haled into court for breaking the law against polluting the water. The trout in a private fish pond were dying.

In the other, the big operator poured millions of gallons of chemical and wood fibre waste a day into the Spanish river and the water is foul for 30 miles downstream. The tourist industry is all but destroyed and the fishing industry is ended. But the government of the day rises to the occasion and passes legislation to protect the big operator from the order to desist. The little guy is squashed, the big one is protected.

The same thing holds across the province right now. Big operators are asked to clean up, but legal action against them is lacking. Perhaps they are not killing enough trout. I do not know. They are just building up incredible pollution in our waterways and lakes and destroying assets wholesale. The flurry of activity now being undertaken should have been initiated ten years ago. Meantime, the situation gets worse, while the government would make available through the Ontario water resources commission the money needed to realistically tackle the problem. A start could be made by repealing the 1950 Act protecting KVP, and then insisting that this company, along with all others who are offending, tackle the situation with some degree of urgency.

Let us apply the same law against the rich and the poor. But above all, let the province make the necessary money available to assist where necessary and let it use the arm of the law with decisiveness where realistic co-operation is refused, and there are so many instances today where that co-operation is being refused.

Where industry is dragging its feet to the detriment of the province, then we should immediately be taking this action, and while certainly I have no criticism against the government for taking action against the operators who are killing the trout in the private fish ponds, I do quarrel with a government which refuses to take the same kind of action, where it is obviously called for in many other instances in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I presume that one o'clock is here, and I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves

that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will resume these estimates and there are bills on the order paper in the committee stage. Next week we will deal with those and I think we probably have enough debaters to have one period of Budget debate.

But on Monday, we will proceed with these estimates of this department.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask the hon. Prime Minister: Does the sequence of departmental estimates remain the same; Economics and Development after Energy—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Economics and Development following this, and then the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the hon. Prime Minister any idea what is beyond that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I will let you know next week. I have not at the moment.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 101



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 9, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 9, 1966

Statement on achievement awards re fitness or amateur sports, Mr. Rowntree 3165

Private Sanitaria Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 3165

Statement re interprovincial conference of human rights administrators, Mr. Rowntree 3165

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued 3166

Recess, 6 o'clock 3208

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, St. Aloysius separate school, and in the west gallery, Milenford junior high school, and Milverton public school, Milverton.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the House will meet at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon only, instead of at 2 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, might I just say that the hon. Prime Minister has asked me to give the House the following information in connection with this motion.

The purpose of the delayed opening is to accommodate a ceremony in the assembly, involving achievement awards to citizens of Ontario who have made a significant contribution to fitness or amateur sports.

The recipients of these awards are selected by The Department of Education and about 45 will be on hand for Tuesday's ceremony to accept their awards.

The last awards were made in 1964, when Bill Crothers, Petra Burka and the late Leo Troy were honoured.

The hon. Prime Minister suggests that although the House is not starting until 3 p.m., all hon. members are invited to be on hand at 2 o'clock for the ceremony.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE PRIVATE SANITARIA ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Private Sanitaria Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment. It is complementary to the amendments to The Coroners Act which provides for the reporting of deaths in private sanitaria.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a statement to the House in connection with the first interprovincial conference of human rights administrators, held in Toronto, May 5 and 6.

The Ontario human rights commission was the host to seven provinces and the federal government who came together to discuss the subject of human rights legislation and its administration in our respective provinces.

During the session, briefs were presented from voluntary organizations, including the Canadian civil liberties association, and the Indian-Eskimo association of Canada.

It is my hope that this truly historic event will mark the beginning of a new relationship among those working in this field and that in the years to come they will have a rich and co-operative association with one another.

The interprovincial meeting also served as a prelude to the international conference for commissions on human rights to be held in Toronto this summer.

It is most appropriate that the first such conference should take place in Ontario, the first province to pass legislation in this field. I feel we have reached a point in our development where it is mandatory for us to be in direct communication with our sister provinces with comparable legislation.

We face problems of prejudice and discrimination that are unique to the Canadian society and that require, in my view, a continuing dialogue, forthright discussions and direct consultation between the provinces and the federal government.

The cause of human rights is so important to the province, our nation, and indeed to the whole world, that it merits being approached with missionary fervour.

The human rights movement all over the world is growing in terms of the strength of its adherents and the directness of its purpose —social justice for all.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would bring to the attention of hon. members, the fact that in the bill book today there is a copy of Bill 81 which has been reprinted for consideration by the committee of the whole House.

The reason for this is that a number of amendments are to be recommended to Bill 81 and it was thought desirable, in order that it would save a lot of reading of amendments, that we reprint the bill with the suggested amendments inserted in the bill in their proper place and identified so that hon. members could compare one with the other.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister is just assuming they will be approved.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am assuming it will be considered by the committee of the whole House in due course of time.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister if he could give us any indication of when the bill will come before the committee of the whole House?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: In answer to that question, I am in hope that the bill will come before the committee of the whole House on Thursday of this week. However, I am not aware of some of the complications that may arise, and other matters may have greater priority than this. But I hope we could have it considered this week and that it would receive Royal assent soon, so that the municipalities and the rest of this metropolitan area would know exactly what the terms of the amending bill really are.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The eleventh order: House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in Cleveland last November, Dr. James Vance, chairman of the Ontario water resources commission, told a meeting of the Great Lakes commission that pollution, rather than shortage, is the greatest water problem to be faced today. In December, Dr. George Langford, head of the Great Lakes institute, when asked was the situation in the Great Lakes improving, replied: "No, it is not improving; it is getting worse." And that statement is in the *United States News and World Report* of December 13, 1965.

The question was a very simple one: "Is the situation in the Great Lakes improving?" And the answer Dr. Langford gave:

> No, it is not improving; it is getting worse. We have not got into effective operation yet. We first have got to make a complete survey to find all the sources of pollution throughout the Great Lakes, know exactly how big the problem is, then we have to plan how we are going to go about cleaning it up. Then we have to get the money and after that gather up the bricks and mortar and do the job.
>
> It is going to be some time before all these things can be done, and pollution of the Great Lakes will probably get worse before it gets better. Some people wonder if it is not already too late, but it is not too late. A lot of time and effort and money will have to go into the job. The longer we wait to start, the more difficult and the more expensive it will be.

The reason, of course, the pollution in the lakes is getting worse is not hard to find. The acute pollution problem in our province developed through long years of sheer neglect; neglect on the part of governments at all levels—this government, municipal governments and federal governments. Now, a decade too late, we are making a frantic effort to make up for the lost years. But so far the growth of population and the growth of industry seem to be outstripping the efforts we are making and we are not catching up.

I will say this, I think the Ontario water resources commission is doing an outstanding job with limited resources and without real power to crack the whip when necessary. Last year, the hon. Minister assured us they had the power, and perhaps they have legally, but for some strange reason they are making very little use of it yet. Or is it so strange, Mr. Chairman? This government simply refuses to give them the fiscal and the legal strength that they need. This year, the Ontario water resources commission drew up what it deemed a practical budget to do a practical job in the face of growing pollution. The Treasury board, ignoring the terrible urgency of the situation, saw fit to materially cut that budget and slow down the development which should have taken place this year.

On Friday, I gave an illustration of the kind of thing that has been happening, in

the one instance, in Northumberland county where an operator was prosecuted — and rightly so—for polluting a stream which killed off some trout in a private fishpond. I made it clear at that time that I held no brief for the offender and that I agreed with the policy that this punishment should take place; and I repeat that today for the benefit of those who may not have heard it then.

But I went on to point out what happened in another area where the Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment Company at Espanola had been protected by this government years ago, and is still protected by it, in the pollution of the Spanish river. I had before me at that time certain reports, and I have some of them here, reports made at various stages at that time and since. One of these reports, in 1952, perhaps came as a result of the episode in 1950 when Bill 117 was passed giving the company protection. In one paragraph from this report of 1952 they point out that in a survey which was made certain things happened.

> In addition to the ten species of fish killed on July 8, others were killed in November, including such hearty forms as the bullhead and the mud minnow. The fact that fish were killed by the slug even after it had travelled down river about 30 miles and out into the bay a mile or more suggests that all fish in the path of the slug as it passed down the river may have been killed. Subsequent netting supported this belief.

In other words, in this case not a few trout were killed but a whole fishing industry was almost obliterated. This report gives the details of the pollution that was being poured into that river by the industry concerned, KVP Company, Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment.

Then in 1955 another report, on page 17, gives the remedy which might be undertaken at that time by the company. It points out that large, comparatively flat sand plains are within pumping distance of the mill and should lend themselves to cheap and effective lagooning of all pulping and recovery plant wastes. Complete isolation of all sewers containing these wastes from other mill sewers would eliminate the most important source of taste, odour-producing and toxic substances.

Now this was 1955. Work has progressed since that time and no doubt we will hear of the progress that has been made. But the report, which I pointed out again on Friday, of the recent sampling of fish in the Spanish river just last summer points out that the fish are still tainted, that the river is still being contaminated by the wastes from that mill.

So we face a situation where on the one hand an operator is rightly brought into court and fined and told to desist. Another case, where the operator is fined and told to desist; but the fine remains, while the injunction itself is set aside by an Act of this Legislature. As I pointed out on Friday, Chief Justice McRuer in issuing the injunction at that time must have known that remedies were available for this situation, otherwise he would not have issued the injunction.

Pulp and paper mills around the world were being cleaned up and had been cleaned up at this time and Chief Justice McRuer must have known before he issued such an injunction that it was possible to carry out that injunction. Former Prime Minister Frost later last week said that remedies were not available at that time. One of these men must have been wrong and perhaps the hon. Minister will tell us at the proper time which was wrong; Chief Justice McRuer or former Prime Minister Leslie Frost. This will be an interesting bit of information for us, because we would like to know which man was in fact correct at this time.

Now, lest we think that I am making a mountain out of a molehill here and illustrating this by one company, I would like to point out two or three other instances of the same kind of treatment. A year ago the report came in from the Ontario water resources commission about certain problems in the oil-rich area of Petrolia. I spoke to the hon. member from that area the other day and he said he would get the information and get the facts of the situation, so we may have that before the estimates are over. I am sorry he is not yet in his seat today, but no doubt he will be here.

The report last year said that 32 oil drilling operations were discharging oil into the Tank street open drain and Buttermilk creek. In this regard the report recommended that adequate treatment of the oil waste being discharged from various drilling operations should be provided by the owners of this operation. Last year when I read this there were great cries from my left: "We are looking after things all right down there; things are coming along fine, we are cleaning up the situation and why do you concern yourself about it?" Those cries were loud and insistent when I read this and other items from the report of the OWRC; but in answer to that I have a clipping from the Toronto

Telegram of February 28, 1966, a very recent clipping, and it says this:

> Petrolia, Ontario: Area oil producers forecast bankruptcy of many oil well operators in Lambton county if recently announced Ontario water resources commission recommendations are carried out. An OWRC report filed last week said oil wells in the Petrolia area were pumping an average of 160,000 to 200,000 gallons of brine and waste into ditches, creeks and on the ground.
>
> About 1.5 million gallons of brine water a year is pumped from 150 producing wells in the area, the report said. The OWRC, which had carried out pollution studies in Bear creek running through Petrolia, recommended injection of waste waters into the ground, digging holding ponds, funnelling of waste into the municipal sewage system or gravity operation.
>
> Charles Fairbanks, a major producer, said the injection method which the OWRC favoured would cost considerable. No producer can afford this, he said. It would mean bankruptcy for the marginal producer.

Well, it may be some of the marginal producers should go out of business if it means a continuation of the pollution, I do not know; but he does not say anything about the producers who are paying their way. Certainly the OWRC again must feel that these people can stand the tariff of cleaning up the pollution in Petrolia. Yet the oil producers have sat there for a year, and now in February of this year have said we cannot do what the OWRC says we ought to do. I think this House is going to be interested to find out whether or not action is being taken to enforce its mandates here. Perhaps there are not enough trout being killed in this particular instance, I do not know, but in any case this business is going on and should be looked at.

Again in the Niagara peninsula, a recent survey has shown that out of 74 industries examined the quality of waste discharged by 22 of these industries was below the OWRC objectives, and this did not include the pulp and paper mills along the old Welland canal. The need for a staged programme of effluent improvement here in these mills is very much apparent.

Now then, the question that this House asks, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not the staging of this clean-up of pollution in the Niagara peninsula is realistic, whether or not it is being enforced and whether or not these mills are in effect simply ignoring the directives which have been issued.

In the Sudbury district, we are told by one of the OWRC releases, disposal of tailings in the area was in keeping with what is considered good practice. That is one on the credit side, but the report suggested that effort should be made to control acid and alkaline content of tailing area effluents. The waste discharges from International Nickel Copper Cliff smelter should be treated to reduce concentrates of suspended solids, copper and nickel, the report recommended. The nature of the wastes involved indicate that segregation of wastes followed by settling in an impounded area may be of benefit in reducing the amount of polluting material reaching the receiving watercourses.

The report said that the pyrrhotite storage basin located at the Hardy Mill, operated by Falconbridge Nickel Mines, gives rise to a discharge which at times carries quantities of suspended solids and nickel considered undesirable for discharge to a watercourse. Efforts should be made to reduce the level of these contaminants. Since this discharge proceeded to the Onaping river, the report said it is felt that rigid control of the discharge is warranted. I am not sure that the pronunciation of all these places are correct. Perhaps the hon. member for Sudbury would correct this, if they are not absolutely right.

The report goes on to say the slimes and the sand plants located in the east mine in the Fecunis lake mine, operated by Falconbridge, should be disposed of to a tailing disposal area.

In the Brampton area, a complete review has been made of all industrial wastes discharged by industry in the town of Brampton and the adjoining subdivision of Bramalea. The capacity of the two districts' water pollution control plans were inadequate to treat the waste load received from this urban and industrial area. Six industries were reported to be contributing significantly to the industrial organic loading on the municipal treatment facilities. They are American Motors; Brampton Poultry Limited; Jerry Lewis Limited, a tannery; General Latex, synthetic and natural latex emulsion; T. J. Lipton, foods processing and gummed papers.

Perhaps no trout are being killed in this particular situation, and so no action seems to be called for at the moment, although we look to the hon. Minister to tell us real action is contemplated and that a timetable has been set up for these industries. We hope he can give us the information.

Following aerial patrols, which the Ontario water resources commission carry out, we are told in a November 30 announcement by the OWRC that oil slicks and other evidence of water pollution can be clearly seen from the air—this is in the Detroit river area—and that the sources may be fixed with some degree of accuracy through observation of this type.

We congratulate the department and the Ontario water resources commission on this kind of aerial surveillance. We hope it results in action.

To date, the commission's aerial patrol programme has located oil slicks on both sides of the international boundary, so that this is not a matter entirely from the United States. Discoloured water and coloured slicks were revealed in the Detroit river near several industries.

In the municipal field we have the problem that has been outlined to us in Toronto itself, and with which the hon. Minister is perfectly familiar. I am not going to bother reading too many excerpts from this report, but it tells us of the need for the city to undertake as quickly as possible the separation of the storm and sanitary sewer systems. While again the big cry is, "there is no money for this project," unless we do get money and get it quickly, and some arrangements made in this field, then this project which is so desperately needed cannot be undertaken.

In a couple of other municipalities, just as illustrations, grossly contaminated wastes are being discharged at Long Point bay from the storm sewers serving the village of Port Rowan in Norfolk county, according to water pollution survey report released by Ontario water resources commission. The village council is aware of the pollution problem but feels the municipality could not bear the cost of such a project until a water supply system debenture is retired.

This is the problem that many municipalities are facing. They are up to their ears in debt at the present time and they feel they cannot afford to put in the sewer system that is needed.

In the village of Fonthill, the continued use of private sub-surface waste disposal systems poses a potential threat to the municipality's water supply, the Ontario water resources commission reports. The municipal officials have been aware of the problem for some time. The two preliminary surveys of sewage work needs were carried out in 1951. This is significant. However, the OWRC says no further action has been taken by the village in this regard.

During the past period of time, industry across this province, and I suppose to some extent municipalities, have been paid a hidden subsidy by the province and by the people of Ontario through allowing them to defer the investment in waste disposal facilities, and through the economic loss suffered by the people of the province in their watercourses and in their lakes. I think we have to face the fact that this kind of hidden subsidy should no longer be necesary. Industry in Ontario is in a pretty healthy situation. The profit picture has been good over the past few years, and the time is here for the department and for the hon. Minister to say that this thing has gone far enough.

The old threat that industry might move out if they are forced to look after their needs in the field of water pollution and cleaning up their effluents no longer works. As I remember the incident, the galleries were packed by workers from KVP at the time Bill 117 was before the House in 1950, and the threat was that mass unemployment could well result if the industry were forced to clean up.

That kind of situation no longer holds. Within the next ten years one would hope that no matter where industry might settle or where it might go, that first of all, before it is given a building permit, the matter of its own pollution and the wastes discharged from that plant would be cleared away and the guarantee would be made that no stream is going to be polluted. And more than that, generally these threats are empty threats in any case. No pulp mill is going to pull up and move because the industry is there. The raw material is there around the pulp mill, and literally there is no place it can move to. So that this kind of threat should not be held over the people any longer, and this government should take drastic action to clean up the situation.

During this past year, in answer to questions that were raised, we had word that industry in Ontario had been notified by Dr. Vance through letters that the expectation of this government was that these industries would clean up, and clean up quickly. I understand, too, that some time limit was set. I was disappointed not to find in the report of the Minister something more about the time limit and about the staged programme of the clean-up.

More than 50 per cent of the firms are meeting the objectives, we are told; 140 have appeared before the commission to discuss

their waste disposal problems, and programmes they proposed are actually embarked upon. This is good, but from the returns we have now, unless there are new ones, it looks as though 100 of the industries in receipt of letters have not replied. The figure may be better than this now, and we are not told who these industries are, how big they are, or how much pollution they are throwing into our rivers. And this information should be forthcoming from the hon. Minister.

I think that the hon. Minister should tell us, above all else, how soon these results will become apparent. He indicates that the back of the problem is now broken—I hope he is right. He indicates that over the next 10 years we should be able to say that the situation is pretty well rectified. I hope he is right on that count. But again, I think the Minister should tell this House what the staging is, particularly for the large industries that have been offenders for a long time. He should give us some indication of what the staging is; what the objectives are that have been set, and whether these objectives are being met year by year.

Vague generalities such as are in the hon. Minister's report should not suffice in this House at this time, because the situation in the lakes, according to our experts, is getting worse. While the rivers and streams now are beginning to clear up, as long as major pollutants are going into the rivers, it will be a long, long time before we can expect results.

Certainly, the kind of fertilizer that is going onto our land is leaching down into the rivers and lakes and providing the nutrient for the algae there. Just how this problem can be met while farming and agricultural operations are still being carried on, is not yet known. The detergent problem, we understand, is now on the way to being licked, and we hope that this will be followed by legislation which forbids the use of detergents and phosphates which create over a certain amount of pollution within the watercourses.

We are told that the situation in Lake Erie is such that the lake is almost at the point of balance as to whether it can ever be cleaned up or not. I think that most of us are not pessimistic enough to think that a body of water such as Lake Erie could not eventually clean itself up if the waters above it, and flowing into it, are cleaned up in the first place. But Lake Erie, the smallest and shallowest of the lakes, would take a long time to flush itself out. I think the time given is two and a half to three years, if the water could pour in and pour out as it does in a bathtub or a basin. But because of the eddies and the particular currents within the lake it would take, even with 100 per cent clean water flowing into it today, about 15 years to clean out the lake completely. Then the lake could be said to have clean water in it, and it would be on its way to recovery so that fish life could be restored and it could return to its pristine purity.

I suppose that with civilization around the lake such as it is today, we never will get back to that happy state. Certainly it is going to take a long, long time after we do clean up the effluent pouring into our rivers and streams before Lake Erie itself and the other lakes can be clean.

There is a very great problem, too, which has already been mentioned in this House at various times and that is the proliferation of agencies which are dealing with the matter of pure water in our province. We are told that about 77 agencies are involved at all levels of government and the recommendation has often been made that there should be far greater unity in getting these agencies together and establishing one authority which will, in effect, have primary responsibility as a co-ordinating body to do the fundamental job that has to be done in cleaning up these watercourses.

I am not talking today about something that has not been done. As this House knows, the Thames river in England is clean and has been that way for a long, long time. The Ruhr basin has been cleaned up with that great industrial complex right along its sides and it was cleaned up because the industry on the side of that basin was given responsibility, not only responsibility, but the law was such that the industry had to pay for the pollution of the river. Any industry that did not clean up was penalized.

The time is here for action. The international joint commission has given its report pointing out that the situation is worsening and that action must take place, and take place soon, and so today, Mr. Chairman, I would urge upon this government that the time has long passed for more rapid action and more positive action than we have had in the past.

Some answers must be found for the municipalities and for industry, if necessary, but in my view, industry today is in a good position to face up to its responsibilities. Small municipalities certainly must be helped and so we must finish this job and finish it within the very near future.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, I might take a few minutes now to answer some of the criticism made by the critics of the official Opposition and the NDP.

The hon. member for Nipissing mentioned during his remarks the water levels in the Great Lakes. I would say that they were of some concern to everyone in the province of Ontario about 18 months ago, but at the present time we have very little worry because I think that he will find they are average, or above average. I understand from those in the know that we will, perhaps, be worrying about high water before this season is out, so we will be dealing with another set of figures.

Now both hon. members have discussed the KVP company and the pollution of the Spanish river. Bill 117 was passed in this House in 1950, and I would like to comment on it if I may. In 1950 there were, of course, very few of the present members in this House. But there are perhaps a few who can recall the passing of that bill and the circumstances surrounding the passing of that bill. I think we will all agree that we are dealing with a different set of circumstances in 1966 compared to what was being dealt with in 1950.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a statement made by the Prime Minister of that day, the Hon. Leslie Frost, prior to introducing Bill 117. I do not think I will cover it all as it can be found in *Hansard* for 1950, but I would like to cover some of it, if I might, and I quote:

> I should like to say a word to hon. members of the House on a matter I know they are very interested in and that relates to the pollution in the Spanish river at the plant which has come to be known as the KVP plant at Espanola and the difficulties that exist there. As a preface to this statement, Mr. Speaker, may I say that we do not regard lightly the matter of pollution of our streams.
>
> Indeed, we think it is a very serious matter and we have already taken action in this House and outside of this House to emphasize the fact that we think the pollution of our streams is an extremely serious matter which we on this side of the House do not hold lightly. We do not hold lightly the rights of individuals to protect their interests in the courts of this land, that is in itself a very important matter which we in no way hold lightly. We also regard as a matter of high importance the employment of our people. And we do recognize in these days in the industrialization and expansion of industry and the increase of population in areas of the province that we are bound to get a certain amount of pollution in our lakes and streams.
>
> At the same time we are determined to hold that to the least possible limit. I might give this little explanation for some of the hon. members who are not familiar with it. The KVP plant, I believe, was reopened or opened in Espanola in 1946. Previous to that time, Mr. Speaker, there had been a plant there, I believe it was one of the Abitibi plants, which had been closed down with the result that the community of Espanola became very much a ghost town, as did that very fine section of Ontario. In 1946, due to forward-looking policies, that plant was reopened. We have investment in that community of something in the neighbourhood of $20 million, but what is more important we have the employment of thousands of Canadian people and we have a fine community in Espanola. I shall refer to that in just a moment.
>
> As a result of the action of the company, there is undoubtedly pollution polluting the waters of the Spanish river. Action was brought by certain people who were interested in the river, with the result that an injunction was granted by the courts of this province. Following that —and I take this from those who have seen me from Espanola; and I gather from what they have said that they have not only seen me but also the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Joliffe) and the leaders of the various groups in this assembly. I imagine that is true and therefore much of what I say has been given to them by the residents of that community. As a result of that, undoubtedly, the industry up there took great corrective measures with a view to removing what was a pollution of that stream, as I understand.
>
> I shall refer to this in just a moment in a prepared statement I will make in connection with these corrective measures that have gone a very long way towards correcting the pollution at this point.
>
> In the meantime, last year in this assembly you will recollect that legislation was passed which brought pulp companies within the terms of the legislation that was held within the statute books. But the courts held that legislation did not apply to this particular case and therefore the injunction still holds. And the

injunction could become effective on April 4 with the effect that the plant would be closed down and there would be a loss of employment in which the people of that community are particularly interested.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should do this: We should make to this House a definite statement on policy of the course that we intend to pursue. I can assure you of this: That we have no intention of putting people of that community out of employment. We intend to keep employment going; at the same time we intend to protect to the fullest extent that we are able, the interests of the people of the province of Ontario.

With that preamble, I might just give you this prepared statement:

Representations have been made to us concerning the operation of the Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment plant at Espanola. We have had representations from the people of Espanola representative of the municipality and the residents, and I might say a very impressive delegation in from that community. It included merchants, doctors, clergy, farmers, guides, fishing and game associations, labour and other interests, and my recollection is there were at least two different labour unions represented. I also had representatives of the various political parties in the community. I do not like to bring this down to the level of introducing political parties, but I think I might say that the representatives of the various political parties in the community were also represented on that deputation and I could not but be impressed by the sincerity of those people.

They asked that the injunction which was obtained in a suit by certain plaintiffs in a case against the KVP company should be dissolved. These persons, representatives of the people of Espanola district, stated to the government unequivocally that in their opinion the company was doing everything possible to prevent undue pollution of the Spanish river. They additionally presented a petition from the residents of the community asking that the injunction be dissolved, otherwise the plant would be closed and the community would be ruined. I think in that petition there was something in the neighbourhood of 2,000 signatures.

Mr. Chairman, I would go on, there is much more to that statement, but I think that would set out perhaps some of the reasons why Bill 117 was passed to deal with certain circumstances prevailing at that time.

Now, if I might, I would like to read some of the history, just note some of the history, of the mill. In 1897, the original pulpwood concession was granted to the Spanish River Pulp Company and a mill was built to produce ground wood only. In 1911, the Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company Limited was incorporated with mills at Espanola and Sturgeon Falls. In 1913, a third mill was opened at Sault Ste. Marie. In 1928, the Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited purchased all three mills, the Espanola mill now being known as the Espanola division, Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited. Ground wood and newsprint were manufactured. In 1930, January, the Espanola mill was closed.

In 1943, you will note it was closed for 13 years, the Espanola property was purchased by the Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment Company. In 1946, ground wood production began. Also in 1946, a modern, integrated 200-tons-per-day sulphide mill was started up in May; bleach plant operations commenced in September. In 1947, paper machines started in July. In 1949, a small lagoon was built to serve as a foam trap and settling base. During 1950-51, in-plant control measures were taken to improve on recovery of chemicals and wood fibres. Kraft production was now 260 tons per day. In 1953-54, the company installed further fibre reclaiming equipment and facilities to prevent spills of black liquor to sewers. In 1955, the company investigated a complete fibre recovery method but found it to be impractical.

Production by that time had risen to 345 tons per day of kraft pulp. The company changed pulp washing from two stages to three stages, providing improved recovery of chemicals. Fibre in the river was reduced as well. In 1956, the company redirected selected odorous waste streams to furnace or bleaching operations where it was hoped they would be eliminated. In 1957, the company announced plans to build a new recovery boiler in 1958 to permit improved control of black liquor and other chemical losses.

In 1958, methods of control of taste and odour production waste taken in 1957 were not successful and further studies were continued. In 1959, operations of the new recovery furnace were reported, indicating good chemical recovery. The company proposed to redirect the turpentine decanter underflow, a small but potent source of odorous waste, to the black liquor recovery system. Experimental lagooning of other

odorous waste was undertaken. Plans were announced for a new paper machine.

In 1960, control of heavy losses of toxic waste was effective. Taste and odour persisted in the river, although less prevalent than in 1950, and measures were sought to deal with known sources: Black liquors, evaporators, condensates and the digester blow steam condensates. A tail oil recovery plant was placed in operation to remove this byproduct from the black liquor and this byproduct was sold. In 1961, experimental lagooning of blow steam condensates was undertaken. In 1964, the company announced plans for expanding from 325 tons per day of kraft production to 625 tons per day.

In-plant measures to be taken in the new mill facilities and in rebuilding the existing facilities are expected to reduce suspended solids, namely, bark fibre and lime, from the present levels of some 25 to 35 tons per day average and to ensure no increase in chemical effects of the waste. In 1966, the company reported the start of a new lime kiln reducing the suspended solid discharge by about 12 tons per day. Measures proposed to the OWRC by the company for inclusion in plant expansion are as follows:

1. Turpentine decanter underflow to be collected and returned to the black liquor recovery system for evaporating or burning. This now being done, as of May, 1966.

2. Blow steam condensate to be collected and used as makeup for hot water and pulp washing. This waste therefore will return to the black liquor system for recovery.

3. The black liquor evaporator condensates are to be reused in making up fresh cooking liquor.

4. Knots rejected from the pulp prior to washing are to be collected and recooked.

5. Green dregs from the liquor preparation process will be filtered and the recovered solids land dumped.

6. A completely revamped fine screen reject reclaiming system is to be installed.

7. Rejects, that is fibre rejects from both bleached and unbleached pulp centrifugal cleaning systems, are to be recovered, dried and sold as filler material.

8. A white water recycling system is to be installed in each individual pulp bleaching stage. A total of 11 recycling systems are involved, resulting in drastic reduction of water use and improving fibre loss control.

9. Fly ash from the boiler house will be removed by a dry collection system and used as land fill.

10. Save-all plans to be installed on wet press sections of machines to return water and attendant fibre to the pulp stream.

11. All sources of waste water to be measured and sampled automatically. Flow in main mill sewer will be measured and recorded and automatically sampled.

12. Ground wood mill to be closed by end of 1966.

13. Experimental work continued on fine screening of wood room waste to remove bark finds. A report is to be submitted to the OWRC by July 1, 1966, to indicate whether or not the proposed method is defective and if a plant scale installation is practical.

14. All sanitary waste will be discharged to the municipal sanitary sewerage system.

The expected results of this programme:

1. Suspended solids and total effluents should be less than 125 particles per million.

2. The oxygen demand expected to be controlled that the dissolved oxygen content in the Spanish river should not fall below four per million.

3. Taste and odour production waste will be largely recovered and reused in the black liquor recovery system.

Total estimated cost of in-plant control measures, $490,000. Cost of the new lime kiln in operation, $907,000.

So, gentlemen, that brings us up to date on the problem we have had with KVP, and I think you will see that they are moving towards cleaning up a problem that has bothered perhaps everyone, and especially this government, for some years.

There were many other things said, and most of it was about pollution. And if we might, we could deal with this as the vote comes up. I would like to say, though, that I think we agree with everyone in this House that pollution is a problem, not only in the province of Ontario, it is a problem in the North American continent and we are all concerned. But at least we in Ontario have started and we have some programmes in operation. We in this province are concerned about pollution and will be concerned until we can get it cleaned up. We do hope we will have industry cleaned up by 1970, and as I said in my statement on Friday, we hope we can say ten years hence that we have no pollution in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Young: May I ask the hon. Minister, does this mean Chief Justice McRuer was wrong in his injunction, in 1950, when he seemed to think that the situation could be cleaned up in a hurry? That considering all

this long recital of the steps that have taken place, the chief justice perhaps was wrong at that time, in setting the injunction?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would not say that he was wrong, but I think if we were listening to the introduction Mr. Frost made, at that time we were worrying about employment. We were worrying about a lot of things. And a lot of things have happened in Ontario over the years that had we the control of them today would not have happened. Our forests disappeared because people had to eat and I think it was felt at that time, and it was not only felt by the government of the day, but by everyone, that we should start that pulp plant to give employment and to keep someone eating up in that area. And I think that was the reason, and the only reason, it was started.

Mr. Young: My point is, Mr. Chairman, could not a pulp plant have been started and the effluent into the river been cleaned up with the building of the plant? The employment perhaps was just a red herring that was drawn across the trail to prevent the enforcement of the regulations.

On vote 601:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on vote 601 there is a matter which I think relates more to policy rather than to any specific estimate and which is of great current importance, and I would like to raise it at this time, with your permission.

In the course of his introductory comment, the hon. Minister made what can only be described as a passing reference to the current issue of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines' application for looping its line from the west, this time south of Lake Superior, to come in at Sault Ste. Marie and Sarnia. On page nine of the mimeographed copy of the Minister's statement, we have this sentence:

> Estimates indicate that by 1980 the market requirements for natural gas will have expanded from the present 220 billion to 500 billion cubic feet per year. For this reason the Ontario government is watching with interest Trans-Canada Pipe Lines' application to the national energy board and the U.S. federal power commission to construct extra transmission facilities to supply greater volumes of western gas for the eastern market.

The sum total of this revelation of government policy is that the government is "watching with interest" this effort on the part of Trans-Canada. I am curious to know where the government stands with regard to a number of important aspects of this development. No one will deny that the requirements for natural gas in eastern Canada are growing apace and that something must be done by way of providing a greater flow from western Canada, and basically the choice is a line throughout northern Ontario, looping it through that area or looping it south.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would wait one moment until I check to see whether this is properly before us. We do have vote 603, dealing with different hearings before our local board, but this does not include Trans-Canada Pipe Lines.

Mr. MacDonald: This has nothing to do with our local board at all. Our local board, I am quite confident the Minister will confirm, has no jurisdiction at all over the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines.

What prompts me to raise the issue, Mr. Chairman, is that on May 2 of this year, another member of this government, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, was speaking in Kirkland Lake to a meeting of the northeastern Ontario development association, and he is reported in the *Globe and Mail* of that day as follows:

> The federal government should never allow a Canadian oil pipeline to go through the United States.

Throughout this story, the newspaper man has said "oil" when I am confident what is meant is "gas." Sometimes newspaper people are ignorant of the basic facts with which they are dealing.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, oh.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. member for Downsview would like to deny it in this instance, I would invite him to do so!

Mr. Singer: I denied your conclusion. I did not deny the fact that they might have made a mistake in this instance.

Mr. MacDonald: About ten days ago I put a question to the Minister before the orders of the day, as to what action this government had taken in protection of our interests—most of which are concentrated in the province of Ontario as far as markets are concerned—either at the national energy board hearing, or at the FRC hearings in Washington. The hon. Minister's reply was that we had somebody sitting in at the hearing at Ottawa. Insofar as Canadian interests

were observed, or protected at the FPC hearings in Washington, it was restricted to the oil or the gas counsellor at the Canadian embassy at Washington sitting in on what was happening.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are some very important problems here on which I think this government should pronounce itself. I am curious, now that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has joined us in the House, to know whether or not his very forthright statement in Kirkland Lake is an indication of government policy. If it is an indication of government policy, why has the government been so silent on the whole issue up until this present time?

Let me deal with a few specific aspects of the problem.

On March 3, in the *Globe and Mail* business and finance section, there were some details as to the cost factors involved, and perhaps I may just quote a couple of paragraphs which will set them before the House. This is at the time of the national energy board hearing at Ottawa:

> Trans-Canada advised the board its cost of moving gas to the centre of its eastern Canadian market would fall in 1967 to 16.62 cents a thousand cubic feet from 19.4 cents in 1966, if the Great Lakes project is built through the United States. The price would remain below the 1966 level until 1974, but if the southern route is not approved the cost of transmission would rise to 20.62 cents in 1967 and continue to climb until 1969, when there would be some reduction. The rate would then climb sharply again after 1974.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, let us face this basic fact, which I do not think is disputed at any point: If the line is built through the southern route by way of a subsidiary of Northern Ontario Natural Gas, a subsidiary over which it has only 50 per cent control, the net result of this would be to reduce the cost of transportation from western Canada by some four cents per 1,000 cubic feet. Instead of it rising from 19 cents to 20 cents, it would drop to about 16 cents, so that there would be a margin of four cents.

It is also contended, and this seems rather logical, that the cost of building a line through this southern route would be less than through the rock and the muskeg of the north. I understand that the possibility of looping the line by placing it in the same trench as the existing line, so to speak, is very remote—in fact, it is completely impossible. Blasting requires putting a new line at least a mile away from the present line from western Canada.

So there would be savings on both construction and transportation. But on the other side of the picture, here are factors which I think are very much part of public policy and therefore arouse my curiosity as to why there have not been some pronouncements from this government.

For example, in the first instance Trans-Canada indicated that they were interested in building along the southern line because they were going to sell gas in the United States. However, apparently as far back as July 6, 1965, this particular phase of the proposal was dropped by Trans-Canada because of opposition from American competitors.

I have another reference to this as carried in the *Globe and Mail* of July 6, 1965, in which a paragraph in parentheses states:

> Trans-Canada originally sought FPC authority to sell gas in the U.S. market along the Great Lakes route. It later dropped these plans which it said would have reduced costs and made the project much more economical.

I am curious to know, therefore, what change has taken place in the calculations with regard to costs since forsaking the original concept of a pipeline through the United States and selling gas along the way, thereby reducing its cost.

Second, by way of underlining the uncertainties as to this whole proposition, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the subsidiary, which is known as the Great Lakes Transmission Company, has been established with 50 per cent of the control lying with Trans-Canada and another 50 per cent of the control lying with an American company centred in Detroit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have always been a bit puzzled, as a layman, as to who has control of the company when there are two groups with a 50 per cent interest. That sounds to me to be a perfect setup for a deadlock and therefore no assurance that Canadian interests are going to be the dominant interests.

However, there is a third and rather important question that I draw to the attention of the House; and that is that on March 2 of this year the Toronto *Telegram* carried a Canadian Press dispatch from Ottawa, one paragraph of which read as follows:

> There was a bill before the U.S. Congress, he said—

the story is referring to John A. McGrath of Washington who was speaking on behalf of a number of organizations in the United States in the hearing before the national energy board:

> —which would impose a tax of six cents per million cubic feet on gas imported into the United States. If this tax applied to Trans-Canada's proposal it would destroy the Canadian company's contention that it can move western gas to eastern Canada more cheaply through the United States.

So here we have another major element of uncertainty, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman. There is a bill before the United States Congress, and whatever may be the fate of that bill at this particular time there is no assurance that a year from now, or five years from that, this bill will not pass—imposing a charge on gas that would be imported from Canada with the result that the economic advantage of the southern route would be completely eliminated. So there you have three elements of uncertainty with regard to the control over this pipeline through the United States and the transmission of a source of power, the great proportion of which is destined for the eastern Canadian market.

Indeed, in other newspaper reports of the various hearings it was indicated that no more than eight per cent—and in another instance I saw as high as 11 per cent—of the gas crossing the border at Emerson would be used in the United States, and the other 89 per cent or 92 per cent would ultimately return to Canada for consumption in the eastern Canadian market.

But the main point which is a matter of major consideration to Canada—it is part and parcel of the great debate on our resources and their control and use for Canadian purposes—is the question of what reserves of natural gas we have in this country.

Now, in his very forthright statement in Kirkland Lake on March 2, the concluding paragraph in the news report quoted the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs as saying this:

> Mr. Spooner said that within ten or 20 years Canada would need for its own use all the natural gas available and would not be in a position to export it.

I would not like to believe that as responsible a person as the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be talking off the top of his head without detailed knowledge of the situation. Indeed, he has been involved in the development of the distribution of gas in this province in many capacities, ranging back to the days when he was mayor of the city of Timmins; and he recounted some of his earlier battles in this connection when he spoke to the eastern Ontario development association.

So we have the proposition that some ten to 20 years from now this gas is going to be needed for the Canadian market alone. In fact, in that connection I would like to make reference to one other quotation which is contained in the report of March 3 that I referred to earlier. In the hearings before the national energy board at Ottawa there was reference to the question of Canadian reserves and a very puzzling observation was made. The news story reports it as follows:

> Earlier in the hearing Trans-Canada proposed a new formula for figuring out Canada's surplus reserves of natural gas. In effect, the Trans-Canada formula would set the present surplus at 4.3 trillion cubic feet. The formula that is being used by the board put the surplus at 3.7 trillion cubic feet. Most of the morning session was taken up with arguments for and against the proposed surplus formula.
>
> At one point, Ian McKinnon, board chairman, said the Trans-Canada plan would ask the board to place more and more reliance on future discoveries of natural gas in the west.
>
> "If we had three or four years of no discoveries, we would be in trouble," he added.

Now, what puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, is this numbers game, where presumably by the acceptance of a different formula in Ottawa, which obviously would not alter the facts regarding our reserves, we would suddenly increase our reserves from 3.7 trillion cubic feet to 4.3 trillion cubic feet. Further, you have the observation of the chairman of the board to the effect that if we had three or four years of no discoveries we would be in serious trouble.

In short, this evidence seems to underline the contention of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that our reserves of gas are not unlimited, that some ten to 20 years from now the Canadian market will absorb all that we can use for the foreseeable future—without running into the fantastic costs involved in converting some other source of power.

In short, Mr. Chairman, here is clearly something in which the province of Ontario has a very great continuing interest.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he got out his political podium in home territory and said what the local people wanted to hear, spoke very forcefully, but those within the government who are responsible for this aspect of government policy have been silent. I think that silence should come to an end. I should like the Minister to enlighten the House as to what government policy is in this connection.

Mr. Chairman: I should say to the member for York South that I have looked through the votes and I do not see anything there dealing with the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines or the building of Trans-Canada's pipelines, because they would come under the regulations of the national energy board. But I know it is of public interest and I have asked the Minister to answer any questions in connection with it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, as the member himself has admitted this is not a responsibility of the Ontario energy board but comes under the national energy board in Canada and under the federal power commission in the United States.

I told the hon. member some time ago that we had a watching brief in Ottawa when this was being heard before the national energy board and our main concern —and as Minister I can speak policy from our department—is in additional supplies of natural gas and getting them to Ontario in the cheapest way that the pipeline company knows how, because we are concerned with price as much as we are concerned with supply.

Most of this gas will be going in storage and our only storage fields are in western Ontario, as the hon. member knows, so anything that we have heard—as the hon. member mentioned—is conflicting. I admit that perhaps it is, but I must admit that we have no jurisdiction over that. Any of the figures we have seen—if they could build a pipeline and obtained permission to come in the southern route—show that we would get gas at Sarnia much cheaper than if it had to come through the northern route.

The hon. member mentioned the Minister of Municipal Affairs and a statement that he made at Kirkland Lake. I read the statement and I must say that if I were the member for the local area I would get up and make the same type of statement. I think the member for York South would agree with that.

When natural gas first came into Ontario I agree that he was right then, because they needed natural gas in northern Ontario. We must get additional supplies in here now, and regardless of whether it comes from the northern or the southern route, we still will have ample supplies of gas for northern Ontario; because if they bring it in from another direction, they will not have to bring as much down here so we have them protected on that score.

I am sure that whatever statement the hon. Minister made—he has been a member of this House a long time and in fact was the responsible Minister for the fuel board and the energy board at one time—I am sure that he can answer for himself.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is attempting to be very slick in his reply, but do I conclude correctly—indeed, can I conclude anything else—that if the hon. Minister accepts the contention that the costs are less for the southern route that this government supports the proposition of the southern route?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I have already said that the only reason we are keeping a watching brief is to make sure that costs are established that we are getting gas in Ontario by the route that will bring it here the cheapest.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister does not reply specifically; he contends the government wants the cheapest route and he agrees that the cheapest route is from the south and therefore we must conclude that the government is in support of the southern route.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not say that!

I said earlier, and I would have to say again, that this is no jurisdiction of the Ontario energy board at all. It comes under the national energy board and I think that they will look after our interests—I hope they do anyway. I think it is before the federal power commission now, and that does not come under our jurisdiction.

We are concerned about additional gas in the province of Ontario and we want to get it here by the cheapest means available; that is our concern.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister agree that the southern route is four cents to five cents cheaper?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would not agree to that because I do not know, and I doubt if anyone knows that yet. I think they are still playing with figures and I think this is what we have to wait and find out. I doubt that any decision will be made

until this is proven, and then we will all know which way is the cheapest.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South has made his point and I am trying, if possible, to stay with the vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of major policy, and surely on the first vote there is an opportunity to discuss policy.

Mr. Chairman: Except, as the member will admit, it is more under federal jurisdiction.

An hon. member: Out of order!

Mr. MacDonald: It is not out of order, Mr. Chairman. The government is talking out of the two sides of its mouth at the same time, or I should say one and a half, because one hon. Minister is saying strongly he wants the north and the other hon. Minister is, in effect, saying, "I have no jurisdiction over it, but I want it by the cheapest route possible."

But the factors that have to be weighed here are factors in which this government should have some concern if the proposition is the protection of Canadian sources of power for this important Ontario market and if there is the prospect of no real control over a line—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have control when it gets into Ontario, but not until it gets here.

Mr. MacDonald: I know that, but as soon as the gas crosses the border at Emerson, you lose control over it and—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You mean Canada loses control over it.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, Canada loses control over it! Therefore we in the province of Ontario, whose market has to be served, are going to lose control over it because we do not even have effective control of the subsidiary company—we have only a 50 per cent interest held by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines.

There is the added factor regarding costs which I submit that the hon. Minister should not shrug off—the pending threat of an N.S. tax on gas which coming from Canada would eliminate any advantage arising from the southern route.

The matter does not really end there. I could go on at great length, but I will not bore you much further, Mr. Chairman—since you appear to be not too happy at the prospect of extended discussion on this—but as late as April 22, which is no more than two or three weeks ago, there was a dispatch from Washington which stated, and I quote:

> A staff member of the federal power commission yesterday summarily dismissed the threat by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited to loop a second line north of the border if a competing company got FPC permission to bring additional natural gas to eastern Canadian markets.

In other words, there are other American companies which are seeking to bring gas into the eastern Canadian market and here is Trans-Canada, after all the presentation of their case, with all the apparent economic advantages that are supposed to be there—even though those advantages might be wiped out by other factors—in effect threatening and having their threat thrown back in their face by a responsible official of the FPC that if they did not get this exclusive right to supply the eastern Canadian market, then they will loop their line through northern Ontario. Maybe the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is correct. Maybe this Minister of Energy and Resources Management with the authority of his Cabinet, should be speaking up for the protection of Canadian interests.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Walter Gordon will look after that!

Mr. MacDonald: Walter Gordon may or may not look after it. They have to settle that issue in the Liberal Party, because he is not in the saddle at the moment.

But as was pointed out in an editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* on May 3 with regard to this issue, there have been no voices raised in terms of protecting Canada's national interest in this important way. If we are going to deplete our limited reserves of gas by exporting it to the United States and have no assurance that we will maintain our control of this new line from western Canada, then I submit that this hon. Minister—who is, by his own admission, interested in the adequate provision of gas for Ontario industries and residents and commercial consumers—that this Minister should be taking an interest in the matter, and up until now he has done nothing but hold watching briefs.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to stay with vote 601.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, under this vote are we going to deal with

the Ontario Northland Railway, or is this under another section or at the end?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there is no vote in my estimates to deal with the Ontario Northland Railway and we will not be dealing with it in the estimates. I understand the commission is going to be before the committee on commissions some time this week where any question pertaining to the ONR might be asked.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think this is a clear admission by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management that the ONR obviously is not connected with development, because surely in previous years this has come up under the Minister's department. You people go around saying that the ONR is part of a development programme responsible to Parliament. This is the Minister in charge of development and we assumed that the ONR, therefore, would come under his estimates.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I put through a supplementary estimate some time early in the year. There was not a question asked by the Opposition and that was the time it should have been debated.

Some hon. members: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh yes, it was. It was the only time I asked for money for the ONR.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, when the Minister put through his supplementary estimate, I asked a question and he gave me exactly the same answer as he gave us today.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, there was a question.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, in every previous year there has been a section under the estimates of this department—

Mr. Chairman: Does the member for Nipissing know of any section where the ONR estimates come before us?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is no section.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I am speaking to the member for Nipissing. Does he know of any particular section because I would be delighted to include it under any proper section—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, you talked of Trans Canada Pipe Lines and the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party was permitted to discuss this because it is obviously very fundamental to policy of development. Surely the government cannot have it two ways. They cannot start going around the country saying that the ONR is important to the development of the north, that it is part of development, and then when the Minister of Development comes in he says, "This has nothing to do with my estimates." That is a contradiction in my terms. And just under general policy, vote 601, it seems to me that this would be appropriate. I am sure the hon. Minister would agree with this.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to broaden the question before the House. Do I conclude from what the Minister has said that the same thing is going to apply to Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, there is a vote in there for Hydro.

Mr. MacDonald: There is a vote in there for Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The same thing will apply to Hydro!

Mr. MacDonald: The relevancy of this remark escapes me, even after sober second thought, so I will ignore it. I wanted to draw to your attention that it has been a tradition in this House that the Minister who is responsible for reporting to the House for any commission has a spot at the end of his estimates for consideration of policy or issues in relation to that commission. That has nothing to do with whether or not that commission may have come before the standing committee on government commissions, because in many instances when the responsible persons or officers of a commission come before the standing committee they state that they are not responsible for the making of policy. Indeed, on many occasions the member of the government who sits on the ONR, now the chairman of it, will say, "This is government policy and I am not in a position to speak on it."

This is the place where we have traditionally dealt with these issues. What in effect the hon. Minister is saying now is that he is going to cut off the opportunity for members of the House to raise questions relating to policy and the administration of the ONR. I submit to you that this is at least a departure from past proceeding and in my view indefensible.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member for York South will agree that the function of the committee of supply is to deal with the estimates, and we are dealing with the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management at the present time. If the Minister is responsible for the Ontario Northland Railway under these estimates and if he has promised to answer some questions under this vote, I think perhaps this would be the time to ask the question, under the main vote.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I said before that the ONR officials are going to be before the committee on commissions this week. I think if they go before this committee and if there are some policy questions to come out of this meeting, we would be very happy to bring it in after. But I do not think we should thrash it out here and then have them come down here and sit before the committee on commissions. They have been asked down here for one day this week, I am not sure whether it is Tuesday or Wednesday, so why do we not let it go and if there are certain questions of policy I will answer them here in the House.

Mr. Chairman: If there are any questions of policy I think we could deal with them now. If there are any questions in connection with the estimates perhaps the member might present his question and see if it deals with policy or with estimates.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I was going to deal with the annual report of the Ontario Northland Railway for the year 1964 and this, I am sure, is moneys for the operation of the railroad.

Mr. Chairman: I cannot hear the member.

Mr. Smith: I was going to ask some questions in regard to the annual report of the Ontario Northland Railway for the year ending 1964, because we do not have the one for the year ending 1965 as yet. Also, I think since the hon. Minister is responsible for the Ontario Northland Railway that the administrative costs of his department would cover that responsibility and it should come under vote 601.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The administration costs do not come under my department; they have their own setup at North Bay. The only thing I deal with in the ONR is a policy matter, where there should be a change in policy as far as government is concerned or a deficit, and we put a vote through this House to get the money for it. We do not deal in the day-to-day operation of the ONR; their bookkeeping is in North Bay.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, surely the hon. Minister is not suggesting to the House that an important arm of the Ontario government is in no way accountable to the members of this Legislature. The committee on commissions is not this vehicle. The vehicle only is the debates here in the Legislature on supply. Surely the hon. Minister is not suggesting that when the liquor commissioner appears before the committee on commissions, and when His Honour Judge Robb says, "That is policy, I can only tell you how we enforce policy" that that is the end of the debate. Surely the same thing is true here.

I am just looking at the debates of last year. There was a full discussion of the ONR and if we are going to be muzzled to the extent that this Minister stands up and says, "I brought in some supplementary estimates," which deal with things that went on a year ago, not the things that are going to go on next year, then he is muzzling this Legislature; he is prohibiting the members of this Legislature from discussing a very important arm of the Ontario government. We are beginning to make brand-new rules because he has recast his amendments, and the people of Ontario must come to the conclusion there is something behind in the ONR and the hon. Minister does not want to discuss it publicly.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Speak about it on the Budget.

Mr. Singer: That is nonsense, and the Provincial Secretary knows it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, in support of your ruling, because the member has brought up the reference to the liquor control board—the liquor licence board; they were up before the committee on commissions, they were asked all kinds of questions. When it comes to a question of policy, those things have correctly been pointed out; there are other vehicles—

Mr. Singer: What are they?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is the Throne debate and the Budget debate. You can have a full discussion on any topic within this House.

Mr. Singer: It is not a question of opportunity to discuss it, it is a question of ac-

countability. The hon. Provincial Secretary was forced by his own leader a year or so ago to stand in his place here and account for liquor policy. The hon. Prime Minister recognized the validity of this argument and neither the Prime Minister nor the House leader are here. And unfortunately when those two gentlemen are absent the front benches collapse into a whole maze of confusion, and that is what we are in today.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we appreciate that you have ruled on this.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member is mistaken. If he will go to the discussion of the estimates of the Provincial Secretary of last year, the liquor boards were not discussed.

Mr. Singer: When were they discussed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There were other vehicles provided. The hon. Prime Minister provided an opportunity for discussion and that opportunity was never taken advantage of. There was another vehicle.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Members have stood in their places in connection with this particular ruling of order, and I would suggest to the members at this time that questions were asked of the Minister and that he promised to answer them during consideration of his estimates. If there are questions in connection with the estimates of the ONR that properly come before us, the Minister—under vote 601 would answer those questions now.

Let us not get into a general discussion of the Ontario Northland Railway, but let us deal with anything under the estimates of this particular vote.

Mr. Smith: I do not know how restricting that statement is. I just cannot follow how we can really deal with the railroad generally at all.

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting that we do not deal with this generally, but that we deal with it from the standpoint of the estimates of the ONR, for which this Minister is responsible at this time.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, in the financial report of the year 1964, the loss of the railroad was $861,526.32 and this year we have voted $861,600 to cover that loss. The profit of Star Transfer Limited, which is a subsidiary of the ONR was $136,439.70, of which $40,000 was turned over to the Ontario Northland Railway. I would like to ask the hon. Minister why we voted $861,600 to cover the loss which did not take into consideration the $40,000 that was turned over from Star Transfer Limited to the Ontario Northland Railway? I would also like to ask where are the other profits of Star Transfer Limited. Were they held by Star Transfer?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this is the problem; the hon. member has asked a question and I cannot answer, because I have nothing to do with this part of ONR's business. They come before the Treasury board with their statement. Their statement must be audited by the provincial auditor and they come up with a figure where they have to have money from the government. Then the vote comes along, and this is where we should have been answering that question, but it never was asked by anyone, so it was not answered.

At that time I had the chairman here, I had people from the office in North Bay who could have given the answers and explained this particular question, but these are not matters that I deal with in my department. I deal on policy matters which have something to do with government, and government only. So I am sorry, sir, I cannot answer that question. But as I said earlier, they are going to be before the committee on commissions this week and I am sure that their auditor is going to be there. He can answer the questions, and if there are policy matters arising out of that meeting, I will undertake to answer them in the House. But that is not a policy matter.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is suggesting that he has no control at all over the Ontario Northland Railway. Now if there is no control over that railroad, this Legislature is a farce, as far as that railroad and the government is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I did not say we had no control, I said that their statement was taken from the office in North Bay and audited by the provincial auditor, and if there is anything wrong, or anything comes out of this audit that would be wrong, I am sure I would know about it. If there is nothing wrong, if it is routine, I am sure that we are not going to go over the statements.

Mr. Smith: I am not suggesting it is wrong, all I am doing is asking the hon. Minister to explain.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not know, and I am sorry I cannot answer your question, because I do not deal in the figures.

Mr. Chairman: Did the member for Riverdale have a question that was asked formerly, under a supplementary vote, that he wanted to ask now?

Mr. Renwick: No, Mr. Chairman, my remark was simply directed to the statement that the hon. Minister made when the supplemental vote went through, that there were no questions asked. I asked a question at that time, and I was given the same answer which the hon. Minister gave today, namely, that it would have to be dealt with when the commission came before the standing committee on government commissions.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I draw your attention to the fact that the hon. Minister said that if we had asked questions then, he had the ONR officials there and he could have given a reply? So he has given two different versions of the situation. The Minister does not grasp my point?

If I may repeat in simple A B C terms, when this supplementary estimate was before the House, your comment a few moments ago, was that when it was before the House if we had any questions, that was the time to ask them because you had officials of the ONR here and you would have been in a position to reply to them. The fact of the matter is, at that time also you said that you would not answer any questions, that they would have to be taken to the standing committtee on government commissions.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we get no opportunity to query on the policy level within this House, which has been the traditional place to do it. And if perchance the ONR, through some increase in business does not have a deficit, so that there is no supplementary estimate, even the theoretical opportunity is going to disappear.

I submit that this is an abrogation of the responsibilities of this government. However, since your ruling is that we have got to deal with policy, I have one or two policy matters I would like to raise, and they are clearly policy—beyond any shadow of doubt.

Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, I would ask what is the government's intention at this point with regard to seeking federal incorporation of the ONR, so the ONR might become eligible for some of the grants that are made to railways from the federal Treasury?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might state that we are not pursuing the matter of a federal charter at this particular time.

Mr. MacDonald: You came to a very abrupt stop there. The net effect of this, Mr. Chairman is that railways today—for a variety of reasons that the House is very familiar with — are faced with very heavy competition. Therefore their revenues have dropped and generally speaking, railways in Canada are the recipients of subsidies because of that fact. What has happened in the north with the ONR is that we have been struggling along without these subsidies and therefore extra moneys that would be necessary for an extension of the ONR for its basic purpose of development, simply have not been available. We have been using the north, with unnecessarily high rates in some instances.

Talk to the farmers in terms of their efforts to get the kind of rates that are required to get fertilizer for agriculture in that area, and you will find what they have been saying for years. We have been using this money, extracted from the consumers in this limited area, to finance the railway, and its deficits except on occasions when you run even beyond that into a deficit, which is met out of the provincial Treasury. In short, this railway is being operated on a completely different basis than any other railway in Canada, and that precludes the possibility of using it for its original function as a development road in this part of the province. It is because of this fact that we are not getting the normal railway subsidies.

Now, I know that the government was giving some consideration to seeking a federal charter, and if they were to seek a federal charter they would resolve a lot of other confusion as to whether or not, for example, their employees come under the Canada labour code. Some of their employees on the link that runs across the Quebec border do come under the Canada labour code, some of them do not. In other words, you have got a general confusion.

Let me ask the hon. Minister another question, since he has rather briefly replied that no active consideration is being given to the question of a federal charter at the moment.

Is any further consideration being given at the moment to extending the ONR down to Parry Sound, so that there would be some direct tie-in to the whole seaway route?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there has not been any consideration at govern-

ment level. Whether it has been discussed in the commission or not, I cannot answer for that. I have read about it and I have heard about it, but there has been no discussion or no thought of extending it to Parry Sound at the present time.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just clarify what influence the hon. Minister has with the ONR. One of the things that I am sure has concerned him, as indeed it has concerned a number of people, is the deficit under which the ONR operates, and there is a question in some people's minds whether the use of business cars are not a costly luxury. I would like to know the Minister's opinion about this.

I would like to know who sets the policy for a business car to come to Toronto, and I would like to ask the Minister if he should decide to travel on the ONR, does he use a business car? Does he order it to come to Toronto, and is it his decision then that it would come to Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might answer that question and say that I have travelled very little on the ONR because I find I am quite busy here. But if I was going to travel on the ONR, I would order a business car to Toronto.

Mr. Thompson: You would?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I would.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask you—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And if the commission is travelling on railroad business, I think if they have the business cars—and they do have them, they have been there for many years—that they are entitled to travel on business cars on their own line; and we consider into Toronto an extension of their own line with a working arrangement with the CNR. I cannot see anything wrong with this, as long as it is used within that jurisdiction because I think the House realizes when you go into northern Ontario —and they meet in many places with different municipalities, different shippers—it is very hard to get hotel accommodation when moving from one place to the other.

In fact, I have been up with the commission when we have held, in the course of three days, as many as twelve different meetings, and we met in the car. It is very useful for that purpose and I think it should be used for that purpose, but within the jurisdiction of Toronto and the ONR.

Mr. Thompson: Could you tell me how much more it costs to use the business car for hotel accommodation, rather than getting hotel accommodation?

Mr. Chairman: Do you not think that this should come under discussion of policy matters scheduled for Wednesday?

Mr. Thompson: Well, I think, sir, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister seems to be able to have the authority to pick up the phone and ask for a business car to pick him up in Toronto—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might correct the hon. leader of the Opposition.

I do not pick up the phone. I get in touch with the chairman, if it is not in use and is going to be in Toronto I ask if I can ride up in it. If I am coming back and coming alone I get on as an ordinary passenger and ride down the same as anyone else would on their pass. I do not ask the car to come down here to bring me back if I am alone.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask specifically: Did you ask to have a car come down to Toronto to take you up to North Bay, or wherever you were going in the north? Do you ask for one to pick you up in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, Mr. Chairman, I have not asked for one, but if I wanted to go I would ask for one.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 601, please.

Mr. Smith: The hon. Minister earlier stated that if there was anything in the annual report of the ONR that was out of line it would come to his attention, especially the remarks of the auditor. I think at the end of the 1964 report there are some remarks of the auditor to do with the actuarial report in connection with the pension fund. I would like the Minister to explain what the government is doing with regard to the $19 million deficit which is now showing in the pension fund.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I know some of the details about this, it was discussed with me last fall. I cannot tell you the sum, but we are putting in moneys every year in order to bring this fund up. We are not putting in a lump sum, but it is broken down to be paid back over the years. We are putting that money in. We put it in last year for the first time and it will be put in year after year until it is sound.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, is that sum you are now paying not to cover the interest only of the deficit?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, it will cover the interest; and eventually it will pay off the total deficit and bring it to an actuarially sound basis.

Mr. Smith: How long will this take?

Mr. Thompson: I want to clarify my mind about the use of this private car. Has the Minister ridden in the private car up to the north from Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask him, how it was decided that the private car should take him? Who informed him the private car would be available, because it is not on the regular schedule?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I said before that I get in touch with the chairman or someone on the commission, ask if they are going up at a certain time that I would like to visit northern Ontario. The private car is here and we get in it and ride up.

If there is anything wrong with this, I cannot see it. When I am going from here to Sharbot Lake and I want my own private car, I have it. Is there anything wrong with that? Should I ask you first?

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the Minister and the leader of the Opposition and the members of the House, that you have asked me to carry on with the sequence that is before us in the estimates of the department and I would ask you, if you will, please, to stay with vote 601.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I think this is very much in the estimates. The people of Ontario are probably paying a great deal to facilitate the travelling convenience of the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Under the ONR—and the vote before us is 601.

Mr. Thompson: I am asking whether when you have gone up, are you on business or have you gone for political reasons, to speak to a political group, when you have had use of the private car?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that I have been on business. I do not know whether you call talking to chambers of commerce and discussing railroad problems political problems or not. I have never attended a political meeting any time I have been in northern Ontario so I would think it would be business reasons.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with vote 601, please!

Mr. Smith: In the discussions of the ONR last year the Minister was involved in the negotiations with the employees—at that time he came to the city by private car from Toronto, just as an aside—I wonder if he would point out what the difference was between the first offer that the government made to the employees and what the settlement was?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot point out the difference, there was very little difference. There were several meetings. I might say that the committee on pensions were down here and met on two different occasions and I was in North Bay and met with them once. It was not a matter of a difference in dollars, it was a matter of clarifying certain points. After I was up there we had someone go up, an authority on pensions, and they reached an agreement. I understand everybody is very happy, but I cannot tell you what it was, it was a very small percentage.

Mr. Smith: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there was a difference in dollars and not the clarification of a point. If you would take the first offer that was made to the employees and which they were told they had to accept and the last offer which they did accept, there would be major difference.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think there was ever any offer made. I think at the beginning they read a statement which was in the press. There never was any final offer made, although there were discussions on it. I cannot think of his name right now, but the individual looking after pensions went up to discuss it with them; however, no final offer was made until we went up and met with them. I might say that the arrangements were not agreed upon it entirely at that time, but they were agreed upon lately and everybody seems quite contented and happy with the results.

Mr. Chairman: I might remind the member for Nipissing that there is a committee notice now in front of me stating that the standing committee on government commissions will meet on Wednesday, May 11, at

1.00 o'clock in committee room No. 1 to hear the Ontario northland transportation commission. Any of those questions could be brought up at that time, or any surplus question you have, you may want to bring up at that time.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I was delighted to see the vice-chairman—chairman, I beg your pardon—and I wonder if he could clear the point up for us. I am sure that with the constant touch that he has on expenses he would know how much it costs to bring the private car of the ONR from North Bay to Toronto. I think the public would like to know this. Could you tell us, sir?

Mr. Chairman: Do you not think this would be a proper question to ask him on Wednesday of this week?

Mr. A. Johnston (Parry Sound): Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a good idea if we did clear the point up, because it does not cost us anything.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think it properly comes before this meeting, but I have no objection to your giving the answer.

Mr. Thompson: I do not quite follow the sort of carefree abandon of the chairman, saying it does not cost us anything. It would seem to me that hauling a car down and hauling it back again would certainly cost something, perhaps a little more than a ticket on an airplane.

An hon. member: No, it is just hooked on the end.

Mr. A. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, arrangements are made between the Canadian National Railways and the Ontario Northland that there is no charge for our equipment on their track, or alternatively their equipment on our track; there is no charge.

Mr. Singer: I have another question relating to the ONR. There was a gentleman named W. J. Cann, apparently an employee, a onetime employee, of the Canadian National Railways, who was very highly regarded by the ONR, who I am advised was hired for a five-year period at a very substantial salary by the ONR and subsequently his contract of service was terminated. I would ask the Minister the detail, the length of the contract of service, the salary it was agreed would be paid to him and the amount that he was paid when his contract was terminated.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that Mr. Cann had no contract for any specific time. He was on loan to us from the CNR for not longer than three years, but he was on recall any time they wanted him. I have a letter in my files, I am sorry I have not got it with me, where they wanted him back for a special project. We were very happy to have him for the time he was with us, but again our agreement with the CNR was that he could return.

Now, sombody has brought these letters to my attention. I do not know if you want them in the record, I have them if you would like to look at them, where he was recalled by the CNR and he left on a very happy arrangement. This was the arrangement that was made in the beginning.

Mr. Singer: I would like to see those letters, Mr. Chairman. I would thank the hon. Minister if he would send them over. We will have some more questions, but I was advised that when he left the ONR there was a substantial payment to him in lieu of retaining his services for the balance of the three years. Am I incorrect on that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, Mr. Chairman, he is wrong. I might just read this letter. I will read it into the record. This is from MacMillan, I guess. It is addressed to the hon. Prime Minister:

> You will remember that when arrangements were made to second Mr. J. L. Cann to the provincial government of Ontario for assignment to the Ontario Northland Railway it was agreed that this would be on an understanding that he would be subject to recall at any time by Canadian National.
>
> Circumstances are now such that we feel that Mr. Cann should be recalled and I should be glad if you would regard this letter as formal notice to that effect. While we would welcome his early return to us we are, of course, prepared to meet your wishes as to an appropriate date. Will you, therefore, please let me know what date would suit your convenience?
>
> I should also welcome an early reply to my letter of April 14, 1965.

—which was on another matter; on pensions. And then the hon. Prime Minister's letter to Mr. MacMillan:

> I have your letter of March 8 concerning Mr. J. L. Cann whom you were kind enough to loan to us for assignment to

the Ontario Northland Railway. I am sorry that circumstances are such that you wish to recall Mr. Cann. However, in accordance with our agreement I accept your letter as notice. The necessary arrangements will be made for Mr. Cann's employment with the Ontario Northland Railway to terminate as of March 31, 1966.

Mr. Singer: For the period of his employment, he was just paid so much a month, or so much a week and nothing extra because of the termination? Am I correct on that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, he was on a yearly salary and he was paid nothing extra. There was no termination. He was up there on a special assignment for us and we were hoping we could keep him for three years, but circumstances being what they are, as outlined in the letter, he had to return to his parent company.

Mr. Singer: Were copies of any of this correspondence sent to Mr. Harry Price?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Not that I know of. This was correspondence that I have—

Mr. Singer: Is there any notation on any of the correspondence that copies of it went to Mr. Harry Price?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, copies of both these letters to Mr. Harry Price. I think Mr. Harry Price is one of the commissioners on the commission—a director of the CN.

Mr. Singer: A director of the CN? I see. Is he presently a director?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I understand he is.

Mr. Singer: No, he is not. He was replaced by Mr. David Anderson. Now, I wonder why copies of it went to Mr. Harry Price?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot answer, but I know that the letter from the Canadian National Railways to the hon. Prime Minister, a copy went to Mr. Price and the letter back from the hon. Prime Minister, again a copy went to Mr. Price, myself and to the chairman of the railway. It was the CNR that sent the copy.

Mr. A. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this would help clear it up or not, but I understood that at the time we needed some help, Mr. Price was a director of the CNR. I think a request was made to ascertain if there was someone whom we could obtain from the CNR for a period of a year or so to assist us in our new development.

I am wondering if all of these problems would not be better discussed on Wednesday at government commissions.

Mr. Chairman: I have indicated to the members of the House that these questions would be more appropriate at that particular time, but the Minister has agreed to answer any policy matters now. He said he is not in a position to give details and on Wednesday he would have the officials with him.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask how long Mr. Cann was with the ONR?

Mr. A. Johnston: Approximately one year. I think he came to us on April 15, 1965, and he was called back in March 1966, March 31.

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if the hon. Minister might be able to answer this query? If he was only there for one year, is it correct that during that year Mr. Cann attempted to have a private car equipped for himself for use on the ONR and this was vetoed by the commission?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot answer that. I think that is a question that maybe could be posed to the commission on Wednesday.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to follow up again on the Great Lakes institute. There has been considerable discussion by both speakers on this and I noticed last year in the estimates, when they were discussing pollution, that the Minister at that time suggested that we on this side of the House emphasized too much the need for research. And yet it was of interest to me to see in the Great Lakes the fact that the American public health service in 1960 authorized a $13 million, seven-year study of the Great Lakes, and five states on Lake Erie are spending from $2 million to $3 million a year in studies in clean-ups.

The Great Lakes institute this year, under this hon. Minister, are getting less than they were under Lands and Forests and from what I can gather they were having a hard struggle to be recognized for this very important work they are doing. A unique organization in Canada, they were having a hard struggle to be recognized under Lands and Forests, but when they came in under this hon. Minister, and knowing his attitude to research, it did not surprise me that they were walloped down in their estimate, from $115,000 grant to $80,000.

We are concerned about the Great Lakes institute not getting an adequate grant for

several reasons. First of all, in order to get people who would work to take graduate work and then go on to teach and then get more research men to get into the field of pollution, it is obvious that there must be a graduate school. There must be fellowships for young people to work there and the Great Lakes institute has been ideal for this.

The hon. Minister last year told us of a number of studies which were stopped because you did not have enough staff, and complained about the difficulty in getting staff. I can appreciate that. This is in many ways a new field of the 20th century and there is a need to recruit more people to study graduate work and postgraduate work in this field.

But the Great Lakes institute is a unique organization for graduate work, and therefore I feel that in view of the other aspects of this, where you are talking about the real difficulty in getting staff, scientists, that surely this is the area in which you would get scientists to do practical field work.

I would like to stop just at this point and ask the Minister why this grant for the Great Lakes institute has been cut so low.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the grant has not been cut. It just happens to be on two different areas. I might just put this on the record. When the grant for the Great Lakes institute was moved from The Department of Lands and Forests—and it was in The Department of Lands and Forests last year, it was not in our department here—when it was moved from Lands and Forests to The Department of Energy and Resources Management, it was decided that it should be split in two parts. First, a grant to assist in administration of the institute and, second, payment for research work carried out by the institute.

The administrative grant has been included under the main office of the department, and is in the amount of $80,000. A further $35,000 is included in the estimates of the water resources commission under water quality research and will be found in vote 605. This means that the basic amount provided for the institute is $115,000, the same as in 1965-66.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I have other questions to ask under water pollution. Do you want me to ask them now or do we wait until we come to the—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would sooner we wait until we get on the water resources estimates. I have some people here from water resources, but right now we are dealing with energy and I would like to clean it up. Energy and conservation first, and then we will deal with water resources and Hydro.

Vote 601 agreed to.

On vote 602:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 602, may I ask the hon. Minister what has happened to what strikes me as a very important aspect of this energy branch, namely, the energy studies branch that was included in the estimates up until two or three years ago, and now seems to have disappeared completely? Have we no studies or research being done in this important area at all at the present time and if so, where do we find it in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that they are part of the energy branch.

Mr. MacDonald: And that is where we are. Would the hon. Minister inform us as to exactly what does the energy studies branch —which is incorporated into, I presume, the general salaries in vote 602—what does that branch do?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say that under the studies section, the one the hon. member is asking about, we have one engineer, an economist and one statistician. Within the province the section concerned relates to all forms of energy in the following categories: Sources of supply, comparison of cost to consumer, transportation costs, statistics of production and use, analysis of serious accidents to determine if any general pattern is developing or if any specific change is needed. Beyond the province, they keep informed of developments which may be important for future requirements, such as fuel cells, solar energy, carbon dioxide generators, national and international statistics, particularly those collected by the Dominion bureau of statistics, studies done by the national energy board, national research council and other federal agencies.

Mr. MacDonald: One of the items that the hon. Minister listed as a responsibility of this unit is the whole question of the statistics of production and use. Now, in my investigations I find there is no difficulty at all in discovering the amounts of oil and gas that are produced and sold in the province of Ontario, but I seem to find difficulty in getting up-to-date figures as far as propane is concerned. What is the picture here? What is the explanation for the fact that the department is

at best two or three years back and making sort of educated guesses as to the amount of propane that is produced and used?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member is speaking of propane only?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am told, Mr. Chairman, that much of their production goes into chemical feed stocks instead of for domestic uses but they seem to be reluctant to give us these figures. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member any more detail at this time; this is a question that has never been posed to me before.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if we have at least the remnants of an energy studies branch and it does devote some of its attention to statistics, I am wondering if any consideration has been given to keeping up-to-date figures. It would seem to me on the matter of energy it would be in our interest to have up-to-date figures. I understand that DBS, for some reason or other, are some two to three years behind the times. Is this not an appropriate area for us, in this flow of statistics from various government departments, to have an up-to-date picture in the whole energy field, including propane?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I think we agree with the hon. member; I understand we have been working with DBS authorities and we are in hopes now that this situation will improve this year.

Mr. MacDonald: Through the Minister's efforts or their efforts?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Both!

Mr. MacDonald: Oh; co-operative federalism, I presume!

Well, Mr. Chairman, I presume that the energy branch is the branch which now has jurisdiction over the matter of safety and safety codes since these have been separated from the energy board; right?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two things I would like to ask in this connection.

One is: In his introductory comments the hon. Minister referred to the fact that he was working on the development of codes for the province of Ontario. Now, we have been hearing this for about two or three years, indeed my recollection is that when this department was being set up, the former Minister, Robert Macaulay, indicated that we were moving with vigour—apparently not with his vigour because we have not got there yet—to the establishment of safety codes in the province of Ontario. What stage have we reached in this process and how soon can we expect that they will be available and proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would say in the reasonably near future.

Mr. MacDonald: In the reasonably near future?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand prior to this year we were trying to go at the national code; but we found we could not do that so our own Ontario code is developed and ready to go to Cabinet at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that question unearthed a very interesting little nugget. There are a lot of people in the field who have been wondering what is happening; they will be delighted to learn it is on the Cabinet's doorstep.

Related to that, the province has been relatively fortunate in the last year or so in the matter of accidents arising from explosions. I suppose the one at Maple a year or so ago, and other spots in the province, are ones to remind us that this kind of thing can happen at any point.

Does the department keep any comparative statistics as to accidents in the various fields of energy? For example as between propane, natural gas, oil? I would also be interested, since hydro is a source of energy, in accidents that arise from the use of hydro-electric power. Is the Minister's department in a position to give us a report on what the record has been, for example, in the calendar year of 1965 as to the number of accidents arising from these four major sources of power?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have the information relative to gas and oil. There were 99 accidents where the fuels listed hereunder were directly involved: Natural gas, 46; l.p. gas, 34, oil, 16; gasoline, 3—with 34 deaths resulting from the causes shown. One was a blocked vent and one an unvented water heater; one an explosion; one lack of combustion air. And again l.p.g. a blocked vent, defective controls, lack of combustion air; another one, the heater improperly installed. The number of deaths by space heaters

poorly maintained, eight; unknown, 13; smoking in bed, two; boiled-over fat on electric range, one.

Mr. MacDonald: What about hydro? Does the hon. Minister, or as far as he knows does Hydro have any reports as to accidents arising from the use of hydro-electric power?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that but I will try to have the answer when we deal with the Hydro estimates.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, over the past year there have been reports in the press of oil discoveries in various parts of the province. I was wondering what licensing requirements the government has for people who are actually doing wildcat exploration, what guidance is available for these people and what report the hon. Minister might make on these discoveries across the province.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, before any drilling is done they must get a permit from our department and it would come under the regulations as set down for drilling of wells.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if we could have a bit more information as to the success that has accompanied the expenditure by individuals and companies in this exploration? I am thinking specifically of the field that was developed east of Woodstock, the one that was announced some weeks ago in the London area; and the possibility for the discovery of oil in the northern tundra region on the plains around Hudson Bay. First, I would like a report of these two developing fields that I mentioned; second, I wonder if the Minister has any information about exploration in the northern reaches of the province.

While we are waiting for the information, I recall to the Minister the observations from the air made by the group of members from the Legislature who toured northern Ontario. I was interested to hear one of the pilots say that in some of his flights he had seen exploration operations going on, but that they were attended by considerable secrecy. I suppose, as Eatons does not tell Simpsons, maybe Esso does not tell Shell what explorations are going on. I wonder if this information is available on a public basis.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I can answer that question: To our knowledge there is no drilling in Hudson or James bays. There is exploration, but no drilling. I think perhaps there may be some doubt as to who has jurisdiction over that, whether it is federal or provincial—

Mr. Nixon: I do not mean to imply that the drilling is in the offshore areas—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think that we have any drilling onshore in those areas, but I know—

Mr. Nixon: No exploration either?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is exploration, yes; but no drilling. There is a large area under exploration in the James and Hudson bay areas.

Mr. Nixon: Excuse me; is the hon. Minister going to give me some information about—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am waiting until I get it here.

Mr. Chairman: While we are waiting for that information, I will ask the member for Etobicoke to speak.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): I want to ask the Minister about safety inspection, but I will wait until the member for Brant has completed his questions.

Mr. Nixon: While we are waiting for this information, I would like to know if there is any committee of the department that is concerned with assisting companies in the exploration for oil in this province. I suppose there are maps of findings that have already been made that would direct, to some extent, those who are searching for oil, yet Ontario has been singularly unsuccessful in expanding these resources in the recent past.

In our earlier history, of course, we had an amazingly valuable field in the Sarnia district and I suppose that, more than anything else, accounts for the development of the chemical industry in that area. These wells have, over the years, faded from importance and it appears that while there is some exploration going on there has been relatively little success, except as I have noted previously. If the hon. Minister is going to give us some information on these small but new oilfields, I wonder if he would also indicate what the government is doing to assist the companies to further their investigations in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, most of the exploration in Ontario is done by our major oil companies. As you know, there

are some independent companies that are doing some work and our department works with them very closely in giving geological information or any information that they require about an area. They must get permission to drill, but I do not think that that is one of the problems in this area. It seems to be that we have not been able to get where there is oil—or enough oil anyway. I now have the information that the hon. member requested on other wells: the Gobels field at Woodstock last year produced 135,200 barrels; the Wylie field in Elgin county produced 74,700 barrels, and in the Hudson bay area there has been geophysic activity only. There has been no drilling there.

Mr. Nixon: Has there ever been a report on oil-bearing formations in the Penetang area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Not to our knowledge.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, for some years now, the question of safety inspection with reference to gas furnaces has been raised during this department's estimates. I understand that last year in the estimates the question of the Switson Industries, Union Gas, and Consumers' Gas was discussed. This concerns gas furnaces and the failure of heat exchangers in gas furnaces. As I understand it, the hon. Minister said that the policy of the government has been to inspect or to see that furnaces are inspected before installation.

I think I am right when I say that the gas company makes the inspection before the installation. The problem apparently has been in several parts of Ontario, including my own riding, that people who have been buying new houses in new subdivisions, have found gas furnaces installed when they bought the house. These gas furnaces have had heat exchangers which have had guarantees of anywhere from one to ten years on them. Sometimes when these heat exchangers have failed, they have been replaced. I understand that sometimes the second exchanger has itself gone. I remember that in the estimates last year the hon. member for Parkdale raised a question of explosions, and other hon. members of this party have discussed this question.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister could tell us if this government has done anything further about protecting the public from a safety point of view, and from the point of view of economics with reference to heat exchangers, and the whole question of the installation of gas furnaces in homes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to state that our inspection is only a safety inspection. I think that the problem with these heat exchangers is not safety, but performance and, again, we would have no jurisdiction in this field. We are concerned with safety, and there has been no problem as far as this is concerned, but I can understand the problem some people are having with their furnaces.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, may I say that I disagree with the hon. Minister, because as I understand it, in one of these furnaces—you could get a crack in the heat exchanger with the family asleep during the night and it is very possible that there could be an explosion, or the family could be killed by the gas. To my mind, this is a safety problem. I am wondering how the hon. Minister can say that this has nothing to do with safety. Perhaps he might make it clear.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there might be a crack, but there would not be any danger of explosion. There could be a danger of gas fumes, and, of course, these would be burned; it would not be raw gas. It would be burned and would, of course, be noticeable to the occupants of the house or the building.

Mr. Braithwaite: The point I am trying to make is that gas fumes, as I understand it, are deadly. If there is no safety factor involved, why does the gas company immediately turn the gas off and instruct that the furnace is not to be used after the crack is discovered? I must disagree with the hon. Minister. I feel that any person who is asleep could not smell gas and would not be able to tell if there was a crack. That is a very serious safety problem to me. I wonder if the government has done anything further in connection with that part of the problem. Has the government taken any steps at all to see that this question of heat exchangers is straightened out?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, we have not Mr. Chairman; we have not taken any steps. It is unfortunate that these furnaces are sold but I would doubt that it would be the government's responsibility to say to a manufacturer that he must change furnaces when he met specifications for the furnace, as laid down, at the time they were bought. I think that these people that have these furnaces know about it, and I can see that they should be alarmed. I think if it were in my home I would want

to get it exchanged myself and get a better type of heater.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am not getting the point across. As far as I can see, Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of replacing the exchanger because as I understand it sometimes the second, and sometimes the third exchanger goes. I should think that this would come under the government's safety regulations, and I do not see how the Minister can say that this is not a government responsibility. I think that I speak for most of the members on this side of the House when I say that this is something the government should look into. I do not know for how many years this has been raised but I do know it is several. If the government has not done anything then I think that if we do have a death or an explosion it will be the responsibility of the government.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, when I brought this question to the attention of the hon. Minister last year I was under the impression that the provincial government undertook to have a factory inspection of this furnace at the time of manufacture. Are they provincial standards or federal government standards?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that these are federal inspections on this type of furnace and that the people who manufacture them have gone out of business. I understand again that we are working with the federal people to see that we do get a heat exchanger; or find out what the life of a heat exchanger should be and see that we get a product so that this will not be occurring again.

Mr. Worton: I do not wish to labour this point, Mr. Minister, but the thing that bothers me is that the firm to all intent has gone bankrupt. On the other hand, they are still building replacement parts and these replacement parts are still defective too. This, I know, is what concerns people in my riding and the hon. member of Etobicoke, that these people are in many cases getting taken a second time. I think that once is enough, but when you get taken two and three times on a deal like this of $300 or $400, I think there should be some department or some agency that should tell these people to get out of business for good.

Mr. Braithwaite: If I might just add, Mr. Chairman, and not wishing to labour it either, but I wrote to the federal government in connection with this last year. I was told that this was a provincial responsibility. I wonder if the Minister could tell us which department of the federal government his advisors say is responsible for this.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is the Canadian standards association, their testing laboratory, it is their specification on this furnace. Of course what we have here is not actually any problem with the gas. It is after the gas exploded that we are having trouble with the furnace or the heat exchanger. Our responsibility stops when there is not any leakage of raw gas in the unit.

Mr. Braithwaite: Did I understand the hon. Minister to say the responsibility ceases when there no leakage of raw gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of raw gas, yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: To turn that around, does that mean that you do have the responsibility when there is some leakage of raw gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, we would.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is the very point we are making.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, this is not a leakage of raw gas. The gas has already exploded and it is burned; all you are getting is the odour of a burned gas. The gas has already been exploded, the furnace itself is working all right as far as the burning of the natural gas is concerned. Fumes from the burned gas is the only problem we would have.

Mr. Braithwaite: It would seem to me that the problem really would not be whether or not the gas has been burned but the problem is we are looking at it from a safety factor and from the point of view of people who have been taken a second and a third time. We are worried about the effect of the leakage of gas, period, whether it is burned or not, on these people. I think this is a responsibility of the government, for that reason if for no other reason. Could a person die because of this? I am certain there must be some safety factor involved or the gas company would not shut your furnace down when the leak is found in the heat exchanger.

I cannot see how the Minister can say this is somebody else's responsibility. There is a safety factor here; if we are discussing safety I think this is one of his responsibilities.

Mr. Thompson: I noticed when you asked which federal department is responsible the hon. Minister answered the Canadian standards association. Which department does that come under, the Canadian standards association?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, it is not under the federal departments. It is an independent association with a federal charter.

Mr. Thompson: Then the federal government has not got any strength to do this?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Thompson: Previously you said the federal government had the responsibility, but this is a private association—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry. It is a private association with a federal charter.

Mr. Thompson: Is the hon. Minister satisfied with that as a method of ensuring the safety of people?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: I would say I am not, Mr. Chairman. On this very company which we are talking about, we have a great many new homes going up in the northern part of my riding, and in the great majority of these they are installing gas furnaces. As far as I am concerned, I think the Minister is shirking his responsibility when he says he is satisfied.

This is not so. One of my constituents could die because the government has not done anything. We have brought this up many times and as far as I am concerned the government has been given notice. The government should do something about this. Look into it, if nothing else. It should look into it.

The hon. Minister can sit there and say that he is satisfied; well I am not! I am sure that nobody else on this side of the House is satisfied either. You are sidestepping the issue, Mr. Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is not satisfied. I do not know why he engages in this double talk periodically. The whole purpose of the safety code is to replace the CSA. In other words, this two years of dilly-dallying in producing safety codes is presumably to come up with a code that will be a little tighter than the CSA standards at the moment. At the moment you are working with the CSA standards in the absence of having your code, so why does the Minister tell the House he is satisfied with it? If that were the case, then a lot of people in your department are wasting their time in devising safety codes. The answer to this question is get these safety codes out! You have been working on them for five years; at least verbally you were working on them for a number of years.

You told me some time back in answer to one of my questions that you had been satisfied with the CSA up until a year or so ago, and now you are working on the safety codes. This is the answer to the hon. member who has been querying you. I do not think the Minister should inadvertently, or otherwise, tell the House he is satisfied when his own department is trying to work out an alternative. Our complaint is the delay in getting the alternative.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think we are talking about two different things here. We might not be satisfied with the codes as they apply to one thing, but we are talking about a product here. I do not think that our department was ever meant to be responsible for a product and how long it would last once it is put on the market. You do not think we should do this, do you?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the hon. Minister, you are cutting the hair pretty fine. Would you draw a distinction in saying that you are responsible for the consequences from raw gas, but after the gas gets into a particular appliance and it then has presumably exploded, then it is not your responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is not exploded, it is burned gases that the problem is.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, it is burned gases. If a person is killed or dies, it is going to be of little consequence to him whether or not that death arose because of the fact that the gas escaped when it was raw gas or after it had burned. Somebody should be responsible, and in a hurry, for getting it off the market and protecting the lives of the people.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is no danger in the problem we are talking about here of an explosion. We will not talk about explosion because—

Mr. MacDonald: There is danger of people dying!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is just danger, the only danger you have is fumes from burned

gases. Surely this could happen to any furnace, it need not apply to a gas furnace alone. It can happen to an oil furnace, it can happen to a coal furnace; it has happened many times. Many of you recall people have been gassed with fumes from a coal furnace; some of them have died too, but we do not use much coal any more.

This could happen at any time to a piece of metal, metal fatigue being what it is; although this particular furnace seemed to be worse than any other manufacturer's. The manufacturer has gone out of business. Among the people who are now manufacturing the furnaces, I think perhaps we might have some bad manufacturers, but again competition, I think, would drive them to build a good product if they are going to stay in business.

I think it is pretty hard for this department, or any department of government, to say when you buy a new furnace this furnace is going to last five years, ten years, 15 or 20 years. This is something that the owner of the home should have checked himself, I would think, although we are responsible for natural gas until it gets to the burner, for the safety at that end.

Mr. Braithwaite: But he is buying the house with the furnace installed. The gas comes from one supplier and one supplier only. Then if this is the case that is exactly why I think the government should step in and do something about it.

It is all right for the hon. Minister to say that the people who are buying these furnaces should make a complaint. It is too late once you have bought the house, you have to take the whole thing out and put in oil, there is no other place you can buy gas. I cannot agree with the hon. Minister at all.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, just on this point alone: Two years ago this matter was raised in this House. I raised it because in my own riding a great many new homes were having this experience of the heat interchange, or whatever you call the thing, cracking and the fumes coming through, and they are having a great deal of trouble.

I attended two protest meetings about this and the gas company was there. I raised it and the hon. Minister spoke on it in the House and finally the problem disappeared from my riding. They got the defective furnaces replaced and it seemed to be cleared up. But evidently what has happened is that they have just jumped the Humber river and now the same thing is happening in the riding of my hon. friend, the member for Etobicoke.

There surely must be some control, some way by which people who are putting up this kind of product can be forced to desist. There is no protection for the homeowner. He buys the home, the furnace is there, the product is piped in and then in a short period of time the cracks appear; the defect is known, that is the time when the homeowner discovers he has no recourse at that point except to make a complaint. To whom is he going to complain? There is evidently no one, and no one to give him protection—no codes which he can invoke to give him that protection—and I think it is high time that this problem was faced up to. It is evidently continuing. I thought it was finished a year ago. Evidently the same thing is continuing and surely some arm of government must step in and do something to end this kind of problem.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, may I say that we hear nothing about this from one year to the other until it comes to this estimate. I do not know whether these furnaces the hon. member talks about are new furnaces, old furnaces or what they are. And I would say that it does not come under our jurisdiction. We could sit here discussing it forever but if we do not know what we are talking about—and I am sure I do not know whether these furnaces are two years old, ten years old or 50 years old, and I doubt if the hon. member does. If we get some facts we can have a look at it, but up until now I have never received a fact about one of these in our office.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, under this vote I think is included gas transmission lines and I would like to refer back to what was discussed under the first vote, which I think perhaps should have come in under this vote. The hon. member for York South was asking some assurances from the hon. Minister, I believe, that the natural gas supply in Ontario and in northern Ontario would be sufficient over the next years, in spite of whether the new line goes through the states or through northern Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: But I do not see that under this vote.

Mr. Smith: I think under the energy branch and under the energy board they are responsible for the transmission of gas and for the cost of natural gas as well as the supply.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer that question. If we bring another line into western and central Ontario, there is ample gas going through the northern route now, so there will be ample supplies to take care of the needs up there for many years to come as far as we can see. Of course, if there is more needed then it will have to be looked after. But at the present time there will be no shortage in northern Ontario, because as you know, all the gas coming in central and western Ontario now is coming right through to the hon. member's area, to northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Smith: I would like to ask the hon. Minister if they have done any studies on energy requirements for the coming years in his department in order to assure adequate supplies at the most economical rate.

Mr. Chairman: Does that not properly come under the next vote, on constructing the pipelines? Under the energy board?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We can do it under this vote. We make certain studies and estimate along with the gas companies the supplies that are going to be needed from year to year. We would have to get a lot of our information from them as to whether, when an industry moves into an area, it is going to be supplied by gas, oil, electric or what-have-you, then we estimate from that for our supplies.

Vote 602 agreed to.

On vote 603:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on 603 there are a number of points that I think would come under the jurisdiction of the Ontario energy board, which is responsible for regulating the transmission of gas in the province of Ontario. The first one I would like to raise with the hon. Minister arises out of a paragraph in his introductory statement. He said:

> During the current year the board will hold public hearings on rates which have not previously come before it for review. These will include the rates of Lakeland Natural Gas Company Limited, Provincial Gas Company Limited and Grimsby Natural Gas Limited, as well as the storage rates of Tecumseh Gas Storage Limited and the storage transmission and wholesale gas rates of Union Gas Company.

Now, the thing that puzzles me is, do you mean to say that none of these companies have ever had a rate hearing up until now, even the latter one, for example, "the storage, transmission and wholesale gas rates of Union Gas Company"? What is the explanation for getting around to a rate hearing only at this stage?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am informed we have had interim meetings but as yet we have not had public hearings on the setting of these rates. There have been interim hearings and interim rates set up.

Mr. MacDonald: This is for all of them?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: For all that were mentioned, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Including the storage, transmission and wholesale gas rates of Union Gas Company?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Surely Union Gas has been in the storage business now for years. Why would you operate on an interim basis for this length of time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They were exempt, I understand, until last year for their storage charges. And transmission.

Mr. MacDonald: They were exempt even for transmission?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister mean the transmission for example from the Dawn field down to the Oakville—that was exempt from public hearing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, by regulation.

Mr. MacDonald: By regulation?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: What was the purpose of that exemption?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand storage was a very small part of their operation until last year, and the same with transmission.

Mr. MacDonald: It is certainly a matter of judgment. It was so large and growing a proposition for years that they have already looped the line from Dawn through to Oakville. I think that whether or not it is a small part of their overall operation, I do not know what percentage it is, the proposition that a company that comes under the regulations of the Ontario energy board should have been exempted from a public hearing

by regulation strikes me as being a strange business.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand, as was said in the statement, they are all coming up for hearings this year and again the chairman of the energy board advises me that there was very little storage until 1961 and now it is starting to increase. In fact, in 1961 there were only 15,228,000 and last year 33,155,000, so you can see the growth in storage in the last few years. It will continue to grow as time goes on.

Mr. MacDonald: I assume from the hon. Minister's earlier reply—if I may go back then to Lakeland Natural Gas, Provincial Gas Company and Grimsby Natural Gas Limited—these have been operating under interim orders now for a number of years.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is correct.

Mr. MacDonald: I once referred to the regulatory body at Ottawa in regard to Bell rates as being a sleeping watchdog. This one is not only sleeping; it concedes freedom to charge what the company wants until five or six years afterwards and then finally gets into the field at that level. It strikes me as being a strange way to operate a regulated industry, to come into the field some five or six or seven years after they have been in operation. However, the hon. Minister has put it on the record; there it is.

Another point, that I wanted to raise: I understand from farmers in the Niagara peninsula that there is a growing objection and protest to the practices of the gas companies in that area. Because they are now refusing to carry out the traditional practice of buying small amounts of gas from farmers. In many instances these may be relatively marginal farmers and revenues from gas were a sizeable contribution to their limited income, though it may have been a certain nuisance as far as the gas company itself was concerned.

Is the hon. Minister in a position to indicate whether or not the decision by the gas company to stop buying these little bits of gas from individual farmers rests with them, or does it in any sense come under the Ontario energy board?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am advised that it rests with the companies and I am advised also that they do buy from these small producers whatever is feasible.

Mr. MacDonald: I suppose this becomes a matter of judgment as to what is a fit topic for regulation, but it seems to me that if companies have been doing this, as they have been for years, the practice of cutting it off now is (a) bad public relations, and (b) conceivably something that the energy board should take a look at, because certainly there are a growing number of protests. An engineer for Consumers' Gas Company down there—I understand that his reputation has reached the point, as the man who makes the decisions in this connection, of being even less popular than the proverbial skunk at a garden party.

I submit this to the hon. Minister and to officials of the energy board, that this is conceivably something that they should look into.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back finally to two or three items that we have been talking about in this House for literally ten years. I wonder how long we have got to go on before the appropriate body, which in this instance is the energy board, can resolve differences in connection with the extraction of gas and oil, particularly in the Lambton fields.

Long before the hon. Minister was in this House, as a matter of fact, I started raising these issues. This was back before we had an energy department at all. When Robert Macaulay came into the picture and was building various departments and getting them established, this was the excuse for not getting around to the relatively trivial matters that had been existing there like running sores for years. Then it was handed over to the Langford committee, but the Langford committee was sidetracked into oil in the Great Lakes and made its first report without any reference to the matter. In its final report it said that this was really beyond its competence and jurisdiction, so at that late stage the government handed it to the energy board. The energy board made a report a year or so ago which was relatively satisfactory in terms of solving some of the problems, but there still has been no final decision on others.

Let me take two or three examples to illustrate it. One is the proposition of residual gas. As the hon. Minister will recognize, when an area has been designated as a pool by order of the board, in effect the private farmer loses the rights he may have had to that land and it is subject to arbitration at a later stage. If gas is left in that pool as the cushion gas on which they can build their stored gas, if there is no gas left, they have to put a certain amount of cushion gas in, so that they will have adequate pressure to be able to get the gas out at a later stage.

My information is that when the Tecumseh subsidiary or company was set up through the joint efforts of Consumers' Gas and Imperial Oil they, in their capital structure, put in figures calculated at 50 cents per thousand cubic feet for the residual gas. But when they come to pay the farmer from whom they had in effect expropriated this gas—it is still subject to final decision in the courts—all they are offering is two cents.

What I cannot understand is why the Ontario energy board is not in the position to move in and resolve this issue with some speed, particularly since the companies themselves have given some indication as to what value they place on it, and put it in the capitalization structure of their subsidiary.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the hon. member, I understand now the paying pool is before the OMB and it would seem that perhaps the companies and the farmers involved in the other pools are waiting to see what decision is coming from the OMB on the paying pool, and then whatever steps are necessary to be taken will be taken after that decision.

Mr. MacDonald: This may be the official explanation, and it may have a degree of validity, but I emphasize once again, Mr. Chairman, the proposition that companies will designate 50 cents per thousand cubic feet, which is in their own view a fair value when they put it in for the calculation of their own rate structures for presentation to the energy board, but when they pay the farmer, they pay him two cents. Now that really has the late J. S. McLean licked three ways. When he commented that he paid the farmer as little as possible and sold it to the consumer for as much as the market will bear—that is business! Maybe that is just business, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that in a regulated industry we do not need to tolerate this kind of thing for as long as we have.

Related to this is another problem. When the energy board steps in and designates a pool, there is in many instances oil, and there is known to be oil beneath this pool. The question is, does the company then have the right not to extract that oil, or alternatively, does the farmer in effect lose all claim he might have, if the oil were extracted?

I understand that for quite some time the department, or the energy board, has been wrestling with this. Indeed, I note that a year or so ago, apparently while they were trying to get competent personnel to come to grips with this, they sought what is known as a reservoir engineer. They are a pretty rare kind of bird, and the civil service association designated, and even advertised to get a reservoir engineer. But characteristic of this government, they put $8,500 as the salary, so it was no surprise to anybody who knew anything about it that they got no replies from competent people.

My guess would be that a reservoir engineer, which is a specialized field in engineering, if he went to Calgary or some of the western oil fields, could claim $15,000 or $20,000 as quickly as he could snap his fingers. So how does this government think they are going to get one for $8,500? But quite apart from that aspect of not having the personnel to do the job, it seems to me that once again it is a matter of bringing to bear on the problem adequate skills and knowledge of the appropriate person and deciding the issue. And if there is oil there, and the company does not see fit to extract this oil, then I think the farmers are entitled to get their payment. If the company then wants to sit on the oil and leave it beneath the gasfield, as a continuing asset to be used at whatever time they wish, that is their decision, but I do not think that the farmers should be put off in the fashion that they have.

What is the hon. Minister's comment on this problem?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that if there is oil there in commercial quantities it is produced and a price arrived at. And if they do not produce it they have to pay the landowner more rental and the price is fixed by the board of arbitration.

Mr. MacDonald: I find it passing strange that there is such a continual range of complaints on this score. Indeed, during the past year still further representations were made by the farmers themselves, and other bodies in the Lambton area to the select committee on mining, when they were visiting in that area. If it is all resolved and if the procedures for resolving it are as clear-cut as the hon. Minister indicates, I cannot understand why the local people are still making representations to select committees of this Legislature.

There is a final point I want to raise with the hon. Minister in this connection, and I presume that this gets down into the details of calculating the rate base of these various companies. For example, Union Gas in its

latest statement—I believe it is for the year March 31, 1965—has specified a figure of some $11,586,000 as a rate reserve—I think this is the terminology that is used. This is moneys that are in effect, placed in a so-called "rate" reserve, after they have paid their income tax.

The people in the Lambton gas storage association argue that under the original cost less depreciation formula which was promulgated by the previous fuel board back in the days of Robert Macaulay — under the cost less depreciation formula, this $11,586,000 in rate reserve which is in reality the property of the gas consumers, is ploughed back into more original costs, thereby pyramiding the allowable cost to consumers for the use of their own money. In other words, it becomes part of the capital structure which is entertained by the energy board in deciding what appropriate rates can be charged.

Why is this practice tolerated if it is as bad as the Lambton gas storage association people contend?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am informed that they can have anything they like in the books, but the rate base is spelled out in this way: a rate base is no longer a matter for conjecture but is a matter of law; see subsection 1(b) of Bill 104 enacted during the last session. As a matter of information, this has always been the definition of rate base as applied by the board and its successors. Legislation defining rate base is worded similarly in nearly every other province in Canada and in nearly every state in the United States, and if the hon. member looks at Bill 104, section 1(b) he will see that:

> The rate base determined by the board under section 1(a) shall be the total of:
>
> (a) An amount for the property, plant and equipment equal to the actual cost thereof to the present owner, less an amount deemed adequate by the board for depreciation, amortization and depletion, but:
>
> 1. If the actual cost to the present owner of any property, plant or equipment cannot be ascertained, the amount to be included in the rate base as the actual cost thereof shall be determined or calculated by the board from the evidence adduced at the hearing, and
>
> 2. If the actual cost to the present owner of any property, plant or equipment used are useful in serving the public was, in the opinion of the board, excessive, the amount to be included in the rate base as an actual cost thereof shall be determined by the board from the evidence adduced at the hearing.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, it is very well for the hon. Minister to get up and say that this is designated by law, but I invite him as a layman, along with me, to take a look at that legal gobbledygook there and say that it is designated by law through the exercise of the judgment of the board after they have looked at many, many factors. This is the contention; one of the things that happened here is that these reserves, in effect, become "built-in" to the capital base which you have to take into account in calculating the rate base and therefore the consumer, in effect, has to pay on the basis of reserves that are built into the capital structure of the company.

I do not profess to be an expert in this field and I am only attempting to present to the Minister the views of those who live with it and presumably are very aware of all of the ramifications of it. I submit to him that his answer is not going to satisfy the good folk of Lambton county.

However, I have one final question, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down. Will the hon. Minister inform us: When the board has heard all of the companies that were listed in his introductory statement for public rate hearings, will this have completed all companies who are in the distribution of gas in the province of Ontario at the present time? Put it another way—are there any others for which public hearings have not yet been held?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This will include all the major companies. I understand that there are several smaller companies that have from 10 to 20 customers who have not had rate hearings.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 603 carry?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this vote, I have two questions about the Ontario energy board and its relation to the national energy board.

The hon. member for Nipissing touched upon it in his question as to whether there were any studies being made by the Minister's department about the needs for the province of Ontario in future years. I would like to know whether or not the Ontario energy board has any formal liaison arrangement with the national energy board for the purpose of keeping the national energy board

fully aware of the needs of the province of Ontario, particularly for natural gas, in forecasting for, say, 25 or 50 years? The national energy board is charged with that as a primary responsibility, but it would seem to me that a useful purpose could be served if the Ontario energy board interested itself in this field and maintained constant liaison on a formal basis with the national energy board as to the needs of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand they have informal meetings with the national energy board about once a month and they try to forecast the needs for five to ten years in advance.

Vote 603 agreed to.

On vote 604:

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, for each year since I have been in the Legislature and since the start of conservation authorities, I have been greatly interested in these projects, both from the viewpoint of the fact that the Moira River conservation authority includes a small portion of my riding and also I have been well-acquainted from the very beginning with the formation of the Napanee River conservation authority. A great job was done in that regard in constructing a dam and securing a much improved supply of water for the town of Napanee, as well as serving in many other ways for the benefit of all the people concerned.

More recently, the Cataraqui conservation authority was formed. This embodies a complete new concept, so far as I am aware, that, namely, rather than following a rivershed or a watershed this authority extends from Lennox-Addington county through Frontenac and Leeds on a basis of dealing with the streams and the waterfront leading to Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence river. I was fortunate to be invited on the night that the decision was made in regard to setting up that authority, and from that got the idea of a similar authority being formed in Prince Edward county.

I went home and told my people of the assistance that was available, and I am very pleased that Mr. A. S. L. Barnes came to Prince Edward county and discussed the whole project with the members of the county council and interested people. As a result, late last year Prince Edward conservation authority was formed. They have a very energetic board and they are doing a good job. I want to commend the department for this plan they have which can, in the future, mean so much in conservation.

I think in recent years the droughts we have had have made us all more aware of the needs for conservation, particularly in regard to water. With the prospects not good this year, the frost having done considerable harm already, I am sure that any work they can do to provide water for irrigation purposes will be greatly appreciated.

We know that this is their first year of formation, but they are already busy and active and I do want to commend the department and Mr. Barnes, Mr. Chubb, the former field officer, and Mr. King, the present field officer, for their efforts on behalf of conservation in our district.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Brant.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I was delighted to hear the remarks of the hon. member who just spoke, having been part of the committee that went down to his county to meet the people interested in setting up a new conservation authority. We certainly appreciate the interest shown by the people in Prince Edward. I would like to say something, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, having to do with item one in this very important vote, salaries.

It is obvious that we are asked to spend an additional $50,000 in payment of the staff in the conservation branch. One of the most serious criticisms that was brought to the committee on conservation that was set up by the Legislature last year was in fact that the staff of this branch was entirely inadequate to meet its responsibilities, particularly as these responsibilities have grown or should be growing. I want the hon. Minister to report to the House whether this sum is going to be sufficient to meet these expanding requirements.

Before sitting down, however, I think you, Mr. Chairman, would be well aware of the fact that the branch provides field officers, as has been mentioned by the hon. member who just spoke, who will assist in the supervision of conservation responsibilities but are in fact employees of the department, and particularly this branch.

We are all familiar with the importance placed on local autonomy and local initiative in any of these conservation responsibilities. The fact remains, however, that some authorities have been singularly lacking in initiative in the development of a programme that is up to date and in fulfilling the requirements of the expanded community in this day of

realization of the importance of conservation. It is questionable whether these field officers have been employed by the branch in sufficient number to staff the various authorities as they would wish and, in fact, require.

Beyond this, however, there is considerable responsibility at the branch level to provide specialized services for the various authorities. People who have specialized knowledge in the various fields of conservation, whether it be the control of wildlife, the planning and construction of dams, and so on down the list of the many areas that fall within this branch—although there are a few of these specialized officers available through the branch to the conservation authorities, their services are always in great demand.

My own experience is that there is a temptation for them to get established with one large active authority and spend most of their time dealing with the requirements of only a single area of the province. So the staffing requirements here are very important. I submit that they have been very inadequate in the past.

Our information is that the staff has not grown over the past few years and I would sincerely hope that we are coming into a year now where the budget will permit a considerable departure from this inadequacy I have described.

I would like the hon. Minister to report on what staff changes and staff increases are envisaged for the coming year, what salary changes might be in his mind, whether or not these are before the committee that is going to make general representation to the various departments on salary changes, and how he is going to expand the specialized services that this branch of his department must be increasingly offering to the conservation authorities.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we have added four new field officers, starting immediately; also one in recreational planning.

As we increase our authorities, or as we add new authorities, we will be increasing our staff. I do not think there will be any change in our policy as far as staff is concerned until such time the select committee on conservation report to us. We would like to see their recommendations before we make any drastic changes, in fact we are looking forward to getting that report to make some of the changes we do anticipate ourselves.

As far as salaries are concerned for the staff in this department, we, as you know, do not set the salaries. This is arranged through another department and of course I think we are paying competitive salaries in comparison to other government bodies. I know we also are adding three new engineers to the conservation staff this year.

Mr. Nixon: Still talking on the first item in the vote—I would like to say to the Minister that the chairman of our special committee, the select committee, has already reported to the Legislature, saying that the work has not been completed and that another year of work would be required and requesting a reappointment of the committee.

Nevertheless, it would be a shame if action on some of the outstanding difficulties that are known not only to the individual authorities but must surely be well known to the branch, were held up until such time as the full report were available. In the wisdom of the majority of the committee, the interim report that was handed down a few days ago contained no recommendations at all; nevertheless some of the requirements having to do with an expansion of the staff must be well known to the advisors of the hon. Minister and surely some effective action could well be taken before the report in its entirety is available.

Having to do with the level of salaries itself: it is true that another department of government has the main responsibility for setting the salaries. Surely, however, the hon. Minister as well as the rest of his colleagues in the government must from time to time turn to the hon. Provincial Treasurer and assure him of the difficulties in obtaining qualified staff for this particular duty, as well as some others.

It may well be that the qualifications are a changing thing and the rate of salary might not permit the increase in the level of qualified personnel that the hon. Minister himself would consider adequate. Nevertheless, the point is, and I want to make it as strongly as I can under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, that some of the conservation authorities—I would say all of them—feel that the staff is inadequate to meet their expanding demands. I want to go on record here as bringing this to the attention of the hon. Minister as I know it has been referred to him so many times before.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Is the hon. Minister going to make any comments on this, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think in the light of what I have said, and the fact there is a select committee which will report—of

course now if there is anything urgent which they feel they would like to bring before us, we will deal with it at any time, we will do this—I do not think it is fair to a select committee for us to go out on new tangents and a new programme when they are sitting. I hope they will bring in recommendations that will clear up a lot of items that perhaps we ourselves have an idea exist, but we would like to get your views on it. If there is anything urgent we would be only too happy to sit down and discuss it with members of the select committee.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to comment on this, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. Minister said it is not fair to take any departmental action while the committee is sitting. I do not believe it is fair either that all development of policy in his own department should wait until the entire committee report is available. Surely the same recommendations that have come in to us from so many of the authorities have been coming in to the department itself for a period of years. This is just one of the many matters on which I thought some further action might have been taken during this present discussion and on this budget.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I think it was on April 27, that quite a serious storm hit the north shore of the counties of Essex and Kent and extensive damage was done. The residents of the area did approach the federal authorities for financial assistance as a result of the damage done. Has the province considered giving them financial aid? I understand the approach should have been made to the provincial authorities and they in turn should have asked the federal authorities, because this was a combined programme of assistance to the area.

Has this department been approached, and are they prepared to render financial assistance to the residents?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might advise the hon. member that there was no conservation authority in the area that he mentioned and, of course, we are dealing with the conservation authorities only. I cannot speak for government policy; in fact, this is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. Newman: May I ask this under vote 608, which includes flood control programmes, because the damage was water damage, flood damage, and surely some department of government—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think possibly the flood control programmes within a conservation area.

Mr. Newman: Within a conservation area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Then may I ask, Mr. Chairman, if there is some department of government of which I may ask a question like that, or should I ask it before the orders of the day of the hon. Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The vote for situations such as you are bringing up here are under Public Works.

Mr. Newman: Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, for dams and that type of damage, outside of authorities.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister, good enough!

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, during the hon. Minister's opening statement he said in regard to conservation authorities: "Achieving our plan to have most of the municipalities in old Ontario take advantage of its provisions." Could the hon. Minister explain to me what he means by old Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I mean we who come from the east and the south and the west down here. I can recall, I used to live in North Bay, as a young fellow, I was from old Ontario when I went to Nipissing. I think we would almost take North Bay in now as old Ontario; and the new Ontario, the word seems to have disappeared. It is just a word; it used to be that anyone from down east or down this way was old Ontario, and northern Ontario was new Ontario. It is just a designation, that is all.

Mr. Smith: I gather from that the Minister means The Conservation Authorities Act was not meant to cover the northern part of the province?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh yes, they are covered, but again if you get into the northern part of the province you will admit with me that there are many acres of Crown land, which come under Lands and Forests for closer supervision, whereas, if I can use the term again, in old Ontario, most of the acres are deeded. This is why we wanted to get

conservation authorities more active here, because there is no Crown agency that is taking care of our streams.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I do not think The Department of Lands and Forests looks after control of the watersheds in a manner similar to that of a conservation authority. Under this Act, does the government contribute on a per capita basis to a conservation authority in unorganized territories?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The answer is no.

Mr. Smith: Well then, the Act could not apply to northern Ontario, where there are large areas which are unorganized?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, a conservation authority may be formed only upon application from a municipality.

Mr. Smith: Yes, but the municipalities in an area where there are large areas that are unorganized, the organized municipalities in that area, could not afford to carry the load for the government areas in other words, or those areas for which the government is responsible. I think this is the reason we do not have conservation authorities set up in northern Ontario as we should.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of course, you have some in northern Ontario. You have one in the Sudbury area, I think there is one there; and the Lakehead and the Soo, you have conservation authorities there. So it it not just confined to one area of Ontario, it is different areas.

Mr. Smith: No, but the areas you mentioned are those areas that are thickly populated.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Smith: In other words, the areas that are not thickly populated cannot afford to have conservation authorities and gain all the grants and what-not that do come under these authorities. Does the hon. Minister have any idea of covering these areas by another Act that would be similar to this but would provide for the contribution of the province to a similar authority?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No. I would say that a conservation authority, as they are known, will work with municipalities; but when you have Lands and Forests looking after their area, and I believe under ARDA programme applies, I think you are eligible there for work on streams or watersheds. Outside of a conservation area, I think other departments in government can deal with this where a request comes in. Now, I would say if there is a lot of Crown land involved, it would be the responsibility of Lands and Forests and they would be the people that would report on it.

Mr. Smith: I would suggest to the hon. Minister that this is not the case. The municipalities that are in the area would like a conservation authority, but they cannot afford it and they are not going to get any financial support from The Department of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: If a municipality is involved and they cannot afford it we have a grant structure—75 per cent—on dams, 25 per cent to municipalities and 50 per cent on administration. Of course we have not changed our policy and I doubt if we will as far as that is concerned. If there is a group of municipalities I think they can afford to get in if they really wanted to get in. Is there any specific problem you have in mind in your area?

Mr. Smith: Yes, I think there is in the district of Nipissing covering all the waters that drain into Lake Nipissing. It takes in about three different districts and great portions of those districts are unorganized territories and there would be no way to collect on the local level from these people.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that the staff of the conservation authority have made several trips up there in the last two or three years and were unable to work out anything on account of your organized and unorganized areas.

Mr. Smith: This is just the point I am trying to make. I think the government should take into consideration the unorganized territories and pay the per capita rate for them, just as the organized territories would have to pay.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think perhaps, if I may interrupt, that you have a good point there. I think this is a point that you should bring before this select committee that is going to recommend on things, I hope next year. Maybe your point is well taken and it should be brought to their attention.

Mr. Smith: Yes, but I would rather bring it to the attention of the hon. Minister, who is going to have to receive it from the select committee.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have not changed our policy, anyway until after this report.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if he has received any representations from any of the municipalities in Essex county for the setting up of a conservation authority in the Essex county area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand the answer is no.

Mr. Newman: None of them have approached you, Mr. Minister? None whatsoever?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand the answer is no. They have not approached me and I am just informed that they have not approached the conservation department at any time.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, at an earlier date in this House we were discussing the acquisition of land for conservation purposes and the hon. Minister himself just mentioned that the ARDA programme, administered by his colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, is taking an increasingly important role in this.

I am thinking particularly of the co-ordination for the acquisition of land, and where the conservation authority in a certain area may have what amounts to an overall plan for land acquisition, there have been cases where representatives of ARDA would step in and acquire the land, having access to other funds.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, at the headwaters of the Grand river and in the area of the Luther marsh, there have been lands bought by the ARDA authorities that really would form a part of the total conservation authority plan for this area.

I am very concerned with the co-ordination of these purchases. I am sure the Minister can assure me that they are co-ordinated through his department, and yet I would like an explanation of why these lands in this particular area were purchased by ARDA when in fact the conservation authority is on the scene and has an increasing responsibility at the headwaters of this important river.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Is this within a conservation authority?

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And it has been purchased by ARDA?

I am afraid this is something that I did not know anything about before and I understand it has not come to the knowledge of the department. Now I might say that there are certain areas that we are looking at now and we have said to the people in ARDA that we would go along with them on a project providing the federal ARDA people approve, but I do not know of any particular project that has been approved at this date.

Mr. Nixon: The Department of Lands and Forests also becomes involved to some extent in these purchases. My own feeling is that there are large sums of ARDA money available for approved projects and that we in Ontario have not taken advantage of the availability of this federal money.

I do not know whether this hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, is prepared to comment specifically on whether or not these funds will be increasingly used for the acquisition of land. My own feeling is that we have not taken sufficient advantage of federal funds for the purchase of lands for conservation purposes. It becomes plainer as we become more involved with the problem that the conservation branch—this is the vote we are discussing now—has to co-ordinate its aims very carefully with ARDA and The Department of Lands and Forests if, in fact, these acquisitions are going to be made most economically as far as the taxpayers in Ontario are concerned. Also the overall plan is going to be effective so that the lands acquired will fit in and dovetail with the plans of the other agencies.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first let me say that this ARDA project in the Luther marsh is under The Department of Lands and Forests and has nothing to do with conservation authorities, and it has been approved as an ARDA project.

Mr. Nixon: My question is: why has it not got something to do with the conservation authorities?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Because it is not within a conservation area. It was property that belonged to Lands and Forests and still does.

Mr. Nixon: Does the hon. Minister mean if land belongs to Lands and Forests it is automatically excluded from the watershed? The Grand River conservation authority includes all the land drained by the Grand river.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is not correct.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs would clarify this situation. He is advising the hon. Minister whose estimates are before us and shaking his head at me across the House. I wonder if he could explain why these lands were not under the general jurisdiction of the Grand River conservation authority?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I may not be exactly correct but as I remember it—and I am trying to remember things I did when I was Minister of Lands and Forests—as I remember it, the Grand River conservation authority did not extend to the headwaters of the Grand river, which are in the Luther marsh. The Department of Lands and Forests acquired some properties over a period of several years with a view of conserving the Luther marsh for game bird propagation and other purposes. Wilderness area, I think that is right; it has been designated as a wilderness area or some terminology like that.

Since the ARDA agreement was entered into between the federal authorities and the provinces, certain federal funds have been made available for the acquisition of land and sites of this type. The programme is to continue the acquisition of lands so that eventually The Department of Lands and Forests would have complete control of the Luther marsh and all the land surrounding it necessary for their particular project. Some of this area has since been acquired under the ARDA programme where the federal people subscribe something to the cost of acquiring the land.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, my information is that the conservation authority does have jurisdiction that extends to the headwaters now, whether it did in those days gone by or not. In fact, there is a dam that has been erected by the former conservation commission to control the large reservoir of water that constitutes the source of the river. The point then would be this, there should be some co-ordination between the plans of the conservation authority, which should really not be regarded as just a local thing. It extends almost from Georgian bay right down to Lake Erie. They spend a lot of money, they employ qualified people to make plans for land acquisition among other things, and for this land to be bought up by another arm of government entirely without co-operation and discussions seems very strange indeed.

The hon. Minister whose estimates are now before us should surely be the centre of this co-ordination. The Minister of Agriculture is in control of the ARDA funds but his prime responsibility is elsewhere. Conservation is a branch, it comes under the present department, the one that we are discussing. I wonder if the Minister could describe to us what arrangements are made for this co-ordination other than just informal discussions, say, around the Cabinet dining room table?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, before answering that question, I would like to make it clear again to the hon. member that I was trying to recollect from memory. He says in his opinion—and he was quite definite in this—that the Grand River conservation authority extends up to and including the headwaters. We may be talking about something that we will have to examine and I will be glad, with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, to examine that particular point. But I want to assure the member that insofar as projects of this kind are concerned, there is always very close co-operation and understanding between the provincial government and its Department of Lands and Forests, if it happens to be Lands and Forests, Energy and Resources Management, conservation authorities branch, and the ARDA organization, because there is a committee of Cabinet Ministers who examine every one of these projects and Treasury board eventually gets to have a look at the project itself also.

Mr. Nixon: Right. The hon. Minister says I am very definite that it is in my opinion, and I am quite prepared to leave it at that until we examine the facts.

Just one further point along this line: I wonder if the Minister can tell the House what government policy is with regard to the use of ARDA moneys by the conservation authorities over which he has jurisdiction. I was quite interested, in fact pleased, to see particularly in the eastern end of the province ARDA moneys are coming into play more and more for the acquisition of land and certain projects. But these are apparently not available in some of the other areas. According to the statistics available to us, comparing the use of these funds by the provinces right across Canada, Ontario per capita is away behind the other provinces.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Ontario is away ahead of everybody else. We spent millions of

dollars on projects before ARDA ever came in effect in Canada.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister's implication is that all the conservation lands have been acquired and all the conservation projects have been completed. There are plenty of things to be done and without congratulating the government on their accomplishments over the past few years, I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are some very pressing projects that could be carried out more speedily if these federal funds were applied to them, as they may well be if we were taking advantage of these ARDA funds that are available.

The question is, what is the policy of this hon. Minister and this department for the co-operation of the federal government through the ARDA funds in projects other than in the poorer sections of the rocky land in some of the areas in eastern Ontario? I know it applies to some of the better land there as well.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We do work very closely with ARDA regarding dams or the acquisition of land. There will be some areas in Ontario that I am afraid would not come under an ARDA project. I think the hon. member can understand that. He knows what ARDA was set up for and the purpose it was supposed to serve. I do not think it would apply to Metropolitan Toronto but I could see maybe in the nation that it might apply there, it might apply to some projects in the hon. member's area. And where we are working on a project that perhaps we cannot—or it is not clearcut, we would go along and work with the ARDA people, and we do co-operate through the Minister of Agriculture. Then these projects will be forwarded to the federal ARDA people for either approval or disapproval.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the hon. Minister can tell the House specifically where the line is drawn between areas that he would say would automatically come under ARDA assistance and others that would not. My thought was that under the redefined guidelines that were intended to administer the ARDA funds at the federal level, they were backing away from using them only in the areas of the country that would be said to be rocky or poor farmland or where there were large populations that were disadvantaged.

I had understood that these new guidelines were in fact opening it up to much greater and broader use, but that Ontario had not really accepted the guidelines in this regard, even in Metropolitan Toronto, which is where the hon. Minister has made reference to. It might be difficult to apply ARDA funds in the midst of a large metropolitan area, and yet my understanding of the federal intention is that these funds would be used for projects that would gain provincial approval of almost any nature.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I understand that ARDA was set up for redevelopment projects. Again, I cannot answer just to what projects this would apply. I think this is a question that should be posed under the Minister of Agriculture, because he is Minister of the ARDA programme. I would say this though: any projects we have in conservation authorities, we are going to find out if ARDA's moneys will apply regardless of where it is or what it is. And we will let them make the decision and, of course, if they agree with us it then must go to Ottawa for confirmation.

Vote 604 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might, while I have the conservation people here, just pass over that vote and go to vote 607, which is the capital vote under conservation authorities? With your permission, sir, I would like to do that.

On vote 607:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the money under 607 is to provide for grants for the construction of farm ponds. Is it correct that the decision on the building of these ponds is made entirely on the advice of the hon. Minister of Agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, they do the investigating and recommendation and approval and we do the paying on all farm ponds.

Mr. Nixon: This policy came into being during the drought under which so many of the farmers and farm lands suffered during the past few years. We hope that the drought has ended.

I think that the Minister would agree there is more and more of the farm land of the province used by people who could not be designated as bona-fide farmers. They in fact earn most of their living off the farm and in some other employment. But in this vote we are interested in conservation, and they are not permitted to take part in the government programme to foster the building of ponds as water-holding reservoirs; and because of this the programme does not apply to large areas of formerly rural lands.

I would ask the Minister if there is any plan to amend this so that the emphasis is still left on the provision of farm ponds for irrigation and watering livestock, as well as for holding water for conservation purposes, that it might be extended to apply to these people who are living on former farm lands. They are taxpayers and are interested in taking part in some of the conservation work that is going on in the township around them.

There is always the possibility, of course, that they are going to use government funds just to build themselves a pleasant pond near their home; but the fact remains that we are interested in conservation and part of conservation, and an important part of it, is the holding of water from the spring runoff to maintain watertables which have been so disastrously lowered during the past few years of drought and extensive irrigation and the heavy draw on the watertable by municipalities and industries. I would wonder if the hon. Minister is considering asking for a broadening of the use of these funds, or if in fact he would be considering on the other hand turning this whole vote over to The Department of Agriculture where, under those circumstances, it should obviously be.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, Mr. Chairman, we are not considering broadening this application. I think, sir, the hon. member would agree with me that the one thing we are concerned with is a farm pond for the watering of livestock or the many uses the farmer makes of a farm pond. If we broadened our scope and opened it up we would be building swimming pools, and so on. We have already had applications from golf courses wanting to know if they were eligible for a farm pond. You have to draw the line some place, and I think it is doing a good job as it is now.

There is a policy, a small reservoir policy, under which a municipality or a group of municipalities are entitled to grants. It does not have to be within a conservation authority. Where there is a problem on a stream outside a conservation authority, again, a municipality or a group of municipalities can ask for subsidy and can receive up to 75 per cent subsidy on a dam on any watercourse; and this seems to be working out very well.

Mr. Nixon: Can the hon. Minister tell us how the number of ponds being built has changed since The Department of Agriculture has taken this over?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That figure was in my statement yesterday. Under our new policy there has been 504 built in the last fiscal year, and about the same number in the first 18 months of the new policy. Prior to that, under the conservation authorities we were building approximately 130 a year.

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry to stick on this so long, Mr. Chairman, but does the new policy prohibit the conservation people in the field from giving advice to non-farmers on the installation of ponds?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, not giving advice, although there are no grants available.

Vote 607 agreed to.

On vote 608:

Mr. Thompson: What vote does expropriation come under? Previously in the estimates, when we were discussing this matter the House leader had told us expropriation could be brought up under your vote. We asked you one night where we would discuss expropriation and you had said—pardon?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It would come under the Attorney General's department unless it was a specific case under conservation authorities.

Mr. Thompson: I was just thinking of the whole broad approach to it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would think, Mr. Chairman, that should be debated under the Attorney General's estimates as he deals with that Act.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 608.

Mr. Nixon: A few weeks ago now I brought to the attention of the House the difficulty in controlling the heavy runoff of the Lower Thames river. Although this is a problem in the Chatham area and beyond it. The hon. member for Kent West, who lives in Chatham, rose in defence of the Minister in this matter, but it was suggested that we might get further information at this time. It is true that the problem continues beyond Chatham for some considerable distance right through to Lake St. Clair. There have been flood problems there in the past, and undoubtedly there will be in the future, but the information that is available to a person who does not live right in the area would indicate that the proper banks that would control the runoff for the years that lie ahead would be a tremendous undertaking and one that would really lie beyond the responsibility of the conservation authority. Before the authority came into being, the

municipalities from Chatham right through to the mouth of the river shared this responsibility and were able to control the difficulty.

I was interested to read of the participation of the federal government in assisting the Winnipeg area with the control of the flood problem on the Red river there. I would assume the federal people are interested in the flood dangers in the Thames as well. I wonder if the Minister could report on what has been done to plan for the continuing flood difficulties in the Lower Thames, what his dealings with the federal authorities have been and what his estimate of the protection would be?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand we have recommended that a study be made in this area to which the hon. member has reference. This matter was discussed at our last meeting with the federal Minister, Hon. Jean Pepin. We are hoping that we might continue with the study, and then we will discuss it with the federal people at their level after that study is completed.

Mr. Nixon: There is just one other area that is involved in this and it also has been brought to the attention of the Minister in this particular branch through a study.

I referred to the dam on the Grand river at Caledonia which has been privately owned for some time and has since fallen into some disrepair, and in fact disuse, because the head of water held back by the dam is no longer needed to drive milling machinery.

The lake that was created by this dam has been used extensively for recreation purposes but there is every indication that the dam is in an advanced state of disrepair and may be lost unless moneys are found to assist in repairing it and maintaining it. Is the hon. Minister aware of this problem and what action does he feel might be taken?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I met with I think two different groups last year regarding this dam and there was some fear in their mind that the dam could go out at any time. As it comes within a conservation area, we were waiting for some movement from the authority and I understand that there is a recommendation for a study to be made of this dam in the hope that we can get a report on it early in the year so that some action can be taken.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister just has a recommendation for study?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They have agreed, I understand.

Mr. Nixon: Is the study now underway?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is not underway yet but it will be shortly; we do not know when exactly.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, on two occasions in this House I have brought before the hon. Minister the problem of Metropolitan Toronto connected with the conservation authority. In this area, which is one of the fastest growing areas in North America, we have a projection of about 4 million people in the area served by the authority; and one of the great problems that is facing that body is the flood plain lands which should be acquired now. These flood plain lands should not be built on, and yet when they are designated by a municipality as flood plain to be acquired by the authority at some future date, the OMB looks with great disfavour on that kind of operation and their point of view is—and a logical one, I think—if land is to be designated in this way, that within a reasonable time at least, that land should be acquired by the public authority. Otherwise, the owners of the land should be able to use it as they wish for private purposes, or perhaps the installation of a private golf course, or the building of residences above the flood plain line, including in the lot the lower part of the valley and various purposes of their own.

The problem is that the authority has not the funds on a 50-50 basis to purchase this land in adequate amounts. Building is taking place so fast up the valley that it is a sheer impossibility for the money available to stretch far enough, and so the building is going past the capacity of the Metropolitan Toronto conservation authority to acquire the land in the valley. So the only answer—and I have pointed this out and the hon. Minister is aware of it—the only answer is that more money somehow be made available to the Metropolitan Toronto conservation authority for this purpose. They have requested 75 per cent instead of 50 per cent from the province and they have also requested that a good portion of the 25 per cent be made available through long-term low-interest loans from the province to do this job.

I do not need to stress this any further; the importance is there and there is no question that if this land is not bought quickly it

may well be lost for many years to come. Expropriation may then have to take place at very high prices in the future and it would seem that this kind of investment is just a sensible thing, that the authority somehow should be able to finance the purchase of land and it should be able to buy this land as development proceeds.

In order to do this, financing must be arranged and the only source of such financing is the province.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would indicate whether any progress has been made. I understand he has had some talks with the federal government, according to his own report. I wonder if this problem was discussed and if the federal government might be willing to participate in this kind of purchase, so that these lands may not be lost, or if the provincial government, failing that kind of assistance, is willing to face up to its responsibilities here.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first I must agree with the hon. member that this is a problem that is of some concern to my department and I must agree with him that when we decide we need certain flood plain lands, whether it be a Metro authority or another authority, some arrangements should be made to buy the property and someone own it.

We have discussed this problem with the federal authorities and up until the present time they will not participate in any programme that we have offered to buy this land, although there is some hope that we are going to discuss it further.

I might say that there were several properties brought to my attention last year. After discussion with the Metro people, I think we solved two or three of them or, at least, we reached the point where the land was acquired and settled for—I think one of the properties was on a long-term pay-back, four or five years, or something like that—and then I am advised that 2,875 acres have been purchased out of a total of 7,200 acres, so that there is something over 4,000 acres yet to be picked up.

If we can work out any arrangement at all, I would like to get it straightened out that the land would be purchased at the time a plan was laid down and it was proclaimed a flood plain area.

Mr. Young: May I ask the hon. Minister if he has made any recommendations for the Treasury board in this regard, so that the thing can be actually looked at carefully?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have not at this time because, again, I thought perhaps at one time that we might have had some recommendations from the select committee. They did not do it but I thought we would take a look at those before we decided on any plan. I hope we can get along until we do get this report and can take a good look at the recommendations handed down by them.

Mr. Young: There will be a lot of land lost in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, because a lot of this is there waiting for this kind of action and the sooner the government acts, the better. The price is going up all the time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, as one of the members of that committee, I do not think the hon. Minister needs to use this as an excuse for not acting. As a matter of fact, some of us on the committee felt there were a few issues on which the consensus had emerged so clearly that we should have made some recommendations to the government so that we would not have this kind of excuse. But it was felt it would be a bit impolite to those people who were coming back to discuss their briefs if a recommendation were made before we had given them an opportunity to come and discuss their briefs. But I would think on this issue, which is an extremely urgent issue, that the government does not need to delay.

Indeed, there was one other—the whole proposition of excluding administrative costs in calculating grants, in which we were told they were reaching a more amicable arrangement with the Treasury board this year and therefore the urgency was lessened. I trust that is the case. Otherwise, we would have been led up a little garden path on that issue, too.

As one member of the committee, I do not think that the hon. Minister need delay. Indeed, one of the standard practices of this government in the past has been to anticipate some of the recommendations of committees when they became very obvious, so that as soon as the report of the committee came down, you wave your hands with a Frostian gesture and say, "We have acted already." So go ahead in these instances—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I want to be fair to this committee because I think they are doing a really good job and we are looking forward to getting the report.

Mr. MacDonald: We want the hon. Minister to do a good job too on some of these urgent points, so do not stand still—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I assure the House that although there has not been any change in policy, if there are any urgent matters that come up—and we had to deal with some last year—we will only be too happy to meet with the Metro people and deal with them on an individual basis.

Vote 608 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: May I inquire of the Minister whether vote 611 involves the same officials?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, Mr. Chairman. With the concurrence of the Houes, we will deal with vote 611.

Vote 611 agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 102

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 9, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 9, 1966

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, concluded 3211

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3244

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: Before proceeding with vote 605, I have a note from the member for York Mills, who tells me that in the east and west galleries and in the Speaker's gallery we have friends and members of the York Mills Progressive-Conservative association. I know you would like me to say a word of welcome to them.

On vote 605:

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Chairman, on this vote I would like to report to the Legislature on some of the highlights of the programme and activities of the Ontario water resources commission.

Ten years ago the Ontario Legislature passed The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act. The commission was charged with the responsibility of the supervision of all surface waters and ground waters in Ontario used as a source of water supply. Very wide powers were given to the commission to carry out this great responsibility and from time to time amendments have been made to the Act to keep abreast with changing conditions in the province.

Through the ten-year history of the commission many dedicated people have rendered great service to Ontario as members of the commission and its staff. Among those who served on the commission were the present Prime Minister, the present Attorney General; the present Minister of Highways. Ontario owes much to the dedicated service that was rendered by the first chairman, Mr. A. M. Snider, and the first general manager, Dr. Albert Berry.

The present members of commission and staff are endeavouring to build on the solid foundations that were laid by these and other men who have gone before.

Mr. Chairman, when the commission was established, it was forecast that it would require something like $2,400 million worth of expenditure to develop projects that would pick up the backlog of necessary works and keep pace with the rapid expansion of population, industry and business in the province. During the first year of its history, the commission was securing staff and facilities to carry out its programme, indeed it was planning the programme to provide adequate sources of water of suitable quality and to bring pollution under control wherever pollution might exist.

Today, ten years later, I can report that at December 31, 1965, some 15,095 certificates of approval had been issued for works with an estimated value of over $1 billion, in the nine-year period from 1957. In other words, the programme of the commission is running right on schedule. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, as we think of the expanded programmes that we are carrying today, we are actually running ahead of the forecast that was made when the commission was established in 1956.

In addition to the billion-dollar programme that has been carried out by the municipalities and the commission, industry has been carrying on an extensive programme to bring their wastes under control. In the same period, some of the major industries have spent over $110 million on industrial waste treatment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to pay a tribute to the public relations branch of the water resources commission. When the commission was established it was recognized that if the programmes for pollution control and the provision of adequate supplies of water were to be successful, it would need the wholehearted support of the people of Ontario. Ontario owes much to the men who carried out the public relations programme of the commission. Ten years ago, very few people were talking about the dangers of polluted water or the problems that would be created if there were inadequate supplies of water. All that has changed, and today on every hand you will find people talking about water pollution and the importance of water. The press is writing many fine articles on this subject. Radio and television commentators are discussing these matters. You will find many

organizations passing resolutions and making suggestions regarding water and pollution control.

During the present session of the Legislature we have debated several resolutions on this matter, all of which indicate that the public relations programme of the commission has been highly successful in bringing to the attention of our people the importance of adequate supplies of suitable water and the menace that could exist if we allowed our waters to become badly polluted.

Mr. Chairman, I would not want to suggest that the Ontario water resources commission is the only group that has brought these matters to the attention of the people. We think of men like Dr. Langford of the Great Lakes institute, who has brought to the attention of the public the effect of an overload of pollution or sewage effluent on some of our lakes. Other prominent men do not entirely agree with everything Dr. Langford has said, but I think that he has made us aware of the fact that there is a limit to how much sewage effluent or pollution any body of water can assimilate and remain suitable for re-use without expensive treatment.

On the other hand, we have other men like Mr. Thomas Kierans, who suggests that we should divert more water into the Great Lakes. More water could stimulate the development of industry that would not normally be attracted to the Great Lakes basin. The same is true of people. And in diverting water we could increase the load of domestic and industrial sewage effluent which, according to Dr. Langford will stimulate the growth of more algae and speed up the changes that are taking place in the lakes. We have all read the suggestion that the changes that are taking place will eventually lead to dead lakes.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of all the sensational headlines that we have read, I think we can be assured that Lake Erie is far from being a dead lake, as yet. I noticed in the *Globe and Mail* of Tuesday, March 15, that The Ontario Department of Lands and Forests estimates that two-thirds of the production of commercial fish—or 35,042,000 pounds—came from Lake Erie, an increase of 38 per cent in the catch, and 40.4 per cent in value.

I am not suggesting that we should lightly brush aside the warning that Dr. Langford has sounded, nor am I suggesting that we should ignore the suggestion that Mr. Kierans has made, that we should divert water into the Great Lakes system, but I think we should study the implications of what both these men have said.

I noticed in the Toronto *Daily Star* of Tuesday, March 29, 1966, in a report from Chicago, that Mr. Kierans was discussing his $2 billion scheme to re-cycle rivers flowing into James bay into the Great Lakes, after they have completed their natural course in Canada. In other words, after the water has dropped down to sea level to pump it back over the divide into the Great Lakes basin. He went on to say that he believes the waters thus added in Canada to the North American supply could be sold to the United States for about 1.5 cents per thousand gallons.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that statements of this kind should be very carefully analyzed, keeping in mind the future needs of our own province, of our own nation and the best contribution that we can make to the development, not only of Canada, but of the continental resources.

A year ago I said in this Legislature when discussing the estimates of our commission, and I quote:

> When I read and hear people quote the fantastic figures which are mentioned to finance diversion schemes, I sometimes ask myself would it be a sounder policy to spend some of this money building traffic arteries into the northern part of our province, making it more attractive for industry to go into the north, and there process raw materials and discharge the treated effluent from the industries and the municipalities that will develop around the industry into the northern rivers, where the effluent would find its way into the Arctic ocean. Should we not keep these ideas in mind and perhaps take industry to the water and scatter our waste effluent, rather than bring the water into the Great Lakes system, increase the load of effluent in the lakes and the associated algae growths, all of which must find its way out of our province, through the St. Lawrence river system and through our sister province of Quebec?
>
> When we think of future developments in the northern part of our province, let us keep in mind that all of the developments in Canada from Vancouver to the Ontario border lie north of a line that runs a few miles south of Cochrane.

That is the end of the quote from last year's speech. The great bulk of the mineral wealth

in Ontario lies in northern Ontario. The timber growth that feeds our pulp and paper industries lies in northern Ontario and I think that we would be very unwise if we were to make snap decisions before we have completed the survey or inventory of Ontario's northern water resources, to be made jointly by Ontario and the federal government. This survey was announced by the hon. Prime Minister last August, and is one of the new programmes that was launched by the Ontario water resources commission last fall and which will be greatly expanded in the coming year. Many of the members of the Legislature had the privilege of flying over some of the areas that will be under investigation, on the fine tour arranged by The Department of Lands and Forests.

Last fall, two reconnaissance trips were made through the northern areas that will be surveyed to acquaint those who will be involved in these studies with the physical features and facilities of the area. Staff of the division of water resources participated in the installation of two stream flow gauging stations, one on the Attawapiskat river and one on the Winisk river.

I think all members realize that it will take a number of years to take an accurate survey of the water resources in northern Ontario, since precipitation varies from year to year and it will be necessary to know what the dependable flow is, and at the same time endeavour to assess what may be needed for future developments in that part of the province. I think I mentioned in a previous speech in this House that the most northerly tip of Ontario lies some 700 miles south of the Arctic Circle, and our Russian neighbours have approximately 800,000 people living north of the Arctic Circle, or at least this is my understanding. Fort Severn, at the mouth of the Severn river, is just about in line with Dawson Creek in British Columbia, the starting point for the 1,500 mile highway known as the Alaska highway that runs north into that part of the United States.

The survey which has been announced and which will be carried out is being co-ordinated with related hydrologic studies of the federal government. The development of hydrometric networks to measure streamflow and precipitation is of major importance to the assessment of the resource and significant expansion of gauging stations for these purposes is planned as a co-operative activity by federal and provincial agencies.

Field studies will start in the Attawapiskat basin with river survey and hydrologic data crews collecting not only hydrometric data but information on geology, relief, soil, vegetation and water quality, which will assist in the understanding and assessment of the hydrology of the area.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should point out that the northern waters are important to our province in many ways. For example, there are already some 671 tourist establishments on the Hudson and James bay watersheds. It is estimated that during the past summer season these establishments catered to some 957,978 persons. Many millions of dollars were spent by the people using these establishments.

I am advised that Ontario Hydro has seven generating stations in operation on the Abitibi and Mattagami rivers, and will have an eighth coming into service in 1966. In addition to the hydro plants that are producing great quantities of power, other power plants are operated by various industries, such as the Abitibi Power and Paper Company and the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company. I am advised that Hydro is carrying out, in connection with its hydrologic development programme, studies of a considerable number of power sites on various rivers flowing into Hudson and James bays. Some of us have had the privilege of visiting some of the great pulp and paper mills that are operating in the Hudson and James bay watersheds, and it is my understanding that there is sufficient growth in the area to operate several more large plants.

Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose anyone is in a position to forecast how much water will be needed to support the mining industry in the days that lie ahead in the northern part of our province. Year after year, the hon. Minister of Mines comes into this House and tells of new mines opening up and of new developments, and new ore bodies being discovered, all of which indicates it is very important for the future development of the north that we give a lot of thought to the future needs of that part of our province, and have a lot of careful studies before we go into any wholesale diversions of water from that part of the province.

I am advised by your industrial wastes branch that at the present time the pulp and paper industry and the mining industry that operate in the Arctic watershed alone, is using some 236.6 million gallons of water per day. This does not take into consideration the amount of water used by the people who work in the industries and the people who patronize the tourist operations in that part of the province. Perhaps this would be an appropriate time to advise the House that the

Ontario water resources commission is developing a water and pollution control system for Moosonee to provide proper services for the people who live in that part of the province and the thousands of tourists who are going up to the terminal of the Ontario Northland Railway, to tidewater on James bay.

Mr. Chairman, the surveys that we are launching in the northern part of the province, a co-ordinated programme with the federal government, will give us much needed information on which to base sound decisions regarding future policies not only in Ontario, but in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, another programme that has been broadened and accelerated is in regard to the Great Lakes surveys and aerial surveillance. I think I should report that sampling was begun on the western basin of Lake Erie, with the use of a small boat, last August 3, and progressed until December 22 when the sampling programme was terminated for the year. In the course of the development of the programme, two 50-foot vessels were chartered, one to continue with the work on Lake Erie and the other to resume studies of the St. Clair and Detroit rivers which had commenced in May, 1965. A temporary laboratory was established at the Union Water filtration plant for analysis of the samples collected.

The programme was initiated as part of the commission's pollution control and water quality investigations and received a great deal of impetus as a result of the pollution reference from the international joint commission. Plans to extend the investigation into Lake Erie and Lake Ontario are being developed by a special staff of engineers and scientists to enable an early start on the work when the shipping season opens in 1966.

An important aspect of the Great Lakes investigation involved the development of an aerial surveillance programme. The first aerial patrol on the St. Clair and Detroit rivers was made in November 1965, using a light airplane. Plans to continue these patrols in other areas along the Great Lakes were made. Where possible, the patrols included the use of surface water surveillance craft and when instances of pollution were sighted, samples of the offending wastes were obtained for further action. It is expected that this work, in conjunction with the water-based surveys, will add an important element of strength to the pollution control programme of the OWRC.

Mr. Chairman, the work on the Great Lakes is being carried out in co-operation with various federal government agencies. We endeavour to establish co-ordinated programmes to eliminate overlapping, always keeping in mind that the OWRC's first responsibility is to the people of Ontario. The quality of the water in the Great Lakes is of increasing importance, as we build pipeline intakes out into the Great Lakes to secure adequate supplies of water for areas in the province that have not enough water and must depend on water through pipeline systems.

Mr. Chairman, I think hon. members are aware of the many studies and developments that are underway with regard to the possibility of building pipelines into areas where there are not sufficient quantities of water. In the summer of 1964, the hon. Prime Minister announced a policy whereby the OWRC, on behalf of the province, would build and own pipeline systems and sell water to municipalities at cost. In 1965, this same principle was applied to the building of pollution control works. To date, some 11 surveys with regard to this type of area development have been carried out, namely, the Lake Huron water supply system, the Lake Erie water supply system, study of the southern part of Peel county, another study of the lower Grand valley up to Brantford, the county of Lambton, the county of Kent, the county of Lincoln. In the county of Lincoln there was a report on the sewage works requirements for the western portion of the county. There was another report on the water supply requirements of the Napanee and Deseronto area; the township of Bucke and north Cobalt area. A preliminary meeting was held at Sudbury. A survey was conducted in Essex county, including those areas not served by the union system.

Hon. members are no doubt aware that the Lake Huron water supply system is under construction, which will deliver water to Arva and from there to London. A number of municipalities adjacent to the pipeline are showing interest in securing water from this system. At the present time, tenders are being called, and right of way is being acquired for the construction of another pipeline system that will serve parts of Elgin county and the St. Thomas area, and discussions are being carried on with interested municipalities in other areas where surveys have been carried out.

Mr. Chairman, with the announcement that was made by the hon. Prime Minister last August, the municipalities now have three

options. Basic to all developments, they must secure the approval of the Ontario water resources commission for the projects they have in mind. When they have secured this approval, they can:

1. Finance, build and operate their own works, provided the effluent coming from the works meets OWRC objectives.

2. They can enter into an agreement with the OWRC and the commission will finance, build and operate the works until the debt is paid, when the system is turned over to the municipality unless the municipality enters into an agreement for the OWRC to continue operating the system.

3. They can enter into an agreement with the OWRC, whereby the commission will finance, build, own and operate the works, and sell the service to the municipality at cost.

Municipalities have a free choice as to which of the three programmes they wish to follow.

During 1965, the commission issued some 1,753 certificates of approval for proposed waterworks, sewage works and industrial waste facilities, sir, at a total estimated value of $140,445,691.

Since 1956, some 204 municipalities have entered into agreements with the OWRC for some 191 sewage projects, and 149 water projects.

During 1965, 33 new municipal projects were accepted by the commission—11 water projects, and 22 sewage projects.

With regard to the provincially owned projects, subsequent to the announcement of extended activities of the commission in the provision of water and sewage works facilities, the division received 36 applications from municipalities for sewage works, five applications for waterworks, and six applications for both water and sewage works. In addition, requests have been received from some 27 municipalities for further information on the proposed programme.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to say something about industrial wastes. Hon. members are aware that the commission has been stepping up its programme to bring industrial wastes under control. I have already mentioned that between 1956 and 1965, over $110 million was spent by industry on waste control facilities. During 1965, the division of industrial wastes wrote to some 470 industries, 456 municipalities and 386 industrial commissioners or industrial procurement officers.

I think I should say at this time that many of the smaller industries treat their wastes through municipal systems. To give you some idea of the way this industrial wastes programme is developing, I have been advised since I prepared these notes that since the beginning of January, 1966, to April 30 we have this indication of the results of the stepped-up programme. Some $4,325,000 of industrial waste projects have been approved, and there are many more millions of dollars worth of industrial waste projects that are before the commission and before the various industries under review at the present time.

I could give you an idea of a few of the companies that are spending great sums of money—for instance, Dofasco of Hamilton has had approval for one project of $280,000, another for $1,350,000, and other plans under review add up to some $2,620,000 or a total of $4,250,000 by this one industry in Hamilton; Imperial Oil at Sarnia has had approval for a $1,100,000 pollution control project; CIL in Lambton county for $825,000; and Provincial Paper at Thorold for $259,000. I could go on to mention many others. In total we see a very great acceleration in the programme for bringing industrial wastes under control.

The division of sanitary engineering, which has been responsible for organic wastes, such as milk plants, meat plants, and canneries, wrote to some 160 industries, 313 municipalities and 18 boards or associations, pointing out the requirements of the Ontario water resources commission.

During 1965, a total of 1,124 industries were under surveillance. Representatives of many industries were brought in to be interviewed by the commission regarding their industrial wastes. The division of industrial wastes held a total of 112 such meetings, in addition to the large number held in the field.

The division of sanitary engineering received excellent co-operation from the organic waste industries as a result of the communications sent out to them. A total of 37 meetings was held at head office with such industries.

I am placing these statistics in the record so hon. members will have some idea of the magnitude of the programme that is underway to bring industrial wastes under control. I must say that we on the commission are pleased with the co-operation we are receiving from industries and from municipalities in a very costly programme of

bringing pollution under control, so that we will arrive at the point where everyone will look at Ontario as the province with an abundance of clean water.

I want to say something about our water resources division. I have already mentioned something about the work that it will be carrying out on our survey of the water resources and of the main rivers flowing into the Hudson bay and James bay basin. This branch of the commission is responsible for many phases of the ground and surface water studies in the province.

They are carrying out surveys under the international hydrologic decade programme. They are building up a lot of information about ground water in various parts of the province. Hon. members are no doubt aware that they license people who drill or bore wells. Last year, some 395 operators were licensed. Some 8,381 well records were kept by these operators, and were received by the water resources commission, providing much valuable information about where suitable ground water can be located, at what depths, and with what quality. To date, this branch of the commission has on file records on more than 100,000 wells.

Hon. members are aware that in certain parts of the province, particularly in the cash crop areas, keen competition has developed for the available water. This led to the amendment to The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, requiring people who are using more than 10,000 gallons of water a day to secure a permit from the commission. At the present time, there are some 3,752 permits out. Of these, more than 90 per cent or approximately 3,400 were issued for people who are using water for irrigation purposes.

The water resources branch of the commission is the branch that carries out investigations when there are ground water interference complaints.

At the end of 1965, there were some 97 observation wells from which water levels were received and plotted on a regular basis. These observation wells provide valuable information regarding the rise or fall of ground water levels.

The branch operates stream flow gauging stations to assess the quantity of water that is moving in various streams in the province. These are but a few of the programmes carried out by this branch of the commission.

For the benefit of members who were not able to visit the laboratory up on Highway 401 when the commission appeared before the standing committee on government commissions, I would like to advise the House that the work of this very important arm of the commission has greatly expanded. For example, in 1956 some 5,915 samples were analyzed, compared with 67,405 in 1965.

The work of the laboratory falls into three main categories — bacteriology, biology and chemistry. I might add that a field laboratory in the Union water plant near Kingsville, Ontario, was set up to carry out water quality evaluation studies of western Lake Erie and the Detroit river. This field laboratory was operational from July to early November of last year.

The expanded programme to bring industrial wastes under control have added an increasing load on the laboratory facilities.

The research division carries out many studies that are of great assistance to the commission as our programme advances and expands. We are constantly seeking better and more efficient, and if possible, more economical methods of treating sanitary and industrial wastes. Research is being carried out to improve the quality of waters. One of the problems that affects water in certain parts of the province is the problem of algae growths.

I could go on giving a much more extended report about the activities of our commission. However, I realize that the House is anxious to get on and vote the moneys that will be necessary for us to carry out this important work that means so much to the health and welfare of our people, and to the future development of our province.

Let me sum up by saying that our programme extends from the international boundaries of the Great Lakes to the shores of Hudson bay, and from the Manitoba border to the Ottawa and St. Lawrence valleys. In this great expansive territory, the staff of the water resources commission is carrying out a programme of construction, finance, industrial waste control, laboratory facilities, plant operations for municipalities that enter into agreements with the commission, project development, research, sanitary engineering and water resource facilities, and supervision.

We who serve on the commission under the leadership of Dr. James Vance are proud of the staff that carries out this broadly based programme, and I count it a privilege to come before this Legislature and report on the highlights of our activities, and to ask you to vote the modest budget that we are asking to continue this programme.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, in the absence of my friend, the hon. member for Bruce, we wanted to find out how much members of the board are actually paid. I wonder if the hon. Minister would have that here.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): What has that to do with water resources?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, I might tell the hon. member that this had come up before in public accounts and I think one question in particular has been asked in this House and has been tabled. I think that question has already been answered.

Mr. Chairman: The answer was tabled previously.

Mr. Root: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer is in the several Acts if hon. members would take time to read them. However, since the question has been asked, the members of the commission are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council in accordance with section 3 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Mr. Reaume: We do not want to know how they are appointed; we want to know how much they are paid.

Mr. Root: We are paid $55 for 7.25 hours. Actually, we are paid by the hour. If we work for two hours, we are paid for two hours. If we work for three, we are paid for three. If we work for 7.25 we receive a full day's pay. If we work overtime we are not paid anything.

Mr. Reaume: Pretty clear, is it not? How much is that an hour?

An hon. member: You figure it out.

Mr. Root: Fifty-five dollars for a 7.25 hour day.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the hon. Minister or the vice-chairman what the present intentions of the commission are with respect to the direction given to the city of Sudbury to build a sewage treatment plant?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I wonder if the member would mind if we deal with these as they come down on 605, when we deal with the different votes as they are listed in the expenditures and disbursements?

Mr. Sopha: Surely this could come under administration?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, it would—does the hon. member want to skip the first seven votes?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, as a matter of administration, could the hon. Minister or the vice-chairman explain the OWRC's position regarding municipalities utilizing combined storm and sanitary sewers? Is there a definite policy of the commission in this regard?

Mr. Chairman: Before the Minister answers, perhaps we could expedite the work of the House, by following the items in sequence. On 605(1) is there some information required? On section 2?

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): On section 1, I would like to know how the representation is chosen to the OWRC. Is it chosen from areas of the province, or what matters are taken into consideration?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, we do try to get representation from different areas. We have certain representatives from western Ontario, some from eastern Ontario and in northern or northwestern Ontario. We try to divide it as equally as we can.

Mr. Sopha: After Mr. Desmarais resigned from the commission, would the hon. Minister tell us who was appointed from northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there has not been an appointment made yet but we expect there will be one in the immediate future.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder if I might be consulted before the appointment is made?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I contacted some of the hon. members over there last year on an appointment and I have not heard from them yet, so perhaps we will have to go ahead in order to get an appointment and do it ourselves.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the hon. Minister whether the Ontario water resources commission intends to set up laboratories in the city of Windsor, seeing that studies are being carried on in the Detroit river, more so in that area than probably in any other area in the province?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would say no, that we would not consider setting up a lab in

Windsor, if I am going to be the responsible Minister. I think we had better get inland where we can serve an area, because I do not think we are going to do much work for the city of Detroit; maybe at Chatham, London, or someplace we could get our field workers working out of a central office, which would make sense to me.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member mind waiting until we come to that—

Mr. Newman: That is actually under administration and salaries, Mr. Chairman. Right under salaries, because the salary of the office would come under—

Mr. Chairman: I thought it might be helpful to the members to follow through on each subheading after we have gone through the numbered votes.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Chairman, under administration, I have been somewhat concerned—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me, on item 1, salaries, in advance of that.

Mr. Apps: Under what vote would I talk about the general aspect of administration, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Under administration. We are going to go through the first six or seven items first and then come to administration. That is actually under item 7.

Mr. Apps: Number seven, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Salaries, No. 1, No. 2, travelling expenses; No. 3; No. 4; No. 5; No. 6—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, may I ask are the studies of the water conditions in the far north under this item or later?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think it is later but at least we will go down through—

Mr. MacDonald: I do not care where I can raise it as long as I know one acceptable place.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think then if we went down to the water resources.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, recently the commission appointed the Kilborn firm to study the four townships, Rayside, Blezard, Hanmer and Capreol—are they under this item?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, would this not come under—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, it is under engineering studies. Might we have the question again, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Sopha: I was inquiring whether the recently appointed Kilborn firm to study the four townships, Blezard, Hanmer, Rayside and Capreol is under this item.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask when that study will be completed? One can see, Mr. Chairman, that leads to a conference.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say it does not lead to a conference. But after all, I think when an hon. member asks a question he would like an answer that is fairly accurate and I am informed now that it will be completed in December, 1966.

Mr. Sopha: In December?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is what my note says, sir, December.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 605:

Item 6 agreed to.

On item 7:

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat concerned with the centralization of many of the personnel dealing with the various areas in the province in the head office here in Toronto, and I would like to put forth just a few of the reasons why I feel that this personnel should be decentralized into the various areas in which they serve.

As I understand it now, and I am not talking particularly of eastern Ontario, the engineers and people who service eastern Ontario now are stationed in Toronto and go out from Toronto to do the job they are supposed to do.

I have a list here of several reasons why I feel they would do a better job if they had their headquarters in an area in eastern Ontario.

First of all, I think that people in the area would tend to identify themselves with the Ontario water resources commission much better when they have an office within the area in which these people are working. I think you would get more interest, you would get more people involved, and overall I think the office in an area would do a better job when it is located there.

Second, I think it is quite evident that office space is much cheaper in some of the smaller areas than it would be, say, at 801 Bay street, Toronto, particularly as I understand it, as you are sort of bulging at the seams right now, it might be a lot cheaper overall if this office space were provided in an area headquarters in one of the smaller areas of Ontario.

Third, if you have to go from Toronto, say, to Cornwall, or Belleville, or Kingston, you have got to leave on a Monday morning; you have got to drive down there; your travelling expenses are going to be higher because of the time that you take going down there. You are not doing the job that you are supposed to do, you are wasting time travelling. I would suggest that your expenses could be lower and you could have more time to do the job that we are trying to do. I think you would get much quicker and more efficient action on many of the problems that occur in these areas. In many cases I am sure that when a problem develops, by the time the engineer, or whoever it is, goes down, the problem may have disappeared and the trip is made worthless. Thus I feel that you would get much quicker and more efficient action on many of these problems that do develop in the various areas.

Again, I think you would get more involvement with the people themselves. If this regional office might be established, say in Kingston, the personnel down there at the university, and many other interested persons would become more involved with the very competent people who are willing and anxious to help. They would help, in most cases free of charge, but they will not do that if they have to communicate with Toronto all the time. Thus you would get more involvement with the competent people who want to help you do the job that you are trying to do.

I think you would have a much better liaison with the conservation authority, The Department of Lands and Forests, for instance, who have regional offices set out throughout the country. Much of this work is interwoven, and you get much better co-operation, you get much better liaison, if you have a regional headquarters, rather than having everything come into Toronto before any decision is made.

I think also there is a certain economic advantage to the area concerned, because a regional headquarters in a place like Kingston—I mention Kingston because I feel that is the logical place for an office in eastern Ontario—the economic advantages to Kingston would be much more evident down there than it would be if the office were placed here in Toronto.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there is any consideration being given to the establishment of regional offices for the Ontario water resources commission, and if so when he expects that these offices may be established.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, I might say that I agree with him on regional offices 100 per cent, although location might be another thing, but I have talked to Dr. Vance and members of the commission, and I understand that they are now actively studying the whole question of regional offices.

I agree with the hon. member, on all but one point. The hon. member mentioned the city of Kingston being in close proximity to Queen's University. I can think of an area that I represent, Kingston township or Pittsburgh—it is not too far away; and perhaps Gananoque, or some other place, we could think about that.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can broaden this topic for a moment, beyond the parochial considerations of Kingston and back to the basic principle of decentralization. I wanted to add my weight to the comments of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, although not necessarily on behalf of Kingston—I will leave him to do that, on that particular score.

As a matter of fact, without repeating all of the particular advantages that the hon. member has mentioned, I think it boils down to simple efficiency. The engineers who have to work out of the city of Toronto, in effect, have a three-day work week, and this is no fault of theirs. They travel on Monday, out to the field, they travel back on Friday, so they have Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday doing the job. My colleague here says Wednesday is a half day, so that is a week pretty well out of sight altogether.

Seriously, if one of the objections has been the slowness with which pollution problems have been tackled by the commission, then I think undoubtedly one of the reasons is that you are not using your existing personnel efficiently. Indeed, I am not surprised that the hon. member for Kingston rose and did battle on behalf of this cause, because I note on March I in the Kingston *Whig Standard*, the authoritative voice of that area,

an editorial, the central paragraph of which read as follows:

> As things stand at the moment the OWRC policy, as a commission spokesman explained, is to maintain all its offices in Toronto and have its staff operate from that city. There is an eastern Ontario representative in Kingston, but he has not even been equipped with an office. Why the government of Ontario should continue to operate on this basis, is beyond us.

Simple, straightforward and to the point. Indeed, if the hon. Minister, as he has indicated, is in effect working with the commission on a policy of decentralization, here, I think, is another occasion on which we trust that through the Cabinet we will get some concept of what regional development associations, or regional development areas are emerging. Conceivably for the hon. Minister's purposes, one or two regional development areas could be brought within the structure for the OWRC and that would include Kingston and maybe a little west of Kingston.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I must agree with the hon. member for Kingston and the hon. member for York South, although I do not agree entirely with the editorial he read into the record. This, I might say, has been under active study since last October. It would seem to me that with the surveillance work that we must do in the province, and especially in that part of the province—and it will be continuous work—we could get much more out of our personnel. They would be in the vicinity where they could answer questions. To me, it would do more good than having people drive back and forth to Toronto, and I must agree 100 per cent.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, on Friday, I covered the establishment of regional offices, but at that time I also pointed out that a lot of the authority for pollution inspection right now rests with the local boards of health and there has been some expressly mentioned things by people of the hon. Minister's department that at times these local boards of health are not doing their job.

I wonder if, with the establishment of these regional offices, it is the intention of the hon. Minister's department, at the same time to take over some of the responsibility from the local departments of health.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say, no. I think we in this department will work very closely with representatives of the boards of health, but I think we must do this because they are looking at pollution from a health standpoint. We are looking at it from other standpoints. I think we must work closely together or we will never achieve what we are trying to do in cleaning up pollution in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Smith: But the hon. Minister has no intention of taking over some of the responsibilities of the local departments of health?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I have not heard anything of it and I would not advocate our taking over any of their responsibilities.

Mr. Smith: Is the hon. Minister now satisfied with the job they are doing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I have not heard any complaints about the job that medical health officers are doing, although they have problems once in a while, but there are no direct complaints coming in to me, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, when I brought up the idea of a regional office in the city of Windsor, I did not bring it up from a local point of view only, but with the city of Detroit directly across the river doing a tremendous amount as far as studies are concerned on this, it would seem only logical that you would have an Ontario office in our vicinity so that you could co-ordinate studies with what is taking place with our U.S. neighbours. A regional office certainly would fill the bill, in fact I understand that Mr. Caverly has contacted the local city clerk and said that a regional office was being considered for the city of Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that Mr. Caverly has not contacted anybody in Windsor regarding a regional office. I doubt very much that he has because I think I have had a little trouble persuading some people that we should have regional offices. I think the House would agree with me that we would not go to our far border and build an office; I think we would build it centrally. They will look after the interests of the hon. member as well as looking after the interests and area around them, whether it is at Chatham or London or wherever it is, I do not know. But I for one—and I might just as well be plain about this—would not recommend that we put a regional office in Windsor. Not because I have anything against Windsor but because of where it is located. This is my only reason for saying this.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, do you not think that a regional office should be located fairly close to an area that is already conducting studies in the same field — that is the city of Detroit? I mean, it is the same problem that is being studied so it would be only natural that the regional office would be in the vicinity of the city of Detroit.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say that we will be in the vicinity of the city of — the hon. member said Detroit but I am going to say Windsor, because Windsor happens to be in Ontario, but I just might advise the House that we have a temporary lab for the Lake Erie-Detroit river-Lake St. Clair and St. Clair river area; a temporary office is to be located at London.

Mr. Smith: Is there a temporary office to be located in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is a lab, this is not a temporary office. At this stage there are no temporary offices to be located any place, although we are working on this idea.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this is the time to reiterate the earlier question that I asked concerning the present intentions of the commission in respect of the order given to the city of Sudbury to build a sewage treatment plant.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there has been no official order issued to build any plant in Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that was certainly the understanding at the meeting referred to by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin which was held earlier this year at Sudbury, and it was certainly the understanding of the city officials of Sudbury that such an order had been given.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am advised that there has been no official order given. I think if the hon. member checks with the powers that be in the city of Sudbury they will verify this statement.

Mr. Sopha: It might be appropriate to ask, then, whether it is the intention of the commission to give such an order, or not.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, after working with the OWRC, that it is very seldom they issue an order. I think by reasoning—I would not say threats—but I think the people in the city of Sudbury know that we have to do something there pretty soon. We are asking them if they would co-operate with OWRC so that we might clean up a problem that the city of Sudbury is bothered with; I know this, I talked to the hon. member a couple of years ago.

Mr. Sopha: Then I would like to ask this question: I wonder if the hon. Minister would inform us whether when Mr. Desmarais was a member of the commission there were some moves made by the commission to acquire some money from the Treasury board to supply at the expense of this government a sewage treatment plant for the city of Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot answer that, but I think the hon. member knows from our new policy last year that we will go in, build the plant and operate it, and it goes back on a service charge to the city of Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, but the commission never gives anything away. The charge is eventually borne by the ratepayers of the community. My inquiry is whether when Mr. Desmarais was a member of the commission, were some steps taken for the provision of a sewage treatment plant for Sudbury, and perhaps two or three other centres in the province, at the expense of the government, without the charge being passed back to the ratepayers of Sudbury?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Again, I cannot answer for what a member of the commission has said, but I know it has never been the government's policy to build a sewage plant and furnish it to any municipality.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister speaks of something having to be done shortly in Sudbury. I might inform him that the council has just passed the budget recently and as my friend, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs knows, it amounted to about a 10 per cent increase in the mill rate. Sudbury is already debentured to the very limit and I might inform the hon. Minister as I did earlier in respect of the resolution that I put on the order paper, that it is absolutely impossible financially for the citizens of Sudbury to bear the cost of the building of any such plant. In view of that, is there any consideration being given—I most respectfully and courteously ask the hon. Minister—for the provision of a sewage treatment plant at the expense of the government?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Does the hon. member mean that the government build it and operate it on a service charge?

Mr. Sopha: And pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, we will pay for it but there would have to be a service charge back to the municipality. But perhaps to clean up the hon. member's point, I have just been advised that officials of the city of Sudbury and officials of the OWRC have agreed on a five-year programme. I do not know what the programme is as yet but they have agreed on this. They are not in disagreement, they want a sewage disposal plant and I guess they are going to have it.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would answer my question in relation to combined storm and sanitary sewers, of the policy of the OWRC in our expanding communities?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am advised that they are not approving any more combined sewage and storm sewers. From now on all municipalities will have to build separate lines. They are encouraging municipalities to separate them.

Mr. Paterson: Therefore, a small community which has a chance to subdivide and grow would then be stopped until such facilities are provided? Is this the directive from the OWRC?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They would be allowed to put in sanitary sewers but not combined sewers.

Mr. Paterson: I would like to ask another question on administration: the policy of the department in relation to drilling on our inland lakes. The reason I ask this is that, as early as last spring I read in the North Bay *Nugget* that a mining firm, Min-Ore Mines, had done an aerial survey of Callander Bay and had commenced drilling through the ice for some type of ore. I just wonder what is the position of the OWRC in relation to mining operations in our lakes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the hon. member, what was the drilling for? Was it mineral?

Mr. Paterson: They were looking for minerals but I just wondered if by chance there could have been a geological fault that may have contained oil or some pollutants. I just wonder what would have happened in that case if this lake had been contaminated at the time of the spring break-up.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of course, the hon. member is getting three departments involved here, The Department of Mines, The Department of Energy, if he is talking about oil, and the OWRC if he is talking about water. But the OWRC would try to see that there were no pollutants, whether it be mines, oil or whatever it might be. This is their responsibility.

Mr. Paterson: Do these mining companies have to get a permit from OWRC before they commence drilling on these inland lakes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I am advised that mineral exploration is not restricted unless in provincial or federal parks. If it is oil they are drilling for, then they must get a permit from the energy branch.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. Smith: Earlier in the year it was announced that there is a plan for next October to have a conference on pollution and environment under the auspices of the Canadian council of resource ministers. What will Ontario's position be at that time in regard to the establishment of a national water conservation board at the federal level, with the co-operation of the provinces? Is Ontario in favour of this type of legislation at the federal level, and of establishing minimum standards across the country for water pollution?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I cannot answer that question. I think something will be discussed at government level prior to the meeting in October, but at the present time I have no answer.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I think this is the most important question that the hon. Minister's department faces and I think that perhaps some policy should be established so that we can be aware of it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think that it is well known what our position is as far as water pollution is concerned in the province of Ontario. In fact, I do not hesitate to say that we are leading the way in the Dominion of Canada as far as pollution control is concerned and we will not relax our policy, but I doubt that perhaps some of the other provinces would like to meet the policy as set down by Ontario at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister the government policy on the use of lagoons as treatment plants?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are acceptable in certain areas and it would depend on population and many other things such as local conditions, ground conditions and isolation. Many things would have to be taken into consideration, although they are acceptable in many areas.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if lagoons would be considered in built-up areas in a community?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The answer is no.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister his department's policy on septic tanks; are septic tanks being ruled out as a future method of waste disposal?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Septic tanks come under the medical officer of health, but I think we would discourage them in built-up areas and would hope that the municipality involved would put in some different type of sewage disposal.

Mr. Newman: The Minister would permit septic tanks in certain areas though, would he not, seeing there is a pollutant that may be involved in the use of septic tanks?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This does not come under the jurisdiction of OWRC; it comes under the jurisdiction of the medical officer of health.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, sir.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, from time to time we read articles in the newspapers with regard to drilling for gas and oil in the Great Lakes. Could the hon. Minister explain to us the policy of his department in regard to drilling in the Great Lakes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Drilling in the Great Lakes comes under the supervision of the energy branch as well as OWRC and, of course, we are on OWRC now. No one will be allowed to drill in the Great Lakes if there is any thought of pollution or even after they have drilled. This is one of the things surveyed very closely, to see if there is any pollution from a well that is drilled in one of the Great Lakes.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's answer is not quite clear. Will anybody be permitted to drill in any of the Great Lakes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The member's question is not very clear; he says "in any of the Great Lakes." We are not allowing anyone to drill in Lake Huron at the present time, as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Spence: What about Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, they are drilling in Lake Erie, as the hon. member well knows. We issue permits to drill on Lake Erie providing they live up to our regulations on drilling in that area.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this topic, I believe the vice chairman mentioned that the department had jurisdiction in James and Hudson bays; has there been any contemplation on allowing drilling for gas and oil in those areas?

Mr. Chairman: This is not under the Ontario water resources commission; we have dealt with the Ontario energy board formerly. The vote before us at the present time is 605.

Mr. Paterson: I agree, Mr. Chairman, that this subject was brought up and I just wondered if the department's interests covered this area.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is no drilling in James bay or Hudson bay at the present time and we are not sure whether that is under our jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of the federal government. So until that argument is settled I think we will leave it as it is.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, earlier today the hon. Minister, in answering a question I put to him last Friday in regard to the Great Lakes water levels, said that the Great Lakes levels are coming up now and we will have a different set of figures to work with later on this year. But this does not really answer the question of permanent regulation to a minimum and maximum level. I wonder if the Minister would enlighten us with regard to the international joint commission study into this matter and what position the province of Ontario is taking in those studies?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not know how I can enlarge on what I have said. The only controls on the Great Lakes are controls through Hydro dams and these are controlled by the international joint commission and the Montreal port. I guess when we get into drought times and there is low water it costs us a lot of money in Ontario because Hydro cannot use the water power as much as they would like. They have to have a certain amount of water in the Montreal port, but at the present time we have no worries that way. Our water is normal and, in fact, is a little above normal.

The only controls on the Great Lakes, as the hon. member knows, are at Lake Superior, and there are very few controls from there down to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, this does not really answer the question. Everything is fine now, but it was not in the years 1962 and 1963, and it certainly was not in the early 1950's when there were high water levels. The international joint commission held hearings last year in which the hon. Minister's department and Hydro and quite a number of other departments of this government made representations. I would like to know what the international joint commission is doing in regard to formulating a policy to set up regulations of the lakes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I was reading last year that they have not completed their studies yet; these are still under way and there has been no report to government on this.

Mr. Smith: In other words, the Minister's department has not had any report back from the IJC.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Smith: Has the hon. Minister continued his interest with the IJC in this matter since that time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Definitely, yes.

Mr. Smith: Since that time has the Minister been in contact with the commission? I think this is a major matter. It costs Ontario Hydro millions of dollars and it could cost the people of Ontario again in the future.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Muskoka.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might ascertain what the volume is—I think it is in cubic feet per second—that we divert into the Great Lakes through the Ogoki diversion.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is 5,000 cfs, I am advised by the hon. member for Muskoka.

Mr. Sopha: Is that the only diversion in existence or is there another one?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is the only one feeding water down through the Great Lakes' system.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder if we might ascertain how much is taken off at Chicago.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: About the same amount.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): The amount is 30,000 cfs at Chicago—pardon me, 3,000 cfs are drawn off at Chicago.

Mr. Sopha: Then might we ascertain how much the city of Chicago wants to take off? What representations have they made to the IJC in respect of the amount they would like to take off?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I think it will be realized that Lake Michigan is a lake which is not under the control of the IJC; it is not an international water, so-called. I could say more about this later, if the hon. member wishes.

Mr. Chairman: I was going to suggest that perhaps the member for Sudbury would like to leave it until the vote comes up in 609 under the hydro-electric power commission. We will be dealing with it in a few minutes.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that will be fine.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what liaison his department has with the international joint commission. Does he have people permanently attending their meetings, or how does he keep up to date on their findings and recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The answer is yes, and I would say that the commission has a very close liaison with the Canadian section of the IJC, and of course that is federal, as you know. The federal people are in very close touch with the American section of IJC, and Dr. Vance, although he does not have to report to me on all the meetings, I think he meets with them, it seems to me, about once a week and they discuss some problems that they have between different states and the provinces and the two federal governments.

Mr. Nixon: A few moments ago, the hon. Minister said that in his opinion Ontario led the nation in provisions for anti-pollution programmes, and this may be so, and it may be because we have more pollution than any other province. It is interesting to note the state of the Great Lakes, particularly as it is observed from the American side, where I would agree with the hon. Minister that their anti-pollution provisions do not live up to what we have achieved here, in at least some regards. It is said that in Lake Erie, if pollution would hypothetically stop, it would take 25 years to clear itself by natural means. This is in spite of the deputy chairman's statement a few moments ago that Lake Erie was not in fact a dead lake, in his view, and

I hope that he is correct, notwithstanding the fact that many very competent scientists have been drawing the attention of the government and the people of Ontario to the terrible pollution that has taken place there.

I would be interested to know whether the government of Ontario, as well as the international joint commission makes pollution readings in the Great Lakes, and if in fact they have information on pollution that comes from the American side, as well as from the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would think the American representatives of IJC have the information that the hon. member is questioning. We have information on the Ontario side, and as you know, if you take the Ontario side of Lake Erie, look at our population, and look at our manufacturing and compare it to what they have in the states on the other side, I do not think it would take any mathematician to see that 90 and ten would be a good average, as far as pollution is concerned. We are ready, willing and able to clean up our pollution and can do it very shortly on the Ontario side of Lake Erie. It would be a very short job.

Mr. Nixon: If we are ready, willing and able, I hope that we will proceed with the programme immediately and not wait for some other jurisdiction. I would like to follow up on this, because as my colleague from Nipissing said a moment or two ago, this is surely the most important matter that faces the government at the present time.

No doubt when the hon. Minister and his officials approach certain industries concerning the pollution that they are putting into the lake—and it may be from the north shore of Lake Erie—it is possible that the argument might be put to the government, that if they are going to be subject to the rigid controls that the hon. Minister has described, it would be an economic advantage to them to leave Ontario and go to some province where they might be able to establish under less rigorous controls.

It might be that they would threaten to leave Canada entirely and go to the United States, or in some cases perhaps withdraw what would be a subsidiary plant here. With this in mind, surely the hon. Minister would agree that not only is it essential that we have some uniformity of controls as between and among our sister provinces, but that there also be some general uniformity with the states that border the Great Lakes system to the south. It is with this in mind that I cannot understand the hon. Minister saying that he has yet to make up his mind on the value, and in fact pressing need, for some national and international body to which we would contribute our know-how and our support, and certainly a good number of our provincial dollars, so that a programme to clean up the Great Lakes system could in fact move ahead.

The hon. Minister said a moment ago that in his view it would be relatively simple for us to complete the clean-up of the Ontario shore of the Great Lakes system and I say to him, for heaven's sake if that is so, then I hope that we can proceed with it immediately and not wait around with any arguments about what Detroit and Cleveland and Buffalo are doing, to contribute their overwhelming share to the pollution of the lake. I would think as well, that it would be at the top of our policy here in this province to take part in a national and international programme that would come to grips with this problem before it has progressed any further.

I wonder if the hon. Minister has anything further to say himself on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Are you suggesting that we go over to the U.S. and tell them to clean up their pollution in the Great Lakes, or do you think the federal government should be the responsible government in that? We cannot go to the American states and the federal government, and tell them what they should do as far as pollution is concerned. We can deal with our federal counterparts in Ottawa, which we are doing. When you talk about pollution in Ontario's section of Lake Erie, I would like you to cite a case where you think it is badly polluted in our section of Lake Erie. This is what I would like to know. I can cite many cases across the border, on Lake Erie, and I do not have to cite them, because you already know about them.

But that is not our responsibility. That is the federal government, who deal with the federal government in the United States, regarding pollution in the Great Lakes. After all, pollution does not stop at the boundaries. Why should we go ahead and make it tough on our municipalities, make it tough on our industries, have them clean up and be cleaned up, when there is nothing happening on the other side of the lake, because pollution does not stop at international boundaries? That is why I said that we are ready, willing and able. When they get theirs cleaned up, we will be cleaned up and in business, and much before they are cleaned up, and I think you would have to agree with that statement.

Mr. Nixon: There are two things that occur to me in this matter. The first is the hon. Minister's reticence to state clearly that he feels some overall national requirements should be set down so that the provinces would have similar requirements, particularly for cleaning up industrial pollution.

Secondly, we are perhaps in a fortunate position, if what the hon. Minister says is true, in that we have no pollution on the Lake Erie side and that all this difficulty comes from the American side. If that is so, I think we should be standing up and complaining bitterly about it, because our people are the ones who are forced to accept the pollution in the lakes, as the hon. Minister says, and I am sure he is correct in this, that we contribute perhaps only ten per cent to it.

There was a time, and it was not too long ago, when the lake levels were a serious problem to Ontario and this is something that did not stop at international boundaries. The hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, called together the authorities from all the states that bordered the Great Lakes and they sat down here in Toronto and worked out some possible plans. I thought at the time that it was an excellent idea and that the initiative was a worthwhile one.

If the hon. Minister were going to concern himself with pollution on the Great Lakes—and I submit he should—it might be worthwhile for him to convene a similar conference, so that the governors, or the representatives of these states that are contributing so much pollution would have an opportunity to sit down with the government of Ontario and discuss the problem. It could very well be under a federal call, if the hon. Minister felt that it should be, but it is not necessary, because we have blazed a trail in these international negotiations.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is a tremendously serious problem and I hope the hon. Minister is not going to stand on some gentlemanly procedure, or lack of procedure, or lack of initiative, simply because in his view we are so far ahead of the others.

If this pollution is coming into the lakes from the American side to such an extent, we are the ones that are being damaged as much as anybody else, perhaps more than anybody else.

I mentioned a moment ago, sir, that an article I read recently said that Lake Erie would not clear itself up if it were left without further pollution for 25 years. The same article said Lake Michigan, which is deeper and much larger, would not clean itself in 200 years. Now whether this is a biological fact or not, the comparison in the figures are there for all to read.

I would agree that the Americans have polluted the Great Lakes far more than we have. Their population and industrial basis are entirely different, but I think it is for us to complain bitterly about it, and do something to convene the authorities so that at least the road back can be laid out and the guidelines and plans can be set out.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I must agree with the hon. member, and I must agree, too, that the meeting we called here a year ago last June, to discuss this problem with the different states and with representatives from our sister province, Quebec, and with representatives from the federal government—I think this was perhaps the start of many meetings that have been held since. But in order for us to deal with the states, I must deal through our federal people and we are dealing very closely with the federal department. I might say there has been good co-operation. I think we are moving ahead and I think with what we read in the papers about what is happening in the United States federally, as far as pollution is concerned, we must admit that they are moving ahead too.

I would think perhaps in the next five or ten years we hope that we will be cleaned up in Ontario and I think they are working to the same end. As far as 200 years or 20 years to clean up pollution in Lake Erie or Lake Michigan is concerned, I doubt if anyone could verify that statement. I think that is a matter of supply and demand. The pollution is going in; I think we will have to wait and live long enough to see whether it is cleaned up or not. Let us not argue that point, our engineers can verify it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, last Saturday in the city of Windsor the united automobile workers had a conference on water pollution. It concerned united action for clear water and during the day-long conference a Mr. George A. Harlow, director of the Detroit River-Lake Erie project of The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, mentioned the fact that the federal government has a programme affecting the Detroit river, Lake Erie, Lake St. Clair area so that by 1970 they have given all industry notice that they are to have their pollution taken care of.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Is that the U.S. federal government or—

Mr. Newman: Yes, in effect it is the federal water pollution control enforcement programme.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In the United States?

Mr. Newman: Yes, the United States, and by 1970 this is supposed to be completely taken care of. The city of Detroit really is the big sinner, so to speak, when it does come to the pollution aspect of things. We are not responsible to any extent for pollution; not to the same extent as are they in the city of Detroit. However, they are actually working on it quite well right now. As has been mentioned, inside of four years they plan on having all of their effluent with secondary treatment so that approximately 85 per cent of the pollution will have been removed. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how his negotiations are proceeding with the city of Windsor in respect of the correction of the water pollution and sewage treatment plants? Has he arrived at some amicable agreement?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand from officials of the OWRC that we have arrived at an agreement. Did I understand the hon. member to say that Detroit would be cleaned up by 1970?

Mr. Newman: This gentleman who is the director of the Detroit River-Lake Erie project of The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare made this statement at the meeting on Saturday.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member would agree then with OWRC and myself that if they are going to be cleaned up in Detroit we at least should be cleaned up in Windsor at the same time.

Mr. Newman: We should be working on it, yes.

Mr. Smith: With respect to the question of the pollution of the Ottawa river, what success has the OWRC or the department had in dealing with the Quebec government in order to co-operate in the cleaning up of pollution of the river there?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of course, we are not affected by direct pollution in Quebec because the water is running down the St. Lawrence towards the province of Quebec, so we have no problems there. In the Ottawa river we have some but I have not heard of too many problems in the Ottawa. I am advised that in regard to the one new paper mill, the province of Quebec has asked OWRC for our requirements as to building a new plant and theirs will be the same.

Mr. Smith: I could not quite follow that. A new plant in Quebec is going to use the Ontario standards; is that what the hon. Minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Quebec province has asked the OWRC for our requirements and have advised us that they will make their requirements the same.

Mr. Smith: What about the present mills that are situated on the river there, on the Quebec side. Are they being cleaned up? The hon. Minister says there is no problem but I am sure the people in Ottawa could point out a lot of problems there.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think we can answer for the province of Quebec but I understand that in many cases they have no requirements for clean-up as far as paper mills are concerned.

Mr. Smith: This is the point I was trying to make earlier, that we need a national policy on this subject, and the hon. Minister just skirted around it. This is one example which points up the need for that policy.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I would agree with the hon. member; we need a national policy. But I think we in Ontario should be responsible for the pollution created within the province of Ontario. When we come to the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence river or international waters, I agree with the hon. member that we need a national policy. I think this is what we are doing at the present time—the OWRC and the federal people in Ottawa—we are working towards a policy that will at least iron out our difficulties in this part of Canada. Whether or not this policy would apply to British Columbia is something else.

Mr. Smith: Well, I am happy to say that in the last 15 minutes we have come to this—

Mr. Chairman: Many of these sections overlap and go from one to the other, and we have sort of leapfrogged through vote 605. Are there further questions on 605?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, there are some questions I wanted to ask. I was waiting for a later vote but we are into this problem now. I have been very much impressed by the work the Ontario water resources commission has been doing and

congratulate them on it. I think the work is certainly under way, but there are some specific questions I would like to ask.

A year ago, I put before the House certain problems which were being faced by the Ontario water resources commission, arising out of their own reports. At that time I was assured that progress was being made and that these situations were being cleaned up. Now, we have had a great deal of difficulty in pinpointing where this progress is and what has actually happened. So I would like to ask several questions regarding certain localities and perhaps the hon. Minister could give me some answers as to progress.

The first one is in connection with Grand river. The reports a year ago—I am looking over *Hansard* now at a speech I made at that time—and the report said that 12 municipalities have some forms of sewer treatment. But these 12—about 95 per cent of the urban population, is included, so that is good. However, significant quantities of contaminating wastes are discharged directly into the stream by lengthy lists of industries, with a wide range of manufacturing processes and resultant varied wastes.

In Kitchener-Waterloo, for instance, industrial wastes are accepted in the municipal sewage system. However, complications developed in the Waterloo plant due to excessive organic loadings. And then it tells that pollution is evident in the following regions: Speed river from Guelph down to where it joins the Grand river, the Grand river extending 20 miles downstream from Bridgeport, approximately 20 miles downstream from Brantford, and then extremely degraded conditions exist downstream from Elmira. Domestic and trade waste is discharged without treatment in the town of Dunnville and has created objectionable conditions in Sunfish creek, and along the east side of the Grand river downstream from the town.

I wonder if the hon. Minister might give us some indication of what is happening on the Grand river over this period; whether real progress has been made in cleaning up the situation which was mentioned a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I wonder if the vice-chairman might answer this question? He comes from that locality and he is more closely associated than I with the problems up there.

Mr. Root: There has been a very extensive programme, as the hon. member has mentioned, on the Grand river. The city of Brantford has spent great sums of money in cleaning up pollution there. Galt, Preston, Kitchener, Waterloo, Elmira, Fergus, Elora, Arthur and Guelph have provided treatment.

Mr. Young: All these places are now cleaned up?

Mr. Root: They have all built plants which are taking care of their municipal waste and most industries are discharging through them. There has been a very decided improvement on the Grand river. I will not say they are 100 per cent cleaned up but there are some smaller places right now where we are trying to develop provincial projects right through the Grand valley, but these are small villages. The major centres have treatment works.

We are developing works at Hespeler where there is a lot of industrial waste and we are developing a project there at the present time. Projects are being developed for Drayton and Grand Valley.

Mr. Young: The Waterloo situation is cleaned up too, is it?

Mr. Root: An enlargement is under design.

Mr. Young: Is under design?

Mr. Root: Yes, and Dunnville is under development, so I think that we have pretty well controlled pollution on the Grand river.

Mr. Young: So that in another year or two there should be significant changes in the Grand river as it flows into the bay.

Mr. Root: Fish are coming back up the Grand river. Perhaps the hon. member for Brant could tell the member how far north they are.

Mr. Young: I will invite the chairman or the representative to join me in a trout fishing expedition there in two years' time. Perhaps we can bring the trout into the House and display what we have caught.

Now the Thames river—serious pollution was evident in parts of the town of Ingersoll, particularly the industrial effluent flowing into the river in that region. I wonder if Ingersoll has made any progress?

Mr. Root: This is on the Thames?

Mr. Young: On the Thames.

Mr. Root: Ingersoll has a proposal in now and it is being scrutinized.

Mr. Young: Being scrutinized? Then there has been no progress since last year on Ingersoll in the matter of the disposal there. We

hear a great deal about fish being killed in the Thames at that particular place.

Mr. Root: I am sorry; I did not get that.

Mr. Young: Well, I understand then, that nothing has happened at Ingersoll during the past 12 months.

Mr. Root: Oh yes, there is a proposal in for a development in Ingersoll.

Mr. Young: A proposal in? But the proposal was there a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that Borden's, or one of the industries, is having some problems there and I think we all know that dairy wastes are very hard to handle. They are working very closely with them. I think the companies are endeavouring to set up a programme that will clean up their industrial wastes. At the present time it has not been cleaned up, but it will be.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford is going to volunteer some information on that same point.

Mr. G. W. Pittock (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I was not sure if the hon. member was talking about sanitary sewage or industrial sewage. Which was it he mentioned?

Mr. Young: Both, Mr. Chairman. Last year I pointed out one of the OWRC reports which talked about the industrial wastes particularly, as well as some sanitary waste, going into the river at the point where the creek goes into the river. Eight municipal storm drains were found to be discharging sanitary sewage into the water courses while four industrial outlets were found to be sources of serious pollution. It was suggested that the high concentration of ammonia being discharged by one industrial plant, may have contributed to fish kills in that particular section of the Thames.

So we have these smaller industries. This was a question at that time and I was wondering whether any real progress has been made in cleaning up this section of the Thames river.

Mr. Pittock: I would like to report, since the hon. Minister has said there have been some changes made, that the extension of laterals to include all the residences of the town of Ingersoll is on a continuing basis. Ingersoll put in the sewage treatment plant about 10 years ago at a time when there was no assistance of any kind, as did many other municipalities in that area, and they have been adding to the areas to be covered with laterals since that time.

The hon. member mentioned a couple of industries; I know now that there are no dairies discharging into the river; they are all going into the municipal system under control.

Borden's large plant spent in the area of $50,000 to change and separate cooling water from process water. Anything containing contaminants is now stored in tanks and metered to the sewage system during the night-time hours. The plant the hon. member referred to in connection with an excessive amount of ammonia being discharged into the river, spent in the area of $25,000 on a complete re-circulation system. There is no discharge at all of effluent into the river. I know that OWRC has been working very closely and they have improved that situation to a large extent.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are getting information from the local source which the hon. Minister was apparently not aware of, and the situation is evidently much better than the OWRC people knew about. We hope that that situation continues. I am sure that the hon. member will push the OWRC and before too long no pollution at all will be going into the Thames from Ingersoll.

The third item I want to ask about is Orillia. On March 10 last year, the industrial waste report states that of Orillia's 30 industries, 16 with industrial waste discharges were surveyed and the report suggested that discharge of industrial wastes into ditches, a common practice of Orillia, should be discontinued. Also, that all industries should pre-treat their wastes to the extent that these wastes would be discharged to the sanitary sewers. Has Orillia made any real progress?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that—did the hon. member say 16 industries at Orillia?

Mr. Young: Sixteen, with industrial wastes discharge, were surveyed.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of the 16 that were discharging industrial wastes last year, 11 were cleaned up and five still are to submit satisfactory treatment plans.

Mr. Young: Are those five being pushed to clean up their—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Definitely; all industry is being pushed in Ontario to be cleaned up by 1970.

Mr. Young: These industries have four years to go and we hope that by that time this will have been done.

Lindsay also had some problems. It acquired a stabilization pond, evidently, and a lot of the effluent went into that, but it did have quite a few problems with industry and I wonder if Lindsay has had some real attention over the past year.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am advised that Lindsay is essentially under control and, again, we have been working very closely with all industries and the hon. member knows what our policy was last year—that if the industries did not get busy within the first 18 months there were going to be some orders issued. I do not think that we are going to have to issue them because industry is co-operating with the OWRC very well. In fact, most personnel of industry today are as concerned about pollution as you and I are, maybe more so, because they are generally pretty good citizens and they have a stake in the area in which they are located. I do not think we will have any problem with that type of industry.

Mr. Young: I have one further question rising out of last year's query, Mr. Chairman. At Penetanguishene a rather serious situation existed at that time and in that area of Georgian bay. This was considered to be quite unacceptable and at that time the extension of the sewage works was turned down by the Ontario municipal board. They were having trouble financing it and too much of the sewage and effluent from industry was going into the bay. I wonder whether Penetanguishene has had the situation clarified.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that a plant is being constructed at the present time and they are looking after finances themselves.

Mr. Young: So that is underway?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Underway!

Mr. Young: All right. Now there is one question arising out of this afternoon, which has not yet been answered. At Petrolia, evidently some work has been done. The Ontario water resources commission has met with the industry there and yet the industry is dragging its feet and saying that they cannot afford to install the sewage disposal work. I wonder if the hon. Minister could comment on the Petrolia situation?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might, with your permission, read this into the record, and this is the proposed programme to eliminate pollution in the oil producing areas:

> In October, 1965, the Ontario water resources commission in co-operation with The Department of Energy and Resources Management, investigated the nature and causes of oil pollution in the Petrolia area. A report on this investigation was published in February, 1966. Although the report deals specifically with the Petrolia field, the following recommendations, if implemented, would apply to all shallow Devonian oil producing areas. These areas can be summarized as follows: In Petrolia we have 150 wells. The number of operators is 15. Production in barrels, 26,300 and the value is $85,000 in 1965. Oil Springs: there are 500 wells; the number of operators, 13; production in barrels, 69,500 and the value in 1965, $210,000. Bothwell, 50 wells; the number of operators, four; production in barrels, 8,800 and the value in 1965, $28,400.
>
> The pollution problem in these fields results primarily from inadequate separation of oil and water prior to disposing the water effluent into the ditches and streams. In addition to oil the effluent presently contains high-chloride and sulphide concentrations. However, in considering the type of operation and the degree of pollution, the Ontario water resources commission is agreeable to permitting the discharge of the water effluent into the ditches provided that all the oil is removed. Based on this recommendation the following programme is proposed:
>
> Primary separation facilities consisting of a gravity separation tank and syphon arrangement for the removal of water are presently installed for each well or group of wells.
>
> To prevent pollution these facilities must be expanded to permit a longer and more effective period of separation, or a secondary separation facility must be used. For the most part the introduction of secondary facilities will be necessary. Such facilities would consist of a large separating tank similar to a primary unit or simply large settling ponds. In both cases the separation time cycle would be dependent upon size and volumes of fluid to be handled. The department would not specify what equipment should be used but would rather ensure that whatever is used effects a complete separation of oil from water.
>
> When initiating the programme to re-

move pollution it should be made very clear that a clean-up of producing properties is also required. In most cases this should be directed towards the improvement of actual producing wells, since little success can be expected with respect to a general clean-up of these areas considering the unsightly conditions which exist, independent of oil producing operations. The requirement of adequate separation facilities to remove oil from the water effluent is a minimum required and does not preclude the possibility that at some later date underground disposal may be necessary. Should some operators find it necessary to suspend operations due to an increase in operating cost, such operators will not have funds to plug their wells. However, literally thousands of wells drilled in the area have not been properly plugged but evidence to date suggests that within a short time natural caving in the hole results in an effective plug. As a result it would seem impracticable for the government to attempt to properly plug and abandon these wells if any operator ceases operation at Petrolia, Oil Springs and Bothwell areas.

I might say that a meeting will be called later this month, or early in June, in Petrolia, with the members of our department, and I am talking about Energy and Resources management and the Ontario water resources commission, to discuss these problems with the operators.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I thought, while we were talking about pollution in the Great Lakes and the various areas of the province, that something should be said about pollution in the vicinity of Metropolitan Toronto. I was interested in hearing the hon. Minister's request to one of my colleagues to tell him where there was pollution in the vicinity of Lake Erie on the Ontario side.

My hon. friend from Kent East tells me that there were several sections in Kent last summer where swimming was banned because of the polluted conditions of Lake Erie.

Mr. Young: Dunnville was another situation here.

Mr. Singer: Yes, Dunnville, as the hon. member for Yorkview mentioned and I am quite certain that my hon. friend from Kent East could give you ten or 15 or 20 different spots along Lake Erie where there was pollution.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member for Kent East just a year ago on these estimates, if he could name one place that was being polluted from the province of Ontario, and that is all I am asking tonight. I did not say there was no pollution in Lake Erie, I said name me one place—

Mr. Singer: On the Canadian side?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: On the Ontario side, that we do not know about and is not reported in the OWRC—

Mr. Singer: I am not really going to try to hold forth on what goes on in Lake Erie, but let us look at what goes on in Lake Ontario, right in Toronto. There is no question, Mr. Chairman—and I am sure you, personally, know the condition of the beaches along the Metropolitan Toronto water front. There has not been swimming along any of the beaches on the Metropolitan water front for years, and years, and years. I am sure the hon. Minister must have read in the paper the remarks of the mayor of Toronto, a few days ago, or a few weeks ago. Perhaps he was a little too alarmist, but he indicated that perhaps Toronto was sitting on top of a potential typhoid epidemic, because of the condition produced in Lake Ontario by the combined storm and sanitary sewers.

This is a situation that has existed in the Toronto area for many, many years. Every time there is a rainfall, the flow of the storm water and the sewage water combine and raw sewage dumps into Lake Ontario. What has the hon. Minister been doing about this; what is he going to do about it? Has there been any action taken or is there any action intended to be taken? Is the water resources commission prepared to take on the city of Toronto, and order them to clear this situation up, or is it not? Is anything going to be done about it; is the hon. Minister concerned at all about the remarks made recently by the mayor of the city of Toronto?

The mayor of the city of Toronto was perhaps making these remarks with a different emphasis. He wanted to get some more money from somebody else, but I would think that the hon. Minister, with all his resources, and all his energy, should be able to bring greater pressure to bear to clean up the situation. My friend, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, I am sure, deplores as I do, the terrible conditions of the Toronto beaches. They have been like this for, what, 20 years or more? Nobody can swim from the Toronto beaches in any summer. The Toronto bay is almost a cesspool.

What is the hon. Minister going to do about the polluted waters in the vicinity of Metropolitan Toronto? The Don river—and anyone who travels the Don Valley parkway every day, and there are several hon. members here in the House that do—every morning in the Don river there are great piles of detergent suds. I wonder if the hon. Minister has any plan at all about detergent studies and whether or not Ontario intends to make any orders about the use of different types of detergents that do not pollute the waters to the same extent that they are presently being polluted. I think the people of the metropolitan area particularly deserve some sort of indication from the hon. Minister about what he is going to do about pollution of our main rivers, the Don and the Humber, in Toronto, and the whole lakefront in the metropolitan area.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member says that the beaches in Toronto have been polluted for many years, I do not know about the beaches, but he spoke about the Don river. My first trip in Toronto where I can recall anything about the Don river was in 1929. Although it is still polluted, I can see the water now and you could not in 1929, so we have made some progress. I do not know whether we have done as well on the beaches or not.

Mr. Singer: You know where it is now.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But you could not see it for—

Mr. MacDonald: It was just because they cut the brush away.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh no, it was not the brush. I am sorry, sir.

I am advised—and I think the hon. member knows this, after all he is the member for a Toronto riding—that OWRC and Metro Toronto are working very closely on their storm sewage problem, and to all intents and purposes, they have a programme, and it will be cleaned up. I do not think we could issue any order when they are working along with the requirements as set down by OWRC. I think it will be cleaned up.

I am sure you understand this, because you are a very smart young fellow and up to date on what goes on in Metro. I am not, I come from eastern Ontario and we try to keep track of that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would hope somebody is working along but I remember 1957 when I was on the Metro council and some of us discovered for the first time that there existed in the city combined storm and sanitary sewers which were continuing to dump raw sewage into Lake Ontario at the time of rain storms. The mayor of Toronto at that time—I think it was Mayor Phillips—said he was very shocked by this discovery and denied it for quite a while until finally there was the admission.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He had not been around the council very long.

Mr. Singer: No, perhaps that was the reason. In any event, Mr. Chairman, as early as 1957 on the Metropolitan council this was a topic of public discussion. As I say, within the last few weeks the present mayor of Toronto says, if he was correctly quoted, that he feels that Toronto might be sitting just on the verge of a typhoid epidemic. Apparently the storm sewers are still combined with the sanitary sewers and every time a big rain falls raw sewage continues to be dumped into Lake Ontario.

I am interested to hear the hon. Minister say that somebody is making some plans but are there any plans that the OWRC has set forth and is issuing orders about to the same extent that they are issuing orders in other municipalities? The Minister's department is very efficient in sending all the hon. members bulletins about the latest investigations and the latest decisions. I am told that the OWRC's accepted maximum bacteria count for safe water is some 2,400 and that the bacteria count along the lakeshore of Metro has been recently recorded at levels ranging from 20,000 to 300 million. Certainly it is not getting better. I think we have a whole generation of children who have grown up in Metropolitan Toronto and have never known what it is to be able to swim in Lake Ontario. Through their whole lifetime they have been unable to get into Lake Ontario because it has been polluted.

An hon. member: Too cold anyway.

Mr. Singer: What is the hon. Minister doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am advised by officials of the OWRC that the city of Toronto has tabled with OWRC a long-range programme for sewer separation and it has been agreed to and they are working towards that end. $300 million.

Mr. Singer: When is it going to commence and what is the charge—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are in the second year now. It is a long-range programme, $300 million.

Mr. Singer: Why the concern of the mayor just the other day when he thought the city might be on the verge of an epidemic?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He gets on about it anyway; the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question regarding industrial waste disposal, particularly as it relates to the fruit belt, such as the area which I represent and conceivably the Niagara peninsula or even the Bradford area. In the production of canned foods, there are taken out what I will term screenings, basically peelings and decomposing vegetables, and I just wonder if any thought is given by your department of erecting a central industrial waste disposal centre, say, for Essex county or the Niagara area to look after these things. Because there is this problem of the canneries; there is also the problem of produce terminals which from time to time have to dump produce, such as at Bradford where they dumped a whole bunch of melons into the river and polluted—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Where was this?

Mr. Paterson: In Bradford—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They dumped them in where, though?

Mr. Paterson: In the river at Bradford.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is contrary to law, to dump them in the river.

Mr. Paterson: We realize this, our conservation group ran into this last summer and it was quite a serious problem for the municipality. But the farmers allow the spreading of these screenings on their fields and unavoidably a certain amount of this washes into the ditches and streams and would cause pollution as well as irritating odours. We also have a couple of fish processing plants which have dumps to dispose of the entrails and so forth, but these are not too satisfactory as there are odours from them. Has the OWRC any plans in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: If the hon. member is talking about pollution and anyone dumping spoiled fruit or fishheads and entrails into a stream, that is contrary to law. We already have the Act here and anyone can be prosecuted if they are caught. Surely we have not people in Ontario who dump spoiled fruit into one of our streams. I imagine we have, because I picked up a paper the other day that was issued very close to an area in which I live and here was a man dumping his garbage into a lake. He was disposing of it, so he thought; it was going to be hidden anyway, it was going to be under the water, or some of it was.

But this is what goes on and I do not think these matters are only for OWRC to look after. I think that we as citizens better start some educating and tell some of these fellows when we see them doing this. Somebody saw this man doing this, because he took a picture of it at the same time and I have the picture in my office. Surely we do not look to government to look after all these things. Surely the people who are dumping spoiled fruit and fishheads into our lakes must be responsible citizens and know much better than that.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, these are by the truckload and are dumped daily.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not care if they are only by a shovel load, it is contrary to law.

Mr. Paterson: Where are people going to put them? Is the department giving any direction as to where these can be dumped?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That does not come under our department; that would come under the department of industry, and surely there must be some garbage disposal places in the areas to which the hon. member is referring. I know you can go into any township in the north part of the county that I represent and they have a garbage dump, a place to get rid of these things. They do not dump them in the lake.

Mr. Paterson: Possibly the hon. Minister is not interpreting my remarks properly, as we have some 30-odd food processors in the county of Essex and a continuing problem with them is, how are they to dispose of them? They are possibly not allowed in municipal dumps or allowed into municipal systems. They are trucking them out to farms and spreading them on the land, creating odours and eventually polluting the streams. I feel there should be a central disposal area, possibly turning this effluent into compost and disposing of it in a proper manner.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of course, that would not come under OWRC. That would come under the municipality, and perhaps the medical officer of health would look after

this. We would be responsible for the effluent in water disposal of some of their waste in canneries and they are particularly hard to deal with, too. But I think OWRC are on top of that in most of the canneries in the province of Ontario. I know they are on top of a little one down in Desoronto which I hear about quite often, so I am sure they are up to date on the hon. member's.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, are there still some cities in Ontario that do not have sewage disposal plants to treat all the sewage?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I covered that in my speech. Would the hon. member like me to look that up in *Hansard*?

Mr. Nixon: I can look that up again, because one of the hon. members was mentioning a few moments ago how the Thames river and the Grand river had been cleaned up considerably by these sewage works built over the last ten years that the commission has been functioning. When asked about the extent of the actual clean-up of the rivers, the vice-chairman of the commission said, "Well, I believe there are fish a considerable distance up the river." This is true by reports that can be read in the newspapers. But I wonder, has the commission any scientific means whereby they can plot the clean-up of the river at specific places?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I understand by biological surveys. Now, the hon. member asked a question about the municipalities who had not cleaned up their sewage problem. I stated this in my statement last Friday, but I will put it in the record again.

> The latest statistics on requirements for sewage works in Ontario indicate that of the 977 municipalities in the province, only 26 with standard sewer systems have no sewage treatment facilities. Only ten of these have no active plans to make provisions for them. The commission is working with these and they are being required to develop and construct the necessary treatment works.

Mr. Nixon: I thought the hon. Minister told the hon. member for Sudbury that they were not required to proceed with the work there.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are required, but we have not issued a mandatory order. They are working with the commission to get cleaned up. Issuing a mandatory order and being required are two different things. We have not ordered them yet to clean it up.

Mr. Nixon: I am not sufficiently versed in government verbiage—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am not either.

Mr. Nixon: —to see the difference, if there is a difference. We were referring also to the pollution in these rivers that have been caused by industrial waste. The hon. Minister said that he is delighted in the way that industry is falling into line and I am glad that he is delighted, because it appears that in the Grand river there is considerable delay in cleaning up the industrial waste that is causing the main part of the pollution, evidently, in the river.

As a farmer, I suppose I should say that one of the most important sources of pollution does come from the various fertilizers used in the extensive farming operations from one end of the river to the other. I do not know whether any solution can be found for this, but the phosphates that are leached out into the river certainly have a bad effect on the waters.

I would be interested to know if the hon. Minister feels that the report of the Ontario water resources commission, in his view, indicates a rapid enough clearing up of the industrial waste problem. As nearly as I can read it, there has been only one conviction. If that is apparently the careful supervision and scrutiny required, and when we see the amount of money being spent by industries across the province, the figure of $3,473,000, this seems to be rather a small amount for a larger requirement.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, first I will speak about convictions, and our feeling, and I think my feeling is the same as the commission's. I do not think that we should go out and convict some of our larger industries for something that they have been doing throughout the years, or many of our older industries have been doing from the start of their businesses.

When we get industry that is willing to work with the government, or with OWRC, to clean up a problem it is having, I do not think we should ask it to do it overnight. I doubt if the hon. member would want us to go into his riding and close any industry, and say, "Now you keep the door closed until you clean up this pollution, or industrial waste problem you are having." I know he would not want us to do it. I know I would not want anyone to do it in my riding, but where industries are co-operating with us and are going to be cleaned up—and we said last year the deadline was 1970, and we hope this is going to happen with our older industries.

As far as we can see now, or as far as I can see—and I am quite close to OWRC through Dr. Vance and the vice-chairman—we have not too many industries that are saying, "No, we are not going to clean up our pollution or our industrial waste." They are presenting their plans, they are going ahead with programmes—

Mr. Nixon: Would you say that all industries are complying?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I would not say that. I think we have one or two that we are waiting for to say "no," or to present some plans, but we may have to deal with them in a different way. But there are not too many. It is surprising how many are cooperating.

Mr. Nixon: Have you any estimate of the total cost of the industrial sewage disposal plants that would be required to achieve the 1970 goal?

The reason I ask is that your report mentions the sum of about $3.5 million. Whether the money is being spent rapidly enough to achieve the goal is really what I am concerned with, because if it is not, I can see a position where the government of the day might be forced, if they were going to follow your policies of extending this date—and perhaps the industries feel that improvement will not be required.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think it will be an estimate at the best, but we took all industry in the province of Ontario, that there would be spent in the vicinity of $200 million or $300 million in cleaning up pollution and industrial waste between the beginning of last year and 1970.

Mr. Nixon: $300 million?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: $200 million to $300 million.

Mr. Nixon: With $3.5 million spent, according to the report, in—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But I might say that since the first of the year, $7 million has been spent. The programmes are just getting underway after our delivering an ultimatum last year.

Mr. Nixon: Is there any government agency that is prepared to give special assistance for these requirements, as far as loans of money are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Just what do you mean by that?

Mr. Nixon: Suppose they have decided that in order to clean up the waste they have to spend $600,000 or $700,000, is there a special source of financial assistance through the government to encourage them to go ahead with this, or are they going to wait until there is a mandatory order?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, there is no assistance from the provincial government, although there is assistance under the federal tax plan of last year, and I think this is helping spur it on. I forget the exact figures now, but I think some of the larger industries are taking advantage of that tax incentive, to spend money on sewage and waste disposal in their plants.

Mr. Nixon: Do you offer them any service similar to the type you offer municipalities, where you would go in, build the disposal facilities, operate it and charge them a fee for service?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, we have not, and I do not think there is any need for it at the present time, because we have not had any problems that way. When they decide that they are going to go ahead with the project, they seem to have access to the money.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, to take care of the water problem, or the pollution problem in the city of Windsor is roughly a $24 million bill. The U.S. has a scheme where the federal authorities contribute 40 per cent, the state authorities 30 per cent and the municipality 30 per cent. Here in Ontario, the federal government will give the municipality as much as a 25 per cent forgiveness feature. Is this government thinking on the same lines of matching the federal authority on a forgiveness feature, of say 25 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: At the present time, the answer is no. I think this is the reason why we introduced our policy last year, where we would build, operate, do all the financing and put it out on a rental basis, which offsets this. After all, a sewage plant or a water system are of no value, only for the use you can get out of them. If a municipality can afford to finance their own, that is fine; if not, we are willing to do it for them at a very low interest rate.

Mr. Newman: Does the department get the 25 per cent forgiveness feature that the federal authorities—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Newman: May I then make the hon. Minister aware that my own community has requested or has adopted a resolution that requested greater financial assistance from both the federal and provincial authorities in the construction of the whole gambit of sewage and sewage disposal and treatment.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of course, as I said before, we have no way of subsidizing. They can go one of two ways: We either build it, or we will build it, finance it, and they pay us back and they own the system, which is at a very nominal rate of interest, spread over 40 years to pay it back. They have their choice, one way or the other, and I think it is a very good arrangement.

Mr. Newman: What type of agreement was reached with the department here and the city of Windsor? Which of the three types?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that they have not stated yet as to what financial agreement they want, only that they are in agreement to go ahead with the project.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, they have always been in agreement to go ahead with the project. The thing is, you know, financially a municipality cannot always afford to do what it would like to do, especially when the OMB puts certain limits on their capital outlays. My community would like to have done this long ago, but not being able to financially—you know, years ago, we were not blessed with the full employment that other communities had. We had as many as 12,000 unemployed, a little over three years ago. Now it happens to be a little different thing, but because of the terrific improvement in the economic picture there, we find ourselves handicapped, that we do not have enough serviceable land; we cannot get authority to come along and continue development in certain areas because we have not got the funds to put in services.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of course, Mr. Chairman, they will not have any problem here when they reach that point, and they are going ahead with the project. Financing can be arranged and there is no problem. It is the policy of the government and we will build it, service it and operate it. It is charged back at a nominal fee so there will be no hardship as far as the inhabitants of the city of Windsor are concerned.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have four items here, all relatively brief, you will be glad to hear. I was going to deal with them under separate topics but they have now become all bunched together.

The hon. member for Brant referred rather unkindly to the government "verbiage" and being in a mellow mood, I suggested that it should be "terminology", but I think the member for Brant was correct—it is verbiage.

A moment ago, the hon. Minister said that "last year we issued an ultimatum and we hope by 1970 it will be done." Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to ponder that. If last year the hon. Minister issued an ultimatum, then by 1970 it is going to be done.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Not necessarily!

Mr. MacDonald: All right, if he does not mean that it is going to be done, he is just inviting the continuation of the kind of thing we have had for generations. If he is going to have this done by 1970 and he issued an ultimatum last year, I would say that not later than 1968 the hon. Minister should say to the industry involved, "As of 1970 there is going to be a mandatory order slapped on you and you know 24 months in advance that this is going to happen. Now get cracking!"

Otherwise, I predict, as sure as the hon. Minister is sitting there and I am standing here, that in 1975 we will still be going through the motions; he will not have had the pollution cleared up. I think the Minister should, as I suggested some time this afternoon in another context, cut out the double talk. If he issued an ultimatum last year, he does not then in the same sentence get up and say that he hopes by 1970 that this will be done, because I can assure him that it will not be done; they will read what he has in the record and if he says it is not necessarily going to be done, it will not be done. I have clippings here concerning a chemical producers conference. Mr. Caverley was there and he was making some strong statements about what must be done but there was somebody as a spokesman for the institute who said, "You have to balance the costs with how you can get rid of the pollution." Now, if the government wants the pollution to end, the hon. Minister should say it as an ultimatum and stick to his word. Otherwise, they can read between the lines as they have been doing for two or three generations.

I do not know whether the hon. Minister wants to make any comment on that, or not.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might make this comment. I said we issued an ultimatum and we are willing to work with industry and I would think that by 1970 the pollution and the industrial waste pollution that exist today will be cleaned up.

I do not think that the hon. member or the hon. Minister or the OWRC are ever going to be able to say that we will be rid of pollution on the North American continent. It has to be a continual thing because we will be dealing with new things from year to year. I am not going to stand up here and say, "In 1970 we will have no more pollution in Ontario." I do not think that the hon. member would say it either and I do not think that any industry would say it. If they met our stipulations and agreed to do the things that we are asking them to do today, I would not want to give you a guarantee and they would not want to give me a guarantee that there will not be any more pollution in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to labour this issue. Obviously there are going to be new sources of pollution and we have to devise new methods, but I submit to the hon. Minister that he cannot talk in contradictions by saying, "We have issued ultimatums and we hope that they will be lived up to."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We make speed limits and we hope—

Mr. MacDonald: And if the hon. Minister does not find the law is obeyed he imposes some penalties.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Very few.

Mr. MacDonald: Some real penalties, and if drivers violate the law as many times as some of the hon. Minister's industries have violated it, they get their 15 points and they are out of operation altogether. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister's analogy is not a bad one; just let him contemplate it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: But not to take a generation or two. However, I do not want to be in bad sorts with the hon. Minister. I now want to intercede with him. I am a regular fellow and he is a very erudite individual and so I solicit his explanation of this one paragraph in the annual report of the OWRC to be found at page 44, and I read:

> Other pollution parameters studies during the year were fecal coliforms and fecal streptococci (enterococci). Literature surveys helped the branch to keep abreast of advances made in the examination of water and waste water for pathogenic bacteria, bacteriophages and pathogenic viruses, as well as recent techniques in bacterial phagetyping, serological typing and fluorescent antibody typing. Micromanipulation techniques were also being considered to permit single cell isolation of bacteria, fungal spores and other microbial elements of importance in bio-fouling problems.

Will the hon. Minister please tell me what that means in simple English, with no circumlocution?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry that I cannot tell the hon. member what that means in simple language, but perhaps I could get whoever wrote that particular paragraph to put it in layman's language and I could give the member a copy and I could keep a copy so that we will both understand it.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good! Perhaps I can help the hon. Minister; one of my colleagues says that this is devising a new way of catching old bugs—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine; thank you. How absurd can one get, sometimes, for a layman's publication?

Mr. Chairman, seriously, I would like to raise one or two questions with regard to the research programme of the OWRC. I think one of the problems with regard to research is that there is a tendency in a government agency like the OWRC that when you get into a tight budget, here is where the cut first comes. It seems to me that this is one area where some intensive research is not only necessary, but conceivably might be able to come up with by-products that would, in turn, help to finance the research. At least, in the broad context of the economy, it would be of some assistance.

For example, may I ask the hon. Minister what effort is there at the OWRC level, apart from what is done—if anything—at the industry level, to cope with the problem of new waste products?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: All the research is confined within the industry. Does the hon. member mean disposal sale of the by-products?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is the industries' affair; it is nothing to do with OWRC.

Mr. MacDonald: Nothing at all?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister does not consider that this is a field in which the OWRC could give some lead or, alternatively, does he think that the work is being done by industry in this area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would say that most of the industries that are doing research on this byproduct, where they can get a saleable product – and perhaps they are working toward that end, and I think this applies to all the paper companies, the refineries and even our mines today with sulphur and many things, are using the byproduct where at one time it used to be straight pollution of either water or air.

Mr. MacDonald: What about nutrient removal? It seems to me that basically—as I understand the whole process involved—algae is a phenomenal kind of development that emerges because of the number of nutrients in the water. Are we doing any research on the proposition of nutrient removal from water, from which all these other consequences flow?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The answer is "yes."

Mr. MacDonald: And the OWRC is doing this?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: I move, Mr. Chairman, to another topic and would like to have a brief comment from the hon. Minister, if I might.

Mr. Caverley was speaking recently to the annual convention of the alumnae association of the Niagara parks commission school of horticulture, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of January 22, and he made this comment with regard to their water resources study in the far north:

> We are taking a cautious approach. We are at the present planning a study in co-operation with The Department of Northern Affairs on the quantity and the quality of water resources in the Arctic region. The study starts this year and may take from 10 to 15 years.

And a little later:

> A lot of people have been making assertions about diverting this water, but until the study is completed we just do not know the situation.

And a little later:

> Maybe we will find out that it might be better to leave the water where it is and bring people in to develop the country there. The Russians are thinking of making big developments in their Arctic regions. Perhaps we should too.

There are two things that disturb me about the tone and the approach of this whole proposition. Am I correct that the timetable for these studies in northern Ontario is a 10-to-15 year timetable, and is there any really serious consideration being given to the proposition that whatever may be the final conclusions as to the feasibility—financially, engineering-wise and everything else—of reversing the flow and bringing this water to the south, that we might engage in the kind of programme of moving populations to the north? I do not know what that will do to give us more water in the south if we continue to need it, because even if you take people to the north we will still need water in the south.

But on these two propositions—is this the timetable, 10-to-15 years? And does the hon. Minister really believe that that is a speedy enough timetable to meet our needs for water in Ontario and conceivably when we settle this issue—whether or not water becomes a product for export, as some academics have predicted—that a few years from now it may well be one of our major exports?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I cannot say that it will take 10 or 15 years, but I know that it will take some time to make a complete inventory of all the water that we have up in the north part of this province and which is flowing into James and Hudson bays. To make a complete study of the stream flow, quantity, quality—I would think that at the present time we are not too concerned about diverting water to flow into the Great Lakes because I think before fall we will have approximately all the water we can handle in the Great Lakes.

This is one thing when you start talking about diversions. How do you handle water once you get it started coming this way? We can have high water down here and get into a lot of problems.

As far as industry going to northern Ontario is concerned, up in this area this is conceivable. I can recall not too many years ago when I was at North Bay there was not a highway beyond there and there were not many industries, just a few mines, but what has happened in the last 30 years? And many things could happen in the next 30 years. We

might need some of that water in northern Ontario where it already is, and to me this would be one way to solve one of the big problems in northern Ontario, if we could get some of the pulp mills or some of the iron or steel mills to move up there where there is a water supply and employ and develop an area badly in need of development.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I think the hon. Minister is dreaming.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think so. I have been told that before—

Mr. MacDonald: It is one thing to talk about that part of Ontario beyond the gateway to the north—namely, North Bay—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What about Timmins?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Timmins is now beyond the gateway and the north is beyond that.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What about Wawa?

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, but what I am trying to get across to the hon. Minister is that it is one thing to talk about that part of northern Ontario and to talk in the same terms of the area of northern Ontario beyond the tree line, which is all muskeg.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am not talking of beyond the tree line.

Mr. MacDonald: But this is where much of the water is.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know, but there is much water between the civilized areas. I talk about Timmins and Cochrane and there are many trees between there and beyond the tree line and there is a lot of water, too, as the member already knows, because he has travelled in that area.

Mr. MacDonald: I will not pursue the thing any longer tonight. If it is 10 or 15 years, we have 15 years to come back to it, Mr. Chairman. But I hope we can get at it a little bit quicker than that. That is really my point; I was, quite frankly, taken a little aback at the proposition that it would take 10 or 15 years to make a study, even though I grant you that it is a study of considerable proportions.

Briefly, I want to come back to something on which I have raised my voice a number of times during the past year, and on which the government has pronounced itself. The matter rests there—but I want to register a continuing, even a somewhat mild protest, and that is with regard to the contention that the contamination levels in the pollution of the waters in the Elliot Lake and Bancroft areas, particularly Elliot Lake, are such that we do not need to be disturbed and bothered about it at all.

The key point here is that nobody really knows the danger level. There is a general acceptance of the proposition that the results of radioactive contamination of water is accumulative and what the ultimate result of that accumulation will be in either this generation, or in succeeding generations, we really do not know. Therefore, it is my contention that one does not play with as dangerous a proposition as this. There have been studies and tests made to indicate that the radioactive levels and contamination levels in many of the waters around Elliot Lake are far beyond what even this government would accept as a permissible level—which is in the range of 10 to no more than 3 picocuries per litre.

I remind the hon. Minister once again that the federal health department in Washington has specified two—not three, not ten or not 25 or 57 that they have recorded in some of the lakes in certain tests up there—but no more than two is a permissible level and even they do not know what the accumulative effect of this will be down through the years.

This is where I suppose the government gets off the hook; they have one medical doctor in Elliot Lake saying that he is happy with the situation—he has just been elected mayor so I suppose he has got to try to dampen the fears of the people. But I was interested to note that when the report came out last fall, that another doctor in the area, namely, Dr. Jean Pigeon—I presume that he is French-Canadian—referred in rather somewhat alarmed tones to the suggestion in the report that there were no dangers. In fact, he was quoted in the *Star* of November 30 as saying:

> I am concerned about the big lakes, particularly Lake Huron. The contamination cannot be held back for any great period of time. It will trickle down and will certainly reach Lake Huron. After a few decades there will be an excessive amount of radiation in this lake and it will stay there.

And a little later in this story, commenting on the "safe" level of radioactivity said to be in Elliot Lake, in an Ontario government report released Friday, Dr. Pigeon said the contamination process is an accumulative one —a point I made before.

I raise it because if you have any serious problem, as I indicated earlier in statements both in and outside the House there are now authorized by the relevant agencies in the world health organization, procedures for coping with this kind of problem all throughout the world; namely, filtering processes which can be established on the municipal water system so that any danger that may exist disappears completely and the cost is in the range, insofar as I have been able to discover, of $100,000.

Now maybe it is not worthwhile to make dead certain that the lives of a few thousand people are going to be protected but I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that in this rather dangerous and new area where we are still attempting to assess the problem that we face —the danger to human life—this might be a wise thing to do. Indeed, I come back to a point that I made earlier, what has the government done by way of a mass survey to find out what is the radioactive content in the bodies of people who have been living under these conditions?

I am told that it is possible through urinalysis, through the testing of hair and other procedures of this nature to come up with a pretty accurate picture as to what the accumulative radiation factor is in the human body.

Has this, at least, been done to allay fears on the part of the government to the point where they feel that they do not need to put in these filter systems or that they can say, in effect, to the public, "You need worry no more"?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think some of those questions are questions that should be posed to the hon. Minister of Health. I am advised that the townsite supply at Elliot Lake is generally below the limit of 3 and I have been advised by the committee and by the medical people in the Elliot Lake area that there is nothing to worry about, and they felt that they did not need the filters of which the hon. member speaks.

I might say that from now on the mines up there are making arrangements to treat all their refuse and to remove the radiation from the effluent that will be going out. So we will not have any problem from the effluent being discharged from the mills.

Mr. Smith: To follow on what the leader of the New Democratic Party has said, Mr. Chairman, in the report there are five recommendations and five conclusions and most of them are based on the fact that we really do not know what the accumulative effects will be of the radium. Also in the report it states that over an eight-year period there were 1,687 tests done and the report is based on these tests.

This hardly qualifies as a scientific study of the problem and I think that much more work has to be done. Could the hon. Minister tell us if they are following the five recommendations of the report?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes, and I might say that a provincial study is now in progress on those recommendations.

Mr. Smith: Has the hon. Minister approached the federal government in regard to the matter of who is responsible for this, the provincial or the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think the answer is yes, but I doubt if we have decided whose responsibility it is yet.

Mr. Smith: It seems, according to the report, it is the federal government's responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would agree with you, sir.

Mr. Smith: And they have to, in order that —the laws under which you are working are not really enforceable, since it comes under the federal government. But have you come to any co-operative agreement with the federal government in regard to implementing the recommendations of the report?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, we have a temporary working arrangement. Of course, all atomic energy comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. I think you will recall, at the start of this there was some urgency that we get some radium. There seemed to be a war on where they needed it and there was not too much thought of what was happening to the waste, or what they were going to pollute. I think they were worried about existence at that time, and these are things that will have to be ironed out as time goes on.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister through you, sir, on page 69 of the report of the Ontario water resources commission, it indicates that the commission purchased a water system from E. D. Smith and Sons Limited, of Saltfleet township, for $44,000. I wonder if I could have an explanation of just what this entailed?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand it was a private system owned by Smith and it was purchased and used in conjunction with a municipal project under OWRC financing.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote number 605 carry?

Mr. Gisborn: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. They would purchase just the line itself from the lake to the factory? All I am interested in, Mr. Chairman, is I would like to know what kind of engineering was done by the commission to ascertain the value of this line. I understand it has been down for many years. I would wonder how one would arrive at a figure without some very extensive investigation as to the worth of this line. I understand that the E. D. Smith Company laid the line themselves some years ago, and have used it in their operation of a processing canning plant and at some time or other, gained permission to sell some of the water and piped it into some of the existing homes for domestic use.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this poses perhaps a difficult question, but I would think with engineering and appraisers there must be some way of arriving at the value of a water system, the same as any other system, and I understand that this was appraised by, should I say, "accredited" appraisers and the engineers, and agreement was arrived at between the company and OWRC, at a value which it was considered to be worth.

Now I doubt if you would get much of a system today for the sum of $44,000 and regardless of whether it had been laid down by the company or by whom, I would think it still had value and I understand that this was a fair value.

Mr. Gisborn: I notice on page 112, that there is also an expenditure of $44,000 for an extension to the existing system. Was there some agreement arrived at, that this would apply? Is this the same $44,000 they are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is the same figure that appears in the other.

Mr. Gisborn: Was that the same $44,000 they paid to E. D. Smith's and then they charged it against the existing system as being part of the project?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right, as being part of their overall operation.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 605 carry?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister how he plans to control the dumping of raw sewage and miscellaneous matter from pleasure craft along the lakes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, OWRC hopes to introduce regulations this year for approval of Cabinet, and as soon as they are approved, we will advertise these regulations that the dumping of sewage from pleasure craft must cease 12 months from the date the regulations have been approved, and that will be looked after during the year 1966.

Mr. Newman: That is very good, Mr. Minister.

How about the freighters that travel up and down the Great Lakes? Now, with the St. Lawrence seaway we have probably—the Detroit river area is busier than the combined Suez and Panama canals. I understand that 30,000 boats travel that lake in a year.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They come under the jurisdiction of The Department of Transport, and of course they could be under control at the present time. The federal department, not ours.

Mr. Newman: I see.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, I believe that if I heard the vice-chairman of the Ontario water resources commission correctly, he mentioned a water study for Kent county. I wonder if he could tell me if this study has been completed and what action does the Ontario water resources commission intend to take if there is a shortage of water?

Mr. Root: Yes, the report is in and we held an information meeting with the municipalities to acquaint them with what is recommended by the engineers and we are waiting for the reaction from the various municipalities.

Mr. Spence: In other words, you are waiting for the report from the municipalities.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, in that same area, the committee of the OWRC was to meet with Forestry Minister Sauvé regarding ARDA assistance to provide irrigation waters. That was last year. Could the hon. Minister tell me what the outcome of those meetings was and if irrigation waters are being provided with ARDA assistance, or will be?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know some of the happenings. When that was announced last year, as you will recall there was a federal election last fall, and for some reason we could not meet with any of the Ministers.

After that, there seemed to be a shuffle in the Cabinet positions, and I doubt very much if there have been any meetings yet. But I would imagine that later on in the year, providing there is not another Cabinet shuffle and another federal election, we will have a meeting and iron out the problem.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Minister, I do not think there has been any Cabinet shuffle. Mr. Sauvé is still the Minister of Forestry and in charge of ARDA, so I do not think there is any excuse. He has been the Minister for over a year, or a year and a half.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But there was an election and we were not having meetings.

Mr. Smith: But there was no Cabinet shuffle.

Mr. Chairman: Could we stay with vote 605, please?

Mr. Smith: Under the division of industrial wastes, last year this division was set up with 21 members and in June there was an addition of five. Under the present estimates, how great a staff increase will there be?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We are asking for eight additional staff.

Mr. Smith: In February this year, there was a report brought in on the pollution of Lake Nipissing in regard to the city of North Bay and certain industries involved. Could you tell me what happened at the meeting of the OWRC with the people concerned, about three weeks ago, and what action those industries are taking?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member that answer tonight, but if he would like, I will get the information from OWRC and send him a copy directly. I will try to get that tomorrow for him.

Mr. Smith: I do not mean the report, I have the report, but the outcome of meeting with the people there, about three weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is the report that I am talking about. I have not looked at my report yet on the meeting, and I will undertake to get it for you and forward you a copy tomorrow, and if you would like to come and discuss it with me, or officials of OWRC in my office, I would be very glad to arrange a meeting.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 605 carried?

Mr. Smith: No, Mr. Chairman, I have a few more questions, please.

The pulp and paper industry was the first group in the industrial field to be given the ultimatum last year and by June 1, I understand, according to the reports at that time, they were to have primary treatment installations. By December 31 they would have plans for their secondary treatment brought to the attention of the OWRC.

Could the hon. Minister tell me how many and what percentage of the pulp and paper industry have followed this pattern?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Seventy-five per cent will meet the objective. I was trying to get a little high there.

Mr. Smith: And of the other 25 per cent, how many are going to bring in their reports within the foreseeable future?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we would hope they would all bring in a report in the foreseeable future and I do not mean too far in the future either. If they do not, then again the OWRC will be working directly with them in the hopes that we can get it before we have to issue an order.

Vote 605 agreed to.

Vote 606 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: If the members would consider vote 610 next as it deals with the Ontario water resources commission. With your concurrence we shall deal with that one first.

On vote 610:

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, on 610 I would ask the hon. Minister a question regarding the pipeline coming into St. Thomas. I have in my hand a photostat of an editorial in the London *Free Press*. It asks certain questions about the pipeline. There has been some controversy about it in that area.

One paragraph from this editorial says this, or it is an article, I am sorry, by Norman Ibson:

> As a provincial agency, the OWRC had to act swiftly out of necessity because the government had promised a company freedom from water worries before it committed itself to the Talbotville site and picked up priority option.

They are speaking there, of course, of the new Ford plant which is coming into Talbotville. The inference here is that the OWRC had promised, or the government had prom-

ised, that the plant would have water when it got there and then the OWRC had to make that promise good.

The significance of this is that the people of St. Thomas, according to the articles I have in my hand, may well have to pay a great deal more for water when this pipeline is installed than they are now paying. Therefore, in order to get the industry into Talbotville, the people are assessing themselves much more than they ought to assess themselves. In other words, their civic authorities are putting the assessment on them to help the Ford plant. I realize the importance of industry coming into an area and the Ford plant is going to be an economic asset to St. Thomas and to the area around about it. But certainly there is a great deal of concern—and I have a lot of it expressed here but I am not going to read it—a great deal of concern about higher water rates in St. Thomas because of the new pipeline. The feeling is that this is perhaps a subsidy being paid to Ford to come in there and that the OWRC has made good a promise to Ford via the government, via the OWRC, the thing is not very clear.

But the other question in connection with this—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I wonder if I might answer that question first because I am getting tired and confused when I get too many at one time. Did I understand the hon. member to say that the city of St. Thomas would be subsidizing the Ford plant?

Mr. Young: The feeling that is expressed in these comments in both the St. Thomas and London papers is that the rates will be much higher for water in St. Thomas once the pipeline is in. Now this may or may not be a founded fear, and perhaps the answer is right there, but if in fact the water rates do not go up, then the situation is clarified. The fact is that there is a great deal of fear that the rates will go up. The people of St. Thomas have a feeling that they have adequate water supplies now for their city, that that water supply could go on more or less indefinitely over the years to come with normal growth. If it had not been for the new plant coming in, the necessity for the water coming in from Lake Erie would not have arisen. Since the water is coming via pipeline, water rates are going to rise higher. Now, if they are not, this fear is unfounded.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say by what I know about this and I have discussed it somewhat with officials of the OWRC, St. Thomas has a marginal water supply for the population that they have today. I think the hon. member would agree with me that when the Ford plant is built at Talbotville and when some of the supporting industries are built around there that St. Thomas is bound to grow. Does the hon. member agree with that or not?

Mr. Young: I would agree with it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: When St. Thomas grows, they are going to need additional water supplies and I think we are just trying to guarantee that they are going to have them when that day arrives and again, as the hon. member said, their water rates may go up and I think we will have to leave it at that until it happens and then we could discuss it further later. But I think they will find this was a good move to ensure that they are going to get water. I doubt if they are going to subsidize the Ford motor plant for the water they are going to use.

Mr. Young: This, of course, may arise out of some competition between the two areas of London and St. Thomas; I do not know, Mr. Chairman; certainly when this industry comes there will be need of more water, I agree with that, but this question has been raised in the various articles and I put it before the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, just cleaning that up for the hon. member—this was a recommendation to the city of St. Thomas in 1956, that they pipe water in, so it is something that did not happen just because the Ford plant was coming in.

Mr. Young: I thank the hon. Minister very much for the answer.

The other question that arises in this connection is this: Is there a plan to integrate the two pipeline systems eventually so that the pipeline coming in from Huron to London and from Erie to St. Thomas will hook up so that any time in the future when there may be a shortage of water in any place in the area, the other pipeline can supplement that shortage? This is a problem that often arises in municipalities where pipelines come in from different directions. Ultimately you have to put the link in to make the pressure equal and to satisfy the various areas as far as water is concerned. Is that hoped for here? It seems to me it makes sense in view of the whole region being developed as one unit, rather than as two units based on two pipelines.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: At the present time there is no arrangement to hook the two pipelines together. Of course, as the hon. member knows, the city of London wanted its water pumped from Lake Huron and this other is coming from Lake Erie. But I would think if the situation ever arose where there was more water needed in the area something could be worked out, that you would have a grid to supply both areas.

Mr. Young: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 610 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The last vote before us is 609, the hydro-electric power commission.

Vote 609 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves the committee of supply rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, hon. members will recall, we will sit at three o'clock and there will be a private members' hour between five and six.

First we will proceed with bills in committee of the whole House. It was stated that the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development would be presented. I am not certain that it will be possible to proceed with that department and if that is the situation then we would proceed with The Department of the Provincial Secretary and/or the office of the provincial auditor and/or The Department of the Lieutenant-Governor.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:55 o'clock, p.m.

No. 103

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Questions of Mr. Wishart re coroner's office, Ontario Hospital in Hamilton, Mr. Gisborn 3247

Plant Diseases Act, bill to amend, reported 3248

Stallions Act, bill to amend, reported 3248

Telephone Act, bill to amend, reported 3248

Resolutions re Bill 61 and Bill 107, concurred in 3248

Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, bill to establish, reported 3249

Power Commission Act, bill to amend, reported 3251

Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, reported 3251

Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, reported 3252

Vital Statistics Act, bill to amend, reported 3252

Juvenile and Family Courts Act, bill to amend, reported 3252

Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act, bill to amend, reported 3252

Jails Act, bill to amend, reported 3252

Industrial Farms Act, bill to amend, reported 3252

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko 3252

On notice of motion No. 22, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Apps, Mr. S. Lewis 3261

Recess, 6 o'clock 3271

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Prince of Wales school, Hamilton; and in the west gallery, Corpus Christi school and St. Joseph's school, Penetanguishene.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to rise on a point of order.

I submitted a series of questions for your approval addressed to the hon. Attorney General and your office refused to entertain or permit me to submit these questions. Now, I think they have merit in them and I can see no reason for your person to reject these questions.

Mr. Speaker: May I inform the member that I gave the reasons when I returned the questions to the member, why they were disallowed and that should suffice. If the questions submitted to the Speaker's office before 12 o'clock on the day on which the questions are to be asked do not, in the opinion of the Speaker, come within the rules of the House for asking such questions, he disallows them. I may say I sought out the hon. member this morning. I was unable to find him, so I left my reply with the executive assistant in the Liberal office, with a note to this effect that the questions did not come within the ambit of the rules of the House and therefore I felt that I could not allow them to be asked.

Therefore, the member does not have any further point of order.

Mr. Ben: If I may, Mr. Speaker, am I to—

Mr. Speaker: No, no further point of order.

I explained the reasons to the member and there is no further point of order, because there has been nothing said in the House at the present time that has been out of order.

Mr. Ben: Well, is the Speaker the sole arbiter of these questions?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. If I disallow a question then there can be no further question asked when the House convenes.

Mr. Ben: And there can be no appeal from your ruling?

Mr. Speaker: No appeal. It has to be done in my office before 12 o'clock.

Mr. Ben: Well, that is very democratic!

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last the hon. member for Wentworth East asked a question of myself. I took it as notice at the time and I was not in the House to answer before now.

The question was: In the Attorney General's opinion have all the procedures and functions of a full-time coroner at the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton been carried out in an efficient and effective manner?

The answer is that I am advised that the relevant reports do not disclose any lack of efficiency or effectivenes in the functioning of the coroner's office in Hamilton. There is no full-time coroner at the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton but Dr. Edwin Crack, who is admittedly 93 years of age, conducts most of the investigation at the hospital. He will, of course, be retiring this year in accordance with the new provision which I have introduced in The Coroners Amendment Act, 1966.

There was a second part to the question: Does the Attorney General intend to look into the procedures of the coroner's office at the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton?

I would answer that I do not intend to investigate the procedures of that particular office because the supervising coroner is

aware of the circumstances and does everything necessary to ensure the continued and proper operation of it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order; committee of the whole House. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT

House in committee on Bill 18, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 18 reported.

THE STALLIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 19, An Act to amend The Stallions Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 19 reported.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

House in committee on Bill 36, An Act to amend The Telephone Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 36 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

during the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967, the expenses of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 61, An Act to establish The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

That,

the moneys required for the purposes of an agreement under section 14a of The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, as enacted by section 1 of The Juvenile and Family Courts Amendment Act, 1966, shall, until the 31st day of March, 1967, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 107, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, before the first resolution is concurred in, I assume that the money required, or at any rate the basic amount required, will actually be voted under the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General. Am I correct in that, for this year?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): This is, I believe, my bill. I think I introduced it. I think the money for it is—but I do not know that I can stand here and say for certain that I do know whether it is—contained in the estimates of the Attorney General. Perhaps I will leave him to answer.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I cannot say at the moment. I did not bring in my material on the bill, but I think I could give the House assurance very shortly.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Money, money; who has got the money?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Chairman, this would authorize the expenditure in any event. This bill will authorize the expenditure of the sums that are necessary during this fiscal year.

The only problem with putting it in the Budget—and as I say I do not know whether it is there or not, but I doubt that it is—would be that really we do not know what the expenses would be. But under this resolution, there is authority for payment out of the consolidated revenue fund the sums that are necessary as the expenses are incurred. In other words, I do not think you will find an item in the estimates of the Attorney General to cover the expenses of setting up this department.

Mr. Bryden: I can understand that there may be expenditures not anticipated. On the other hand, I was led to believe that some branches or sections of The Department of the Attorney General will be transferred.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In that event, Mr. Chairman, then the vote in the estimates of the Attorney General attached to that function would move with the function into the new department. This bill and the resolution contained here would cover just the expenses involved in actually setting up the department and any new functions it might have that are not presently covered in the Attorney General's estimates. But in his estimates we have not attempted to anticipate functions that he is not already carrying out, if the hon. member sees what I mean.

Mr. Bryden: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to throw any sharp

curves this early in the afternoon. I raised the question as a matter of interest. Perhaps I could ask the hon. Attorney General that when he brings his estimates forward in the House, he might identify for us the expenditures that will, in effect, be transferred to the new department. In addition, if it is possible, perhaps he may be able at that time to give us some idea of the additional expenditures that the government anticipates will be required to get this department operating as a going concern. This could be done under his estimates after he has had a chance to review the matter.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to see what can be done to satisfy the hon. member's request. I think it is apparent that the items read, at least insofar as they concern The Department of the Attorney General, under the bill, which will go into the new department, do move out from The Department of the Attorney General to the new department.

Insofar as the situation is presently concerned, The Department of the Attorney General is carrying and administering all those things, so that they will be, and I know that they will be, included in our estimates, as would be the normal practice. Because this legislation is just in the stage of being considered by this House.

I am quite certain, although I cannot give the hon. member any detail, that there will be items in the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General which will cover these matters, as is normal procedure.

After the setting up of the new department, once the legislation is passed and receives Royal assent, it becomes a new department and at that moment the administration moves from The Department of the Attorney General. The funds necessary to set up the administration would be something on which the Attorney General could not give information or exercise control.

I am satisfied there will be in the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General all the features which cover those various things which it is intended to convey to the new department for this year.

Resolutions concurred in.

THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS

House in committee on Bill 61, An Act to establish The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

On section 1:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was not present when this bill came up for second reading and it may be that the matter which I wish to raise has already been discussed to some extent. However, I think it is worth raising it again.

It seems to me that the name of this department is most misleading as to its functions. Financial and commercial affairs usually leads one to think in terms of functions such as are performed, shall we say, by The Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa, or a department of that kind.

As far as I can see, this is a department whose functions will be regulatory as far as various types of financial and other institutions are concerned. May I ask if this is the department which will be responsible for the administration of this new consumer legislation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the title would not better convey the general area in which the department operates if it were changed to the "department of financial and consumer affairs." I hesitate to put the suggestion forward because, as I indicated on second reading of the bills concerned, I think its activity in the consumer field will be far from adequate. Nevertheless, it will be carrying on such activity as the government sees fit to carry on in this field. It would seem to me that a name for the department such as I have suggested would be a little more explanatory of the nature of the department's work than the one now before us.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, we spent a lot of time discussing this before this particular name was chosen and it is difficult to find a name that will give expression to the various functions that the department will have, because they are very wide-ranging and in my opinion, to call it a department of consumer affairs would be quite limiting—

Mr. Bryden: Financial and consumer affairs.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We felt that the word "commercial" would embody such things as the hon. member mentioned: If he reads over the list of Acts that will come under administration—mortgage brokers, insurance, real estate and business brokers, securities and The Used Car Dealers Act—he will see that

it covers a very wide range of things that seem to be all gathered up in that one word, "commercial." This, I think, would be a correct generic term to cover all the functions I mentioned. The financial affairs, of course, refer more particularly to such things as The Insurance Act, The Loan and Trust Corporations Act and The Securities Act, which are very closely associated with the financial affairs of the province.

It is a sufficiently cumbersome title as it is without adding something else and we felt that what the hon. member referred to could be deemed to be embodied in the term, "commercial affairs." When you start looking for names of departments that have any breadth of function whatsoever, eventually the choice of names becomes simply a matter of judgment in choosing one and getting on with the legislation. I might say that we examined and rejected 15 or 20 suggestions before we decided on this.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, at the time of the second reading of the bill the hon. Prime Minister indicated that he would give consideration to a suggestion which I made at that time, that The Bailiffs Act was not a proper Act to be included in this department for the reason which I then stated. The reason I stated was that The Bailiffs Act is peculiarly one related to The Department of the Attorney General and has to do with an Act under which persons are able to use bailiffs for self-help purposes. I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Lewis, that section 4 be amended by deleting the words, "1. The Bailiffs Act and renumbering the items in said section 4, 1 to 12."

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think there are some features of the bailiff's work in the provisions of The Bailiffs Act which come within, perhaps properly, the administration of The Department of the Attorney General. On the other hand there is a very wide area of bailiffs' work which is simply the seizure, the gathering in of property, the sale, the handling of the funds and in a very clear sense commercial.

I would say that certainly not all the bailiffs by any means are related to the courts. Bailiffs are of various classes and appointments and they are engaged really in commercial transactions, in the getting of property and the disposition of the property and the accounting of the funds. I certainly would say that if one is to look at The Department of the Attorney General and the Attorney General carrying out his functions as a law officer, a bailiff is a long way off. He would more properly come within the new department, which is Financial and Commercial Affairs, and certainly there is no reason that the activities of the bailiff, the provisions of The Bailiffs Act, cannot be well administered in the new department.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale has moved that section 4 be amended by deleting item No. 1, The Bailiffs Act, and renumbering the items in said section 4 from 1 to 12. All those in favour of the amendment, please say "aye." Those opposed, will please say "no." I declare the amendment lost.

Call in the members.

Mr. Renwick moves that section 4 of Bill 61 be amended by deleting item No. 1, The Bailiffs Act, and renumbering the remaining items from 1 to 12.

All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

All those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are seven, the "nays" 75.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and the section carried.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, in order to comprehend the objection I take to the wording of this section, one has to deal with 5 and 6 together. In my view, the sections are not very handily worded because in some of the statutes at least the Attorney General is not mentioned. To that end, I looked at The Insurance Act, for example. The Attorney General was the Minister designated to administer The Insurance Act but he is not mentioned in the statute. The Insurance Act defines the Minster as being the member of the executive council charged for the time being by the Lieutenant-Governor in council with the administration of the Act.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the hon. member goes back to section 4, he will see by it that the Minister who would be the Minister of this new department is responsible for the administration of The Insurance Act. That would put The Insurance Act under this

Minister and you would not need to go to section 5. Section 5 would cover those Acts where the Attorney General is specifically mentioned. We tried to cover it both ways.

Mr. Sopha: I see. I am a very reasonable person. I am deeply grateful for the explanation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was prepared to accept an amendment if we could find something to amend but it seems it is all right.

Sections 5 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 61 reported.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

House in committee on Bill 62, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, may I hold this bill up?

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill 63, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, I move that paragraph 6 of section 105 as reenacted by section 1 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following item:

> The guaranteed investment certificates of any trust company that is registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Mr. Chairman: What section did the Minister say?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Section 105 as re-enacted by section 1.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I have the amendment here now.

We have an amendment to Bill 63, section 1, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, that item 3 under paragraph 6 of section 105 as re-enacted by section 1 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following item:

> The guaranteed investment certificates of any trust company that is registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister explain the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would look at the bill he will note that it gives permission to invest short-term money. This amendment gives them permission, if permitted by their board, to invest in certificates of any trust company that is registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Mr. Bryden: Some of them might have been in a mess if this policy had been in effect a year ago, might they not, Mr. Chairman?

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill 63 reported.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister, would that allow the public utilities to invest in certificates of, say, the York Trust company?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, it would allow them to invest in any trust company registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act and York Trust would be registered.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 64, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Sections 1 to 40, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 41:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on 41, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Prime Minister whether it is his intention to move forward with this bill, so that it can get Royal assent along with others that I understand are going to be given some urgent consideration?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The Minister informs me that there is no objection in an administrative way, from his point of view. I have not really fixed a date for Royal assent for any of the bills at present on the order paper, but if His Honour is coming in, we will put in everything we can, in order to be in a position to go ahead with the legislation, so this would be included. There is no objection on the part of the government for moving it forward as rapidly as possible.

Sections 41 and 42 agreed to.

Bill 64 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I do not really think Bill 86 should be on the order paper. We want it to go to the legal bills

committee for examination there. I move that this order be discharged from here, it will then go to the legal bills committee and then come back here in committee of the whole House after it is considered there.

Motion agreed to.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

House in committee on Bill 104, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 104 reported.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

House in committee on Bill 103, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 103 reported.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

House in committee on Bill 107, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 107 reported.

THE PENAL AND REFORM INSTITUTIONS INSPECTION ACT

House in committee on Bill 108, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 108 reported.

THE JAILS ACT

House in committee on Bill 109, An Act to amend The Jails Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 109 reported.

THE INDUSTRIAL FARMS ACT

House in committee on Bill 110, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 110 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution, and certain bills without amendment and one bill with amendment, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a certain resolution, and certain bills without amendment and one bill with amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, this is the sixth consecutive year that I have had the pleasure of presenting the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. It is not yet a record, but I am getting to the stage where there are few former Provincial Secretaries who held this office this length of time.

The most interesting thing is that although I have the pleasure of tabling many reports, and on behalf of most of the departments, and although The Department of the Provincial Secretary is among the oldest in the historical development of this province, we have never as yet filed a report on behalf of the Provincial Secretary's department. I hope this is an item which will be remedied in the forthcoming year, because the department has a wealth of information to tell the hon. members of the House and the public at large. So often we find ourselves so busy doing things, that we do not have the full opportunity of proclaiming to the world what we are doing, and I shall devote a good deal of this coming year to bringing the light from under the bushel where it has been hidden.

The department has historically been sort of a catch-all department, as exemplified by the varied list of items in the estimates. We are called upon from time to time to do functions that spring up from the exigencies of the moment, and my mind goes back to

the year 1965 when there was a postal strike in the province. The office of the legislative postmaster is within this department, and we were called upon to co-ordinate the efforts of the government in ensuring that the very valuable and vital correspondence relating to government business continued. Of course, the bulk of the work of delivery of the mail was merely an extension of our internal delivery service, which takes place in delivery from one office in this building to another, and extension of that from this main division of the legislative buildings to the branch offices throughout the province. In particular, there was a great deal of concern when we were confronted with the fact that the thousands of cheques were owed to our superannuated teachers and to welfare recipients. We had to ensure that they received their cheques on time.

It was very encouraging to see within a 24 hour period all of the relevant departments of government were combined into a working committee. We were able to make contacts of the distribution which individual departments were using as part of their services—the vehicles of The Departments of Lands and Forests and, indeed, some of their planes, Highways, Public Welfare, Attorney General, Tourism and Information and the Ontario provincial police, and it was really remarkable that we were geared up within a 24 hour period to cope with this emergency.

I think the only item which ultimately was delivered in bulk was in relationship to The Department of Public Welfare cheques. I think the meetings were held on a Thursday, and The Department of Public Welfare was able to place their cheques, by virtue of their field officers, into the hands of all the recipients.

This was an encouraging thing. In modern developments, not related to this specific type of matter, it may be that the government must gird up all its forces in a hurry to meet some type of emergency, and this was a very interesting exercise indeed.

A year ago, I indicated our move to the hon. members, and at that time there was an invitation extended to all members to visit every part of the north wing, which had been renovated and reconstructed on behalf of the department. I use the expression, tailor-made to suit our needs, all in order to have an efficient physical plant that we might serve the people of the province of Ontario, because ours is, as is noted again by the items and the sub-headings, basically a service department.

We are very happy in our present quarters. Experience has shown us that there may be adjustments. Fortunately, the type of partition and the type of construction lends itself to ready adjustment, and we propose to do this.

The bulk of our servicing takes place in relationship to the corporations branch, and an expedient has occurred. By bringing all of our solicitors into one compact group we have been able to co-ordinate their efforts, and I shall be referring in a moment or two to the volume of business that we are able to produce. In prior years, solicitors were scattered all over the south wing and the offices to which they had to turn for files were also scattered. Now we have a very compact unit.

As I said, we extended an invitation to all members of the House and I should be delighted to arrange at any time for any member to be escorted through that north wing, and a detailed and a knowledgeable explanation given of all the functions taking place.

The important reorganization phase which has taken place in recent times is the setting up of the operations branch. All the hon. members will see its appearance as a subheading for the first time in our estimates, and the nucleus of that division is the special services, the commissions of appointment and the recording office, being combined with that division which we are calling our systems and analysis division, to enable examination of each phase of the work of the department, and recommend the improvements.

When we moved, organization and methods of The Department of Treasury made an overall survey. Now we will have key personnel right within the department, to subject ourselves to this particular review.

I should like to just detail the work of the operations branch. It receives and sends all dispatches from other jurisdictions which are routed to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor. It drafts, processes, and gazettes all proclamations. It authenticates, after gathering all relevant information, the provincial documents and similar material required for presentation in foreign jurisdictions. It prepares, as I have indicated, the presentation of all the reports of the various departments and agencies. It advises on matters of protocol and precedence. It answers inquiries regarding the coat of arms and permission to use the same, and related matters. It issues commissions of appointment of the great seal of Ontario and the privy seal of the Lieutenant-Governor. It co-ordinates the training programmes referred to, through the

Ontario government, by the federal Department of External Affairs and I refer to such matters as the Colombo plan and other Commonwealth aid plans, and the United Nations training plans.

Prior to the Easter recess I indicated to hon. members of the House that people were visiting with us at that time; I am delighted to report, that a very successful series of seminars were held. It, of course, prepares the congratulatory scrolls which have become so very popular with the hon. members.

I think that some three years ago we were preparing less than 2,000 scrolls; this year we are going to be close to, and will perhaps surpass, 4,000 scrolls. During the course of the year we have developed a new scroll and this may be of interest to some members who have not seen it. All hon. members are familiar with the 50th anniversary scroll which appears lengthwise.

We are very fortunate in this province in having people who are happily wedded for not just 50 years but in many cases for as long as 60 years, and we have had an instance of 70. I think there will be an instance of the 75th anniversary of wedded bliss. And because some of these people will have received the 50th, we have come up with a new design for the 60th wedding anniversary. This is a very handsome scroll with diamonds in the corner and I think it will prove to be very popular with those who will have received one or two of them. As I said, the number is increasing greatly and they are very popular with the members.

Last year I reported that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce led all the members of the House in the number distributed. The member for Kent West heads the list in this past year in the number that have been used. Again, I commend the scrolls very highly to the members because they are very popular with the recipients and I, of course, had the pleasure of presenting congratulatory scrolls to my parents before Easter. The hon. member for Cochrane North is going to have the pleasure of presenting a scroll, signed in this instance by the hon. Prime Minister, myself and by the hon. member himself, to his parents on the occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary, which is an interesting situation, too.

The special services division also has under its jurisdiction the administration of the hospitality fund, and the hon. member for York South will recall with interest the menus that we produced for the first time. I will not refer to the two specific items that he and I talked about, but I have before me two of the menus which we are trying to use in the course of our provision of hospitality.

One menu relates to the tendering of a meal by the government of the province of Ontario to the national technical and vocational training advisory council meeting here in May of last year. There were present the hon. Minister of Education and the hon. Minister of Labour for the government of Canada, the hon. Mr. MacEachen at that time, and the menu was Niagara fruit cocktail, celery hearts and Queen olives, chef's salad, roast prime ribs of Ontario beef au jus, pan roasted Bradford potatoes, green beans, and Ontario blackberry parfait.

I was delighted to see that the Minister who took the suggestion in this instance best was none other than the hon. Prime Minister of this province and I have before me a menu which should set an example for all to come. It was a dinner appropriately held in the old country where we—that is, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development—were attempting to sell our products. Listen to this menu, Mr. Chairman:

Menu—Ontario produce; "Sun parlour" tomato juice—Kent county; baked Lake Erie fillets of perch, Louis dressing; prime rib roast of beef—Middlesex county; "Garden Counties" golden whole kernel corn—Essex county; buttered green beans—Brant county; roast potatoes; Beaver Valley deep apple pie—Georgian Bay; Bay of Quinte cheeses—Prince Edward county; coffee; Niagara wines—Welland county; Matinee cigarettes—Norfolk county.

Is that not a menu that you can invite—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the next time; the only one that did not get a description was the roast potatoes. Maybe they were brought in from Ireland for the occasion.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I hope that they were not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The special services division is in charge of the recording office, and here again, so much of the technical work of the department. They have a great job to do in reporting the facts of the day, as made apparent by the very important government documents of the day.

I will just run through them quickly: proclamations convening this legislative

assembly; commissions of public inquiry; the proclamations bringing into force Acts and amendments thereto; letters patent granting and leasing Crown land; letters patent granting and leasing mining land; election writs; licences of ferries; certificates of incorporation under The Insurance Act; declaration under incorporation of The Benevolent, Provident and Other Societies Act; letters patent; supplementary letters patent; extraprovincial licences; licences in mortmain; all the appointments, executive councilors, sheriffs, justices of peace, Queen's counsel, notaries public, and all these items. The total number of recordings last year was 16,700 and some 3,500 copies were furnished with 3,500 certificates of authentication.

These documents go right back to the very beginnings of government in this province and it must be recognized that some of them are very old indeed and in the beginning they were all contained in books. I think the term goes right back to ancient common law days of the Doomsday Book in which all these items were recorded and, of course, through usage and the passage of time, they have been subjected to hard handling.

When making a review of the matter, we discovered, fortunately, that The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Mines were also vitally interested in this field, because so much of their original documentation is in these books. I am delighted to say that we were able to work out a method whereby all of these things will be microfilmed and the important documents will take their place in the archives of the province so that they will be maintained in perpetuity for examination by the most modern methods, yet for historical purposes we will have the originals.

I pointed out that the new section of this operations branch, the systems and analysis branch, will be devoted to making the department an efficient department in all aspects in order that we might continue the production line which we have.

All members of this House, not only the lawyer members, are familiar with the companies branch of the department, which plays an important role in the economic life of this province. Here again, I wish that these statistics were in a report for the members and they will be, I hope, in future years. But I would like to make a comparison for the year 1966 as compared with the years 1956 and 1946 and I will read these in reverse order, that is, starting in 1946 and continuing to 1956 and 1966:

Corporations incorporated: 2,000, 4,600 and 7,300; supplementary letters patent; 270, 742 and 1,500; licences in mortmain: 122, 222 and 250; extraprovincial licences: 23, 149 and 195. This is an indication of the growth. It has been a steady growth in a line almost directly up like a 45-degree angle.

One can see that in the last 20 years the figure of companies incorporated rose from 2,000 to 7,300, that is an indication of the growth of this province in other fields. It is interesting to note that in the last ten years there have been some 60,000 companies incorporated and I am delighted in review to find out that of between 70,000 and 80,000 corporations which are alive today, I have signed letters patent—without regard to all others—of 32,000 companies incorporated in the last five years. So that in the term of office of six years, that would be close to 40,000 legal persons that I have brought into this world by the signing of my pen. And the total corporate documents in that period would amount to some 50,000.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is quite a claim to paternity.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, I am an excellent midwife, I guess.

The work of the corporations branch involves not only the technical part, which we are trying to reduce to as routine a phase as possible. I have indicated the electronic data processing facilities which are coming into vogue, because I still look forward to the day when people will come in and ask for information and someone at the desk will push either one button or a series of buttons and the documentation and information will be reproduced that way. However, whatever we do in that field—and the annual return that I introduced in this House before Easter is part of that process—we will still have to rely on the good judgment of the people in the granting of names.

On referrals to other departments, I have before me the sheet of referrals that the department does in respect of applications which are received. There are 95 types of referrals which require reference to about 46 different agencies, and they are either government departments or sub-agencies of the department in order that we get their opinion. In the final analysis the responsibility is with the department, the discretion is with the Provincial Secretary, but we do this referral process to provide us with as much background material as is possible in order to arrive at a reasoned decision.

The public office, which is immediately at the entrance to our department, has been very active. I have heard a great deal of commendation about the type of facility which is available for the public and the solicitors to work in—the facilities they have in respect of the information they are able to get. We are always striving for improvement. It was brought to my attention that in a recent case there was a delay in getting a file, but when a department is processing up to 1,000 applications at one stage or another throughout the department, one can realize that the relevant files may be out through the department.

We are hoping to set up as foolproof a system of tracing so that a file, as it goes from person to person, will leave a trail. In any event, we have asked that where a member of the public or a member of the profession has to wait for a file, if an appreciable few minutes pass he should be immediately advised of the fact that the file is not immediately available and how soon it will be available.

Members of this House are vitally interested, of course, in the legislative library and this matter has arisen on a couple of occasions already in the House. I made an initial statement during the opening days of the Legislature and recently there have been questions asked respecting the same. I have been walking through the library as often as I can and I am delighted with the progress that is being made.

It is true that there is inconvenience in respect of trying to get information as quickly as in the past. I know the librarian and her staff are completely dedicated to the members of this House right across the whole 108 members for whose benefit the library exists, regardless of the fact that others may use it. The library is unique.

There is no doubt about it that we have, apart from the location, a library which is a very significant one. As a collector of Canadiana, some of my very limited material resources have been expended in acquiring Canadiana within the political and historical fields so far as it pertains to this province. I know from a personal point of view that there are volumes on those shelves which to an unexperienced eye just look like—say, a well-worn book—but that book may very easily be worth $100 or $200. I do not know which is the most valuable book the librarian has on her shelves, but I am sure there must be one set of two volumes that must be worth in the neighbourhood of $200 or $300. Indeed, some of the books are irreplaceable and the librarian is very much concerned that they be maintained in an absolutely perfect condition.

There is a process of rebinding some of the books. Treasury provided a substantial amount of money for this. We took advantage of this time to review our files and the archives has just finished microfilming the so-called "scrapbook *Hansard*."

In the early days, *Hansard*, as the hon. member knows it today, did not exist, as the large printed volume, nor even as the early mimeographed forms which are in the reference library in the northwest corner of this assembly and which have been bound. In the early days, when there was not a *Hansard*, the librarians of this province fortunately kept scrapbooks of newspapers to find out what was said in the early days of this Legislature. We very often have to go to those scrapbooks. Archives has microfilmed them from the first session in 1867-68 until 1946.

During the move that took place in June, a number of old letter books from the period 1883 to 1920 were discovered, along with packages of mail, from the years 1894 to 1912. I have not had the opportunity of reading them, but I am advised by the librarian they make fascinating reading indeed. They are being listed, and turned over to archives.

I can assure the hon. members of this House that a year from today we will not only have for their comfort some of the finest facilities for quiet study and deep research and erudite reflection—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Even today—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Even today, yes, we have some of the facilities, but they will be even better. They say they will be a long cry from the facilities which I used to use as a law student sub rosa, if I may use the expression, some 30 years ago.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is already.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would like to touch on one matter. I am pleased that within the department there is a continuous programme of staff training and development. This especially pertains to the newly appointed staff, and I should like to just touch on some of the courses which were taken as an indication of what the civil service is doing in this regard.

They took the certificate course in public administration at Ryerson institute, a super-

visor's course of The Department of Civil Service, the personnel course, the position specification writers course, the management course of The Department of Civil Service, and the university extension course on law and laymen. That was again in particular reference to the library staff, because as hon. members will know the law library forms an integral part of the library and the librarian wanted her staff to be as up to date as possible within this field.

Then, of course, the routine civil service typing and shorthand course was taken, and the orientation programme is taking place within the department. Again, as I say, the most pleasing feature has been that in the past year the department, as a unit, has been able to be brought into the north wing and we are able to put some of these time-tried and proved processes into effect.

I turn to a branch which perhaps is small so far as total personnel and the total number of dollars spent within the department are concerned. I am not saying that I play favourites but I may say that this particular function is one that is very close to me and that is the function of the citizenship branch. Hon. members will recall that although within the government there was, under the community programmes branch, almost what amounted to a pure language and citizenship course, some half dozen years ago there was brought into the Provincial Secretary's department a small division which was to be directed to the extension of citizenship programmes. Then in 1961, the new name of the department came into being and I have the honour of being the first combination Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship.

I should like to spend some time delineating these functions because they are very vital to this province. The province has had the good fortune in the postwar period to add to those who came as newcomers and immigrants in the pre-second world war period, more than half of those who have come to Canada, which is a very significant number indeed. We now have within this province some two million in addition to those of the two basic stocks of our country, and about half of those have come in this postwar period.

We have within the citizenship division a classification known as citizenship liaison officer, which is a very demanding position, I may say in my opinion. We are fortunate we have in the past year been able to recruit two and they are doing extremely well. I should like to give the specifications for liaison officer trainee. As I read the specification, interestingly enough it will be a microcosm of the work of the department. The specifications list is as follows. The characteristic duties are:

> Language training; under supervision, maintain liaison with school boards, voluntary agencies, social and religious associations, ethnic organizations and other groups concerned with the English language and citizenship classes and the integration of newcomers in a designated, geographical area.

That is the assignment of the particular officer.

> Investigate the need for classes; provide information about departmental education programmes and resources; recommend what teaching aids and other material should be supplied to establish classes; arrange accommodation for classes sponsored directly by the division; ensure that student enrolment warrants departmental financial support; verify teachers' pay claims; collect and maintain records of classes and student registration in the area.

Then the participation in the information services:

> Advise local social agencies and assist with the planning and implementation of educational and informational programmes for newcomers in order to facilitate their integration into the community, and the like.

Then community service:

> Assist with citizenship receptions; make arrangements for teachers' seminars, with special instruction regarding language teaching methods; may arrange seminars for members of community social agencies on governmental services available to newcomers; prepare reports; make recommendations and conduct necessary correspondence.

That is a microcosm of the type of work, because they are the privates in the field who carry out the direction of the superiors.

The most important aspect of the function is the language training programme. This is an opinion which I hold to very strongly. The greatest handicap which a newcomer to any new environment—whether it be a newcomer to the environment of Ontario or anybody if he had the occasion to go from the environment of Ontario to some other country where there is a different language spoken—and the initial and serious barrier is

one of language. A human being who cannot understand a communication or who cannot communicate is strapped, he is handicapped.

The energies of the department have been devoted, in particular in the last six years, not only to continue the basic work which was initiated back in 1946 but to get into new fields, to experiment with new types of undertaking and to meet this challenging, and I may say, very difficult task. We are confronted not with teaching one group of citizens a language; we are confronted, as I will indicate, with a host of people whose native language is a host of languages, coming to learn the basic language of the community, which in the urban areas of this province is basically the English language.

Dealing with the language classes, I am going to touch on some of the overall picture, because some of these things are so interwoven that it is not easy to look at one without looking at the other. The three basic language classes are those that have three sponsors—the school boards, that is, the boards of education across this province, the voluntary agencies across this province, and those which are administered directly by the division as being our direct Ontario government classes. Those are the classes that we actually run regardless of where their physical site may be.

In the last year, the figures that I have for November show that in the school boards across this province there were some 450 classes with just under 10,000 students; that we had some 59 citizenship division classes with about 1,000 students, and that there were 224 volunteer agency classes with some 1,700 students. I am giving round figures. That gives an indication of the classes.

The registration over the entire province this past year has increased by about nine per cent. In Metro Toronto, which of course has the advantage of having the division physically within it, I think the increase has been some 15 per cent. So far as the division is concerned, the number of classes has remained the same, but the number of students has risen by about ten per cent. That is in the basic, overall language classes. I am going to give some refinements of the situation.

The Toronto board, on the basis of a research project which we conducted in 1963 and 1964 as to whether adult newcomers would attend four-nights-a-week classes, and which in our experience proved its worth, now offers four-nights-a-week classes at four schools in the city. The city of Hamilton board now also offers similar classes. That is in order to provide a continuity of classes in this regard, because the other classes are not as concentrated.

The voluntary agency sponsorship classes are a very important segment, because we have to have the formal atmosphere of the schools, and because we have to deal with such a wide range of people from such a wide range of countries, with different customs and usages, and different starting points. Some are very hesitant to go to a formalized institution, so that voluntary agencies have been able to form a very important role in providing classes in an atmosphere which perhaps is—I will use the expression—friendly. This is not to say that our institution classes are unfriendly, but I think hon. members will appreciate the simile—the difference in atmosphere between a school, which may be even a high school, as compared with accommodation which will be in a voluntary agency.

They have certain handicaps. The teacher turnover is greater and the standard of teacher is not what we would like it to be, but they are making a very important contribution, and I will come in a few moments to a very important aspect of this.

Then we have the classes which are operated by the citizenship division alone. The functions of the citizenship division are to provide advisory services and administrative support to all language and citizenship classes, including advisory services and the textbooks, but where there is a need for language classes which cannot be met by local school boards because of specific circumstances, we try to fill it with voluntary agencies. We provide the classroom space, we will pay for the rental of the classroom space if the agency provides it, and we will provide all the facilities. Then in our own classes we will provide and pay the teachers. These classes are also operated in industries where the hours of work or the location of the industry prevent the workers attending.

I think the best way that I can illustrate the gap that the citizenship division is filling is by actually skimming through the places where these classes are held. This will give, I think, a very vivid and visual portrait.

In Amherstberg, the Verdi club, which I think is a club of Canadians of Italian extraction, has a class; in Hamilton, the Italian technical education centre, six classes; in Kitchener, the Kitchener and Waterloo council of friendship, two classes; in London, the

excellent work of the international services of London, where they have five classes; in Sudbury, the university women's club.

In Metropolitan Toronto—which, of course, has a large number of newcomers, and those that have to fit themselves more rapidly into the urban way of life—international institute, COSTI, and the west end YMCA, account for 42 of our classes; we have the workmen's compensation board rehabilitation centre at Downsview with five classes; the Estonian house on Broadview has four classes; the Ontario Hospital at 999 Queen street west, has four classes; St. Stephen's centre, three classes; Toronto general, three classes; the Inn on the Park, two classes. The provincial institute of trades, one class; and then in the summer, as part of our summer training programme, in conjunction with the Toronto board of education, we have 135 classes, and with North York board of education, ten classes.

Mr. Thompson: Did you say the Toronto general hospital has three classes?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, at the Toronto general hospital there are three classes.

Anyone familiar with some of the places that I have spoken of, such as the Toronto general hospital, will know that today the technical working staff at all levels is made up of a very large number of newcomers. We are sponsoring the classes. It is very interesting that in the Inn on the Park, a private establishment which has a very large personnel of newcomers that service that establishment—we have established classes there, and I have correspondence—

Mr. MacDonald: They are all low wage areas.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Low wage areas? I am not familiar with the wages paid in that area. As I say we cover the ground in our classes.

It is interesting to note, sir, that the Bell Telephone of Montreal, hearing of our classes, made application for some of their executive personnel to attend our classes, of course, within the terms of our agreement.

I should have pointed out that our agreement in respect of adult training is on the basis of a federal-provincial agreement which we have worked out. It is on a cost-shared basis. They would not come within the terms of the agreement, but we arranged tutorial assistance and other advice which we would provide for anyone.

I want to take one particular type of place where we have made an excellent development and I am full of praise for it. That is at the international institute of Metropolitan Toronto. The international institute, in all phases of assistance to newcomers, right from extending the friendly hand to providing counselling service, has turned out to be one of the most interesting and successful places for our classes to be held. For the past three years this programme has been operated on a year-round basis.

The board of education classes are run in accordance with their seasonal requirements, apart from our participation in the special summer classes. These classes operate two-and-a-half hours a day, five days a week, and they meet the needs of shift workers, unemployed persons, women or other adult students who are unable to attend regular school board classes. We basically provide the operation of that class.

It was my pleasure to be there, just before Easter, when they had their graduation party, and it is wonderful the enthusiasm that all the students have for this particular class. This particular class, in conjunction also with the work of COSTI, which I will refer to in a moment, has been one of the two great proving grounds for our experiments into what can be done when classes are provided on a broad range.

I also want to refer again to what we call the escalator language training programme. We try to have our classes on the basis of an escalator. That is, these classes are going on at different levels, so that a student can step in at his level, and continue from that time. The problem is, and it has been pointed out in this House time and time again, that teachers come and teachers go, and students come and students go, and some attend for only a matter of days while others go through courses for two or three years and they go through all that broad range. We are trying to adapt our programme to fit the needs of the newcomer. That is, we cut our programme to fit them and do not try to make them fit our programme, which I think is the proper approach.

In respect of the special type of classes, since 1961 the department has co-operated with COSTI and the provincial institute of trades at Nassau street and at Dartnel, in operating a number of combined English and trades training programmes. Here again, we have bilingual teachers who are able to teach the trades, but human nature being what it is, the basic reason that the

students go to these particular schools is to learn the trade, or to be able to get a sufficient knowledge of the trade that he can be gainfully employed.

I am always trying to preach that it is of vital importance to learn the language first. Once you have learned the language, then everything is open to you. You have all these channels and all the facilities available, and that is now the considered opinion of those who are dealing with these things. When I come, for example, to the content of our language and citizenship classes, we have now shifted our content to 60 per cent language and 40 per cent what we call citizenship training. Once the person has learned the language, he has available to him all the newspapers, all the periodicals, and all the wealth of material through which he can pick up the specific items of citizenship which he wants to have, in order to be integrated into our way of life.

A very recent development in the field of language training, an added option for newcomers, under the jurisdiction of the local school boards, has been the addition of language training as an approved subject under programmes 3 and 5 of the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreement of 1961. This agreement between the federal Department of Labour and the provincial Department of Education, as hon. members know, provides for a system of skill and vocational training programmes for unemployed adults, operated under the jurisdiction of the local school boards. Students in attendance receive allowances, while undergoing training to fit them for new vocations.

This is where the department is playing what I might call a very significant role. Although the department has grown in personnel and in dollars spent, a vital part of the work is that of getting other agencies or other departments to make their special facilities available, with some modifications or alterations, to the needs of this category of persons. It was this division that highlighted this need in the course of discussion between various departments that took part in the intergovernmental committee. As a result, this extension of the programme was made and newcomers admitted to language classes receive allowances under the programme.

This was, to my mind, a very significant role. All the landed immigrant needs is to have 30 days residence as a landed immigrant, and he can attend, receive allowance, and take either English only, English and academic uptraining, or English, academic uptraining and skill or vocation training. This shows the kind of parcel that is made.

I referred to language training at the Toronto general and at the Inn on the Park not on the job but on getting ready to do the job, and again I would like to refer to the excellent work of COSTI.

COSTI is an outstanding example of where the dedicated persons within the community have seen a problem which confronts their particular community and done something about it. My mind goes back to a meeting which took place in a restaurant on College street, on the second floor of the Capriccio café. Incidentally there was excellent lasagna served that night, and after the lasagna, we sat down with members of our staff, Father Carrero and Mr. Caccia, and we sympathized with them, we encouraged them. We told them that we agreed that there was a need.

From that very small beginning, COSTI has grown to be a very influencing factor in the life of this Metro community. It has expanded its services, not only within a physical plant on Dundas street, but is assisting in Estonian house, on Broadview avenue. Its influence is felt in the ITEC plant in Hamilton. The interesting thing is that COSTI not only is doing a service, but there are two other very interesting aspects. One is that the community of Canadians of Italian origin took upon themselves this very great social step. There had not been this type of activity, to my knowledge, to any degree within this particular community, and it was a significant step for the community. The wonderful part was that it has now turned out to be a very significant step, and something to be emulated and admired by all concerned.

There are two other categories that I should like to touch upon, and one is in respect of the newcomers who fall within the category of women, married and unmarried. A number of years ago, in 1962, 1963 and 1964, we had operated as an experiment the so-called kitchen classes and reference has been made to them heretofore in this House. I may say that I personally was disappointed that they did not turn out as successfully as we had hoped, but we have gained experience in the meantime.

A very interesting experiment took place this past year under the guiding hand of Mrs. Margaret Norquay who, in my mind, is to be highly commended, as are all those associated with her. I met with the group only last Friday and I have a list of names of the people who came with her. It was an inspiring thing to see this group of people from across the broad range of our

citizens. I will not mention them by name, but it included a vice-principal, and a graduate in social work, a volunteer and social researcher who drives in from Oakville. One of the women who participated in the class came as a part of the delegation, and she was Exhibit A, if I may use the term, of this programme. There were also a member of the Catholic family service association and one of our teachers, a member of the social planning council. I do not mention them by name because they are part of a dedicated group of citizens in this city.

We have been watching their work with interest and as a result of that meeting on Friday I am adopting a recommendation of the department that we will conduct a three-year experimental programme in co-operation with selected voluntary agencies to determine effective means of recruiting immigrant women into language classes operated by these agencies under the supervision of teachers employed by this department. We are going to use the experience of this particular group to enlarge this, because this experiment will not be restricted to one particular place. We are now going to have four selected places throughout the community, and they will again be in the voluntary agency facilities.

We have discovered, for example, that any doubts we might have about any newcomer going to a facility provided by another community language group, or another religious group, have been dispelled. If the facilities are made known and if the confidence is obtained that the purpose of that facility is for the language and citizenship training programme, we have discovered that there is a very ready acceptance. A very significant portion of this experiment will be that side-by-side, as we deal with the immigrant women—that is, the mothers, the newcomers—there will be a programme developed for the pre-school immigrant children to be operated by, and to be the responsibility of, the voluntary agency. We are not moving into this field as a department or division, but the two things will be operated hand-in-hand.

That, I think, has been the significant success of this aspect of Mrs. Norquay's particular class—that they have arranged to have the mothers and their children in the same facility, at the same time. One only has to be in the company of the teacher and the mother in a discussion of this kind to see the enthusiasm that is felt for this kind of programme.

Mr. Chairman, it is now five o'clock.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 22, by Mr. R. F. Nixon,

Resolved,

> That special classes for children with learning disabilities be established on a regional basis across Ontario at provincial government expense.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Racine, resolution No. 22, standing in my name.

During the past few weeks we have discussed during the estimates of The Department of Health and on other occasions, the difficulties that certain of our young people experience in obtaining an education in Ontario. Some of these difficulties are obvious in the regrettable instance of mental retardation, where we in Ontario have provided hospital schools to which these unfortunate young people are sent so that they can be assisted in adjusting, in spite of their overwhelming handicap, to the best of their abilities.

We know also that schools for retarded children have been established in a number of the progressive cities across Ontario so that it is no longer essential that these children be sent away from home in order to experience the advantages of some special assistance.

The second type that we have discussed in this House has to do with the young people who are emotionally disturbed or in fact psychotic. They suffer from no retardation but through some mental quirk or through some extraordinary pressures that have been exerted upon them, sometimes physical, sometimes otherwise, in their home or school circumstance, these young people have developed these mental difficulties that sometimes require them to be sent to special institutions where they can be cared for. On the other hand, there are a good

many of these people unfortunately afflicted in this way who have really no accommodation at all in the province of Ontario where their parents can turn for the assistance they so desperately need.

The third category of young people who have been afflicted in this way or in a similar way is those who have been born with cerebral palsy. Even though their mentality may not be affected in any way, because of their inability to control their bodies and their speech, it is not possible for them to attend ordinary schools and so there are special community schools, that have been established on a private basis usually, in the centres across the province.

But the category of afflicted young people that I want to talk about this afternoon is not included in any of these three. These people are referred to as having specific learning disabilities, they have difficulty in perceiving the learning experience around them and they are usually referred to as being perceptually handicapped. They are not mentally retarded, they are not emotionally disturbed, they do not suffer from cerebral palsy, and so we must not confuse them with these three categories that I have outlined.

I would say that these young people are extremely numerous in this province. It is estimated by those qualified to do so that there are 300,000 people of school age and younger in Ontario, who suffer from perceptual handicaps. They are of average intelligence and some of them are well above average, so they are in no way retarded mentally. They have the ability to perceive their environment as we have—that is, their eyesight is normal and their hearing is normal —but the difficulty takes place after their observations of the world around them are transmitted to their brain where proper perception should take place, accompanied by the interrelationship of these facts as they are observed by the individual.

It is here that the difficulty takes place, and although their sight, hearing and other senses are individually normal, it is in the relationship and interpretation of the information within the brain itself that there is a severe difficulty and breakdown of function. Thus extreme difficulties are experienced in learning how to read, to understand instruction, to relate words already learned, to speak and to respond to normal teaching circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, young people, particularly, experiencing this difficulty are very numerous in Ontario. Those of us without any specific learning along these lines normally refer to them as "spoiled kids." They are people who do not respond to normal family discipline and respond in a very bad way, frequently, to school discipline. They cannot fit into circumstances of the normal classroom, and as a matter of fact, they react in such a way to these otherwise normal situations that they form the largest segment of the dropout population. Many of them have difficulty in achieving normal success even in the very early grades of our educational system.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, these people have within themselves, difficulties that can be corrected. They can be corrected fairly easily and without being exposed to the expensive and rare ministrations of psychiatrists and people with these special knowledges and professional capacities.

Before going further, I would like to say something about the causes of these perceptual handicaps. Basically, they are caused by impairments of the central nervous system, and without going into details that are beyond my competence, I would say to you, sir, that frequently they are caused by prenatal injuries or brain damage at birth. Along with this are a large number of cases where illness or injury during the important formative years of the child have taken place causing this injury to the central nervous system. A fall or a bump on the head—and I suppose that there are very few children who are raised without these—can cause the perceptual handicaps that I have described.

Sometimes they are caused by sustained high fevers that are associated with childhood illnesses, or a small accident in the car—perhaps something as common as somebody stepping on power brakes too suddenly and the child being flung forward into the dashboard or on the back of the front seat. Something as simple as that can cause the apparently minor injuries that are associated with these perceptual handicaps and which can be corrected.

The incidence of these difficulties is very great indeed. Statistics vary but, Mr. Speaker, you may be aware that already there is an association of people concerned with this range of difficulties. This association has sponsored some research; certain universities in Canada and in other jurisdictions have looked into the matter. The statistics of the incidence vary but the average would indicate that between ten per cent and 15 per cent of the children in Ontario or in any other specific community that is selected, suffer from these perceptual difficulties, and it means that it is going to be difficult and

almost impossible for them to fit into a normal school environment. They are sometimes referred to as "slow learners" and are dealt with in this way by the schools and on an individual basis. I will try to point out to you, sir, a bit later that this does not always fill the need and, as a matter of fact, there are many instances where the difficulty is aggravated by putting these unfortunate young people in with students whose difficulties of a mental nature are entirely different and caused by some other means.

I have said that between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of our young people are severely handicapped by these perceptual difficulties, but other researchers indicate that 30 per cent of our young people suffer some measure of the impairment that can give them increasing difficulties in a school situation. When these statistics are applied to Ontario, it means that there are 300,000 children in this province at the present time who suffer from perceptual handicaps to a greater or lesser degree and of these 300,000, 60,000 are at present in the school system.

I suppose it would be obvious that most of them would be found in the lower grades, because these difficulties soon become apparent even in nursery school, kindergarten and grade 1. Instances of young people failing kindergarten and grade 1 are well known, certainly to teachers, and many of us as parents may have this difficulty in our own children or in the children of families well known to us.

As I said a few moments ago, the ordinary symptom is that the child appears to be unmanageable and spoiled; he reacts in an abnormal way to certain stimulation and becomes unnaturally excitable. In a school situation, no matter how hard the child applies himself to his work or how conscientiously the mother assists him in keeping up with the rest of the class, he does have a continuing difficulty in maintaining his position there.

In order to be more specific about this phenomenon, I thought that I would read a short paragraph from a brief prepared by the Ontario association for children with learning disabilities that was presented to the select committee of the Legislature on youth. Some of the members of this committee may have had an opportunity to question the people representing the association, but I think it would be of value and interest if I were to read two paragraphs from this brief, and I quote:

> The perceptually impaired child exhibits behaviour of a hyperactive and impulsive nature. He is easily frustrated, distractable, disorganized and repetitive with very short interest span. He will not perceive the things he sees, hears or feels in a proper fashion, the sight or sound becoming distorted when it reaches the brain. Therefore, he cannot learn in a normal educational setting until he is trained to perceive normally.
>
> The earlier the process of retraining is initiated, the greater are the results obtained. Conversely, if the child is allowed to remain in a normal or opportunity classroom, the difficulties he encounters in his inability to cope and the constant punishment he receives for his hyperactive, uncontrolled behaviour create an overlay of severe psychological problems. He is so used to achieving negative results that he soon ceases to try to learn, remains retarded and failing further, so falls behind his classmates.

This, in a more concise way than would be possible for me, sums up the difficulty. We all know children who are afflicted in this way. We may not realize that 60,000 of them are in our classrooms at the present time.

What happens in the classroom now where the teachers are untrained and unable to cope with these special difficulties? I suppose most of the young people struggle valiantly with the assistance of their worried parents and finally fail. One statistic associated with this that would interest you, Mr. Speaker, and some of the other members of the House, is that the cost for keeping a young person in a primary school classroom for one year is $450 on an average. So for every failure, $450 extra must be spent in order to allow the young person to repeat his year. I will refer to this later when I talk about the economics of providing effective assistance from the revenues of the provincial government.

There would be a considerable saving if our efforts would be crowned with some reasonable success so that these young people would be able to continue in their regular school course without having to repeat and finally drop out. As I say, I suppose most of the young people simply attend school, fail, get into increasing difficulties, and then are withdrawn from the school. However, certain of them undergo severe school difficulty from the very start, and the people who are in charge of this matter simply consider the child retarded when in fact his IQ may be normal or above normal. He is then sent

away to a school for the retarded with all of the expense and frustration that would be involved in that.

As a matter of fact, the child whose problem, if properly diagnosed, could be cured or at least helped and set on the proper road to learning, is relegated to a situation where hope for him has been given up and he would be assisted in simply coping with the situation as a retarded person.

The third thing that might happen to him is that he would be sent to an opportunity class in the school. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people in the House, yourself included, who have had teaching experience and I would venture to say that a number of the members of the House are familiar with families where the young people cannot accomplish academic work, and have a chance to attend so-called opportunity classes. Here, no matter how sympathetic a teacher may be, she is trained to deal with the person of lower intellect and lower capacity to absorb academic training and this is not the problem that we are talking about in these young people with perceptual handicaps. The teacher, as I say, no matter how sympathetic she may be, cannot provide the assistance these young people require.

I suppose at the bottom of the list there are those who are such a problem at school and come from areas where no alternatives do exist, that at the urging of the teacher, and with the consent of the school board and the inspector, the child is simply withdrawn from school and kept at home because the school system in that particular area has no way in which it can cope with the problem.

Fortunately, recognition of the difficulty is beginning to creep into the educational system of this province and things beyond these four possibilities that I have listed are starting to be done. There are, at the present time in Ontario, 27 special classes where the teacher is trained to deal with this perceptual handicap that is not associated with retardation. Most of them are in Metro Toronto, three of them are in Ottawa and three are in the city of London. But these classes accommodate only 200 of the perceptually handicapped children of Ontario and, as I have told you already, there are 60,000 of these young people in the school system of this province.

So, although certain of the municipalities and the school boards have made some progress toward beginning to meet the problem, most of the children are as yet unassisted and most of the school boards are proceeding in the belief that their opportunity classes are all that is required, when in fact they provide little or no assistance for the children that I am talking about at the present time.

The Department of Education is reasonably sympathetic to the problem. In 1964 and in 1965, they provided special summer courses for teachers to be trained not only in the recognition and diagnosis of this difficulty, but in teaching classes that are specially laid on to assist the young people. It is interesting to note that of the 30 teachers that attended the special classes in 1964, only one of them is in fact using this information in a special class for the perceptually handicapped child. This is because there are simply not enough funds available to provide these classes that are so sorely needed.

I should mention in passing that not only the government agencies and the school boards are taking some steps to assist with this problem, but I have specific knowledge of a group of optometrists who are giving classes at no charge to those young people whose perceptual handicap is associated with their sight. I am informed that their sight is good or perfect in some cases but it is in the malfunction of the brain itself where the message, I suppose it might be called, that comes from the eye to the brain is not perceived properly by the brain because of some previous damage. This damage is not of the sort that cannot be repaired. At least, professional assistance can teach the child to overcome the distortion which is associated with the way he may see a certain object. He can be taught to make as good use of his powers of sight as any normal child. The same is true of hearing and the other senses that may be distorted because of these handicaps that I have been describing to you, sir.

At the present time, The Department of Education has dealt with the difficulty as I have described. There are permissive regulations that permit school boards to set up special classes, with specially trained teachers to staff them. Funds are found to provide some of the equipment that is needed for these classes but most school boards have not taken advantage of the lead that has been provided by our own Department of Education.

I would submit that this lead has been ineffectual because there has not been enough information distributed to the school boards about it. The school boards are continuing to assume that these young people who are having difficulty with the educational system

are simply intellectual incompetents or lazy or suffering from some difficulty other than the one that could be diagnosed if there were trained staff available to do it.

So, as I say, in spite of sympathetic teaching, special training is required if these 60,000 young people are going to get the assistance that they must have. I would suggest to you, sir, a threefold programme should be introduced in the province that would go considerably beyond what The Department of Education has undertaken up to this time. It would begin with diagnosis—a very difficult thing indeed—for those young people who are not severely handicapped by these perceptual difficulties. For those who are grossly handicapped, our teachers should be provided in the colleges of education and particularly in the teachers colleges, with the information that would permit them to identify the young people at an early age in the lower grades who obviously suffer from these handicaps.

General practitioners across the province could be alerted to the frequency that has been found by other researchers so that as they examine these young people, who come before their professional eye in any capacity, they would be on the lookout for the diagnosis that is so important. But, mainly, from a number of sources in the community—in the churches, in the YM and YWCA, at school and other community services—these young people can be picked out as soon as possible and sent to central diagnostic clinics that are maintained by the government of Ontario under the jurisdiction of The Department of Health.

The CPRI clinic in London is one of the better-known ones but all of the hospitals dealing with children specifically, and which have some special responsibility along these lines, could be designated as diagnostic centres. I would not suggest to you that these centres would deal only with the perceptually handicapped child, because, of course, part of their function would be to deal with those who are basically retarded or have some other physical or mental disability. But once diagnosis has been achieved, then treatment becomes the thing that is most important.

This does not involve heavy new expenditures, it does not involve the provision of a lot of expensive equipment to the schools. It does require a co-ordination of teachers, doctors, specialists in speech therapy, those with special responsibilities in the community such as doctors specializing in eye diseases and optometrists, physiotherapists and others, so that the co-ordinated effort would be provided to assist these young people. Part of the treatment would be the stepping up of research at the university and clinical and hospital levels for specific assistance that may be rendered to the victims of these disabilities.

To show you how effective treatment can be—treatment that does not involve expensive equipment and does not involve hospitalization or the use of special institutions—I would describe to you, sir, the result of one experiment involving a group of perceptually handicapped children. These have been professionally diagnosed so it was found beforehand that they suffered from no other disability. Because of their perceptual handicap, they were rated on an IQ scale in a range well under normal, which is 100 to 110. Most of them had at that time IQs between 70 and 80.

These young people underwent treatment by teachers and others, some of whom had taken the special classes provided by The Department of Education. It was found that after a series of special classes, 90 per cent of these young people, who would have been classed otherwise as retarded or needing some opportunity classes, were then rated with an IQ well over 105—between 105 and 120. It appears, then, that they were made mentally normal by these special classes and this special assistance.

It seems like a miracle because children classified as dull were made normal. They were not relegated to special homes for retarded children, they were not taken out of the regular classroom stream, they were able to return to school, and many of them have since been able to undergo normal achievement in the school system.

Education rather than health or welfare is the key to this difficulty. The 60,000 children at present in our school system can be helped with a co-ordinated effort. The machinery is there for our school boards and other officials to institute these classes. The facilities for the special training of teachers in summer courses has already been set up. And yet the steps have not been co-ordinated to meet the problem across the province of Ontario.

I have pointed out to you, sir, that the costs would not be large and the returns would be enormous. Economically, it is well known that for every year that is repeated in the school system by a student, $450 in extra funds have got to be found. If we can assist these young people to

achieve success and avert failure, we are saving money. But the real saving, of course, is the opportunity that we can provide for the 300,000 young people in Ontario to develop and take their place in our community.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kingston is next on my list and then the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): The list must have got mixed up. The one I received from the Whip indicates that the member for Scarborough West is next.

Mr. Speaker: The list I have is Nixon, Apps, Lewis.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry there has been this mixup in the order of speakers here, but I think probably the comments of the hon. member for Scarborough West will be very similar to mine.

I am very happy to have this opportunity of speaking on this particular resolution, and to support it as well as I can. We on the select committee on youth had the opportunity of hearing a brief presented to us by Mr. R. H. Shannon, the president of the Ontario association for children with learning disabilities. I may say it was a very excellent presentation and I for one was most impressed with the contents of that brief and was certainly convinced of the need of more help being given to those whom we might call perceptually handicapped, than is being given at the present time.

I think one of the things that was most important was the fact that there were so many who could be classified as having some degree of learning disability. As the hon. member for Brant has indicated, that figure stands at approximately 60,000 within our school system alone and could reach as high as 300,000 in the whole province of Ontario. One of the problems apparently has been the fact that there was some confusion as to just what was meant by perceptually handicapped children and in order to clarify that to some extent, I would like to quote from the brief that we did receive, which I think clears it very well. Mr. Shannon, in his presentation, went on to say:

> Children with learning disabilities should not be confused with children who are subject to established clinical categorization, such as retarded, emotionally disturbed, psychotic, and so on, but rather should be categorized as children described as perceptually handicapped or neurologically impaired.
>
> The words "perceptually handicapped" are used because of their inability to discriminate and co-ordinate information received through their various senses, or in other words, they do not perceive as others perceive. In some cases brain damage is obviously present, in many cases not.
>
> These children are usually capable of being educated rather than merely trained, but they do require diagnosis to establish the nature of their disability, treatment to overcome the disability, and education by special methods and specially trained teachers to make them capable of reaching their full potential as members of our society.
>
> With a total programme such as this, these perceptually handicapped children can be rehabilitated and become participants and not bystanders in our society. The recovery rate [as the hon. member for Brant has indicated] if caught soon enough, can be very high.
>
> Perception is the process of understanding experience, of comprehending the information our senses give us. Without perception, our world would seem fragmentary and distorted. And to the perceptually handicapped child, life is a distortion. For him it is difficult, often impossible to separate ideas, to discriminate between the important and the irrelevant and to co-ordinate information.

You might say, what is the incidence of the perceptually handicapped? It has been indicated here by the hon. member for Brant that it is very high and the unfortunate thing is that in many cases we have not been able to diagnose these great numbers of children satisfactorily.

What happens to them when they are not diagnosed properly? They may be struggling along in the bottom of the class. They may be in classes for other disabilities. They may be put into these opportunity class systems that The Department of Education has. They may be institutionalized, or they may be kept at home. In Ontario, practically none of these children are now being rehabilitated, and no complete diagnostic facilities exist in Ontario to uncover these children. Their position is really unfortunate.

I would like to suggest that The Department of Health and The Department of

Education, along with the Ontario association for children with learning disabilities, convene a conference and, among them, try to set down a programme by which they can not only find out who these children are, but formulate plans so that they can be properly educated and so properly take their place in society. We are advised that many of these children can be diagnosed even before school age, and that the percentage rehabilitated, if diagnosed before they get to school, is even higher than it is after they begin school. The further they go along in school the tougher it is to rehabilitate them.

It would seem to me to be a very practical idea to have The Department of Education, The Department of Health, and those who are very vitally concerned with this problem —the parents who have these children, that is, members of the Ontario association for children with learning disabilities—to sit down and convene a conference, and bring to this conference competent people in this area, and try to find out the best way to go about finding the problems of these children, and to determine the course and the programme for them, so that they can be helped in a much better way than they are being helped at the present time.

We were also very fortunate to have appearing before our committee, Dr. W. A. Hurst, who is president of the York county educational research council. I would like to bring before this House, some of the comments of Dr. Hurst, in connection with this very pressing problem. He said there were two main problems which affect school boards, teachers, pupils and the taxpayers: (1) The failure rate within our school system which vitally affects the teacher, the pupil and the parents; (2) The massive cost of failure affecting school boards and the taxpayer.

That there is a phenomenal waste in both pupil and tax resources cannot be denied. This can be shown by figures from a 1957 survey in the province of Quebec where totals of approximately $100 million were paid out for failures in the primary grades up to grade 7 only. This was based on the figure, as the hon. member for Brant said, of from $400 to $450 per child per year, and the failure rate was found to be some 25 per cent. This failure rate for Quebec may be a little low for Ontario if we take reading retardation as our criterion. May I hasten to add that one of the major causes of reading retardation is the perceptually handicapped child, since the perceptual problem may lie in one or more of the visual-auditory tactile or kinesthetic perceptions. Dr. Hurst went on to say that the cost of maintaining failures in adult life is astronomical.

Mr. William Branson, chairman of the economic council for Canada, in an address to the Canadian vocational association remarked, and I quote:

> The office of economic opportunity in the United States has calculated that the dollar cost to the American economy of each student who drops out before completing high school education is well over $1,000. During a lifetime, uneducated and unskilled workers contribute less in taxes, and impose a large welfare and unemployment bill on their community. And this group has a higher incidence of delinquency. Their illness rate is twice the national average. The cost per dropout could be considered more than $100,000.

Let us assume that it is just $100,000 and no more. Thus one could argue that on the basis of these U.S. statistics, in pure economic terms, every $1 million that the taxpayers invest in education is liquidated when ten students are put on a lifetime pattern of taxpaying skilled employment. A vocational institute costing $5 million starts to pay substantial dividends after it graduates 50 students in gainful employment.

Treatment of learning disabilities should start in early pre-school years. Specialized personnel with a high degree of training in the functional aspect of child care should be employed. We know that a minimum of 20 per cent of the kindergarten population has perceptual disabilities, and if it is detected earlier in the pre-school years, very little training is required to eliminate most of the problems. However, if this problem remains undetected, and the child, as required by law, remains at school to 16 years of age, emotional and environmental complications resulting from learning disabilities will increase with the years, together with the cost of eradication training. Finally, at 16 to 18 years of age, it turns out to be an almost hopeless task.

Not only are we talking in thousands of dollars for the failures in our school system, but think what it means in the terms of the child. What price do you put on the cost of preventing failure? Failure—with all the misery it entails for both parents and child, ridicule, loss of faith and pride in one's own ability, together with all the emotional upheaval this brings.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that we, as legislators, realizing the problems of the perceptually handicapped child, are in a

position to do something about it, are in a position to do more than we have done previously, and are in a position to bring light and happiness to many thousands of children, who are now entering and are in our school system at the present time, but who because of the inadequate diagnostic facilities, the inadequate treatment facilities, the inadequate research that has been going on in this particular area, are doomed to a life of failure.

If it is not for something like this that we are here, then I may be mistaken to some extent because I believe that one of the reasons we are elected to this particular job is to see what we can do to help others that are much less fortunate than ourselves. I do not think that there is any way to do this better than to take a good hard look at the problem of the perceptually handicapped child, and through the co-operation of every means that we have available—our Department of Education, our Department of Health, our universities and our schools—get together and do something more for these people, who goodness knows need the help a great deal.

I could read you excerpts of letters from parents who have written to the Ontario association for children with learning disabilities, almost pleading that they be given help. For the first time in their lives they have been able to write to an organization that they feel may be able to give them some help.

Mr. Speaker, I for one, am very happy to speak on behalf of this resolution brought by the hon. member for Brant, and I would urge that this government certainly put more effort and more money into a problem which I think affects the lives of many thousands of children.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, like the member for Kingston, I rise in support of the resolution put before us. I must say that with his usual precise and graphic exposition, the hon. member for Brant has covered the subject so comprehensively that there is little left to say. I will try to deal with that very little, Mr. Speaker.

As the member said at the outset, children with learning disabilities form part of that growing number—at least we are aware of a growing number—of children with handicaps in this area in the province of Ontario, variously estimated at between 60,000 and 300,000. In this case, as has already been said in this debate, the problem lies in the difficulty in perceiving the external world, and conveying the messages in the external world directly to the brain, because the central nervous system has normally been damaged at some point in life and a malfunctioning is involved.

In the process, the possibilities of adjusting within a school system where there are no special classes are very limited indeed. I would, however, take one small exception to what the member said, Mr. Speaker: The ability to categorize these individuals in precisely his fashion is not yet given to us; in fact the problems of disturbance that arise for perceptually handicapped children are so deeply interwoven that the whole pattern of diagnosis is now just being discovered. It is probably sufficient to say that the figures he quoted relate to the thousands of children who are variously handicapped, of which perceptual handicaps are probably the dominant feature.

The interesting part about this resolution, to me, Mr. Speaker, is that it conveys the failure of the school system in the province of Ontario and—I am not going to be quite as charitable as the hon. member for Brant—it conveys the failure of the hon. Minister of Education. The Minister runs a smooth and benevolent political machine, with a glittering court and entourage, moving from school opening to school opening, much in the fashion of Louis XIV, announcing that "I am the state."

The fact of the matter is that what he is doing in truth is signifying the paradox of our educational system; this government's headlong rush into creating a sufficient number of places for students has resulted in two fatal consequences, I suggest.

One is the content and quality of education itself, which I suggest to this House has been largely debased in the process—but obviously the education estimates are the place to discuss that. The second fatal consequence, and I think equally important, is that tens of thousands of children embraced by this resolution, are educationally disenfranchised, are excluded from a school system geared to the normal child. They do not actually drop out, as much as they are arbitrarily thrown out of the school system, in the absence of any adequate facilities.

We spent some time this afternoon on estimating the numbers involved. It is very difficult. Everyone uses the figure of five to ten per cent and one is naturally uncertain in deciding what is the right figure. I was frankly startled that the hon. member for Kingston did not mention the one school

board in the province of Ontario which has actually conducted a study to find out the accurate percentage—the school board of the city of Kingston, which published its results last week. They are very interesting, because this is the first time in Ontario that a number of children were specifically screened to find learning disabilities or perceptual handicaps. Two hundred and eighty children were thus screened in four schools in Kingston, in kindergarten, grade one and grade two. Ten per cent, 28, were found to have slight perceptual handicaps, and another ten per cent, again 28, were found to have severe perceptual handicaps.

In other words, it is possible, on the basis of the Kingston experience, to say that ten per cent of the students in primary school at this time have a degree of learning disability sufficiently severe to necessitate the kind of special classes, or special education within the normal system that has been outlined by the hon. member for Brant.

Let me narrow it to the elementary school system for a moment. In 1965 there were roughly 1,300,000 students in the elementary school system. Ten per cent of that would be 130,000. There is no suggestion, as I do not think there would be any suggestion from the other members who spoke, that 60,000 to 130,000 would require special classes, as such, removed from the school system. But certainly a small percentage of them, and most of the authorities suggest one per cent, would require either special classes, or special remedial training within a regular class, with a teacher who is equipped to handle the job.

That means in the province of Ontario on this day, in 1966, there are roughly 13,000 students who fall within that category, and as the hon. member for Brant has stated, we are now providing places for 200. There is nothing available elsewhere, except for 200.

That means, and let us not mollify it in friendly phrases, that there are 12,800 lost, rejected, or destroyed children in the school system; indeed, not so often in the school system, because they are frequently totally removed from the school system. And I suggest this reduces to hollow prentensions the proud boasts of this government that there is equality of educational opportunity. For several thousand children there is not equality of educational opportunity and that is a serious abdication on the part of our educational system.

The question has been asked, what happens to them? I have given up in this House, and I admit it freely, discussing in general terms, these areas of children with learning disabilities, and emotionally disturbed children. I have decided that the only conceivable way of getting through and making the case felt is to draw individual cases to the attention of the House.

So let me now bring to the attention of the House one such case involving one such youngster, directly within this resolution, and demonstrate what happens to such children, the children who need the special classes with the special teachers, in this educational system. I do not wish, of course, to involve the parents.

I will call it the case of Peter Y, who is an 11-year-old boy living in the Metropolitan Toronto area. And let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this is not an unusual case. Indeed, as the hon. member for Kingston can testify, having sat on the select committee of youth, there are innumerable numbers of youngsters and parents who are in this frustrated position.

Peter Y was a lively and reasonable youngster whose problems of perception emerged roughly at the age of four or five. He began to have difficulty in learning. He lives in North York and the North York board of education, in the absence of any special classes, put Peter into an opportunity class. This, as the hon. member for Brant indicated, is the pattern. An opportunity class could not conceivably be more inappropriate because there was nothing wrong with Peter's intelligence; there was everything wrong with his capacity to comprehend and to perceive.

He remained in that opportunity class for four years, again in the absence of anything else. At the age of seven, he received a psychiatric assessment by Dr. Haveicova, of sick children's hospital, and he was diagnosed as perceptually handicapped. As a matter of fact, he was diagnosed as having what is called cross-dominance, the tendency to see words in reverse. For the word "was," Peter would see the word "saw." He would substitute letters in any given sentence. He had problems of differentiating a figure in a picture from the background of that picture. All of the usual perceptual handicaps that accompany such functional disorders.

For a year, for one hour a week, the psychiatrist attempted to establish a diagnosis and came to the conclusion that cross-dominance or perceptual handicap was, of course, accurate, but Peter remained in an opportunity class. There was nothing else for him in the entire Metropolitan Toronto area.

In his second year Peter began to react violently to the opportunity class. He suffered repeated failures in the class, as has been suggested, and began to develop emotional problems which did not exist before he was thrust into the inadequacies of this part of the school system.

Then, in his second year, at the age of eight, there ensued what must have been a terrifying procedure to this young boy. He was first seen at Toronto's Delaport educational clinic one-half day a week, which provides remedial reading classes. He was seen by an ophthalmologist. He was seen by an optometrist. He was seen by a neurologist. He was seen by the North York board of psychological services. He was seen by the Sutherland educational clinic, all of them trying to make a precise diagnosis and provide some kind of environment within the educational system. But absolutely nothing was available, except the terror that arose from a young lad of the age of eight, being shuttled from one diagnostic service to another, like some inanimate object, in the absence of adequate facilities.

What happened here, and I suggest what continually happens in these cases, is that the emotional problems the boy had, began to assume the primary focus, and the perceptual handicap which caused it all and could not be treated in the province of Ontario, reverted to the background. The boy became hyperactive, distractable, acted out, was aggressive and showed all the symptoms of perceptually handicapped youngsters.

The parents, desperate, went to Baltimore which, curiously enough, was the best centre for assessment in the absence of anything in the province of Ontario. They paid $1,200 to receive a full, complete assessment of their son, under one roof with all the facilities available. Again, it was identified as a perceptual handicap with emotional disturbance and the Baltimore clinic pointed out that in the process of being in the opportunity class, young Peter had developed an almost pathological hatred of school and a desperate fear of failure. So they made three recommendations: They suggested he be either put in a controlled setting where he could in effect live in and be taught, or be sent to a treatment centre, or be put into the Sutherland school.

The parents came back; North York had started its first class for perceptually handicapped children, but Peter was not eligible; the limiting age was the age of nine and Peter was then 11. So Peter was excluded from the only class in the school system. The parents appealed to Boys' village and to Thistletown, but again a combination of age and diagnosis rendered Peter ineligible. He finally went to the Sutherland reading clinic from September to mid-November of 1965. They could no longer contain him and he was dismissed from that agency in the middle of November.

The parents finally made one last stab at the North York school system in January of this year. Young Peter was returned to the opportunity class; he lasted four days—four days—and then in a conference with the principal, the teacher and the guidance workers, it was agreed that there was no future in the North York school system for this youngster with a perceptual handicap, an overlay of emotional disturbance and problems that properly could have been coped with years ago.

Indeed, if I may interject, Mr. Speaker, it could have been coped with in the city of London as early as 1960 where the first major class was set up. That city, with some vision, has had no serious problems.

Well, where are such youngsters, we have asked in this Legislature? Young Peter at the age of 11 has been at home alone since the middle of January, 1966, while both parents are at work desperately trying to earn the funds that they will eventually need if Peter receives admission to some treatment centre or other therapeutic environment. The young lad sits at home, has developed a serious stutter and talks in a worried fashion about the possibilities of Bowmanville and Orillia where his friends have told him he will eventually reside.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest it without any reservations, that only a thoroughly insensitive system could inflict such terror and hopelessness on one young child. And the fact is that there are upwards of 13,000 such children in the province. Let us make no mistake about it, these are children who fall within this resolution; these are children whose learning disability is so severe that they require special classes or special education within a given class. The answer to the question, "Must it be so?" is very simple. It need not be so at all.

All these children can be helped, almost without exception, Mr. Speaker, if the proper facilities are provided. We in this party continue to be noncomprehending in the face of the inadequate facilities and the refusal to provide them. I simply do not know why in these obvious areas steps cannot be taken.

As the hon. member for Brant said, one could have separate regional schools. Perhaps more desirably, one should have special classes dealing with one or two perceptually handicapped children in a class of 20 or 25. Integrated classes and the interaction between the normal and the perceptually handicapped child is often more desirable.

The diagnostic services within the Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, are simply not adequate. Individual school boards, perhaps regionally developed, will have to have the diagnostic services and above all, we will have to develop a pattern of testing at the kindergarten and grade 1 level right across the province of Ontario. So the nature of the permissive regulations will surely have to be changed to mandatory to facilitate this kind of service, or, again, we are adding another 13,000 or more children to the forgotten generation which, frankly, we in this province seem intent on creating, and which we in this party will continue to point to as long as the problem remains unsolved.

Again, I support the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 104

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Estimates, Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, continued 3275

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3311

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The Legislature is always pleased to have guests and tonight we welcome in the east gallery students from Thistletown collegiate institute.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order: House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

(*continued*)

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, you will recall that at 5 o'clock I was in the course of outlining some of the educational programmes in which the division had a hand.

The year 1965, I think, will go down in the overall programmes of all of those concerned as the year in which the immigrant child was discovered. We in the department, of course, are charged with the responsibility in respect of adult educational programmes. Our agreement with the federal authorities is in this field. We also have always respected the autonomy of the local school boards; that is their jurisdiction, it is not ours. The Department of Education has its responsibility, The Department of Labour has its and other departments also; we play a co-operative role to the extent that we can.

We discovered in the fall of 1964 that our adult classes, which were being held in the international institute, were being attended by children. Through parents and through friends these children had discovered these classes and they themselves had sensed the handicap that they were under in the ordinary school stream. They found their way to this school.

Of course we are not legally authorized to provide a service for them. However, because everybody involved was understanding and sympathetic we set up an experimental project at the COSTI headquarters whereby a child over the age of 12, with the consent of the proper school authority, would be admitted to this experimental course in the English language. Some 120 passed through that course in the subsequent months. Our results were exceedingly encouraging and we came to a conclusion as a division that we had to make the story known. We found a vehicle, by very happy happenstance, in the fact that the select committee of the Legislature on youth was sitting. The department having been invited to submit a brief, as other departments had been, we chose that opportunity of preparing and devoting the whole of our brief to the problem of the immigrant child in the Canadian community.

The following recommendations were made by the department in this field:

That government assistance be made available to school boards in respect of teaching costs and the provision of free textbooks for language and citizenship classes of adult newcomers be extended to cover special classes for immigrant children attending day school;

That a broad province-wide approach should be taken to the whole problem of language training for immigrant children;

That teachers assigned to work in any language programme should have: (a) A special training in teaching in English as a second language; and (b) a knowledge of the psychological, social and cultural adjustment problems of newcomer children and their parents;

That school boards should be encouraged and assisted in operating summer language training programmes for children of school age. To make such programmes effective, a close liaison between all organizations and branches of government concerned with the newcomer would be necessary;

That school boards be encouraged and assisted to experiment with a variety of complete or partial withdrawal programmes of language instruction to determine the most efficient method of integrating the non-English-speaking immigrant child into the school academic programme.

As a result of that brief, the interest which had been latent in certain quarters came to

the surface and the response in this field has been very encouraging indeed.

The department was in touch with the hon. Minister of Education and having placed before him the problem that confronted us—and the department's position as exemplified by this recommendation—The Department of Education saw fit to join with us in appearing before the Treasury board and getting the Treasury board approval for funds which will, as the Minister of Education has announced, be channelled to the special facilities grant section of The Department of Education grants. These will be made available across the board of the province of Ontario for school boards to take advantage of in this field.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister how much?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The funds have been made available. The department has a formula for making this available. Any school board that provides the programme which qualifies under this formula will get the funds under special grants, whatever the total may be. The Department of Education has been authorized by Treasury board to expend the funds necessary to fill out this programme in the grant system.

Now, this, to my mind, is a very significant role. Of course it is my belief that this problem came about because of the nature of the immigration which has taken place in the immediately preceding years, as compared with the earlier postwar immigration. I am delighted that the Toronto board of education and other boards of education in the metropolitan area have seen this. They have instituted their own experimental programmes —I noted even as late as today the details of a programme in one of the newspapers. I have absolute confidence that in the immediate years ahead we will develop these programmes which should enure to the benefit of the tens of thousands of the children of newcomers that will be going into our stream.

Now, I just want to touch briefly again on other classes. We have special citizenship classes. There are not only those who attend our classes and are trained in the citizenship portion of our programme; we also have special citizenship classes in the way of concentrated refresher courses. This has been worked out in co-operation with the federal department, the board of education and ourselves. We have this intensive course for somebody who is about to appear before a citizenship court in order that he may attain one of the qualifications that are required.

Another very integral part of the department's activities is the summer school evening classes for adult newcomers and this has been a resounding success. Last year we had 3,700 students, which was a 50 per cent increase over the preceding summer. We filled all the available space at the Central technical school, Central high school of commerce, Harbord collegiate, International institute, COSTI, west end YMCA and the WoodGreen community centre.

This summer school programme, in the opinion of staff specialists both from Canada and the United States, is one of the largest of its kind in the world today. It serves a twofold purpose. It provides the student with the facility of a concentrated course in the summertime when there is more leisure available and it is also used in conjunction with The Department of Education for the training of teachers to teach a second language.

The Department of Education pays the salaries of the professional staff engaged and issues the certificates; we organize and administer the teachers' courses, we determine the academic and practical content and we pay the salaries of the teachers involved. Here again a measure of the success of this school can be established by the statistics. We have teachers who come from other places. In 1959, as compared with 1965: Ontario teachers, 23 to 125; teachers from other provinces, nil to two; and Department of External Affairs and Citizenship and Immigration, from zero to 15—for a total of from 23 to 142. These teachers, when they complete our courses, are then qualified to teach a second language.

I am going to give the statistics of some of the students in order to convey two things to the hon. members of the House, Mr. Chairman. One is the make-up of the classes and also the very interesting variety that we find within our province today. I will read the attendance with the names of the native language: Italian, 1,062; Greek, 507; Portuguese, 443; German, 329; Polish, 198; Spanish, 115; Chinese, 114; Yugoslav, 99; French, 97; Hungarian, 84. Those are the big groups. Other languages, in addition to those, are Albanian, Arabic, Armenian, Austrian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Czech, Cuban, Danish, Dutch, Egyptian, Estonian, Finnish, Hebrew, Hindustani, Indonesian, Iranian, Japanese, Korean, Latvian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Malaysian, Maltese, Norwegian, Roumanian, Russian, Serbian, Croatian, Slavic,

Swedish, Swiss, Thai, Turkish, Ukrainian and Urdu. That gives an indication also of the problem involved when we are trying to establish courses and content for those who come with this myriad of native tongues.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): All loyal to the Red Ensign.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They have respect for others as they wish others to have respect for them. For the hon. member for Sudbury, I am positive that each one of these language groups holds something which is dear and near to it. I was at a weekend gathering the other day where one of the proudest flags that was flying was the white and red of the Polish flag. And I can assure hon. members that these people have respect, they wish respect from others and they do not mind giving respect, to the Polish flag. I can assure you that these people wish respect for others and they do not mind giving respect—

Mr. Sopha: I can tell you that Canada's flag does not fly on many of the provincial buildings.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, confronted with this problem, the department has been dealing with the development of materials which would enable the department to carry its job in this language field. There are no materials suitable for this type of training of such a variety of students and so we have developed our own and they have received acclaim around the world.

They are not only used by our courses, they are now used in language programmes in other provinces, The Department of Northern Affairs programme for Indians and Eskimos, the Australian language programme, the English language institute in the United States, the University of Education in London, England, the Canadian mission in Korea and the CUSO orientation course. It has also been used in Algeria, California, Tanganyika and Hong Kong, and this, I think, will give the worth and value of these materials developed by this department.

In addition, we use almost every other type of facility which is available. We purchased in 1963 a series of language films which, to our knowledge, is one of two sets available in Canada. These provide a necessary adjunct where we are unable to hold a seminar, but we can send these films.

In this field of language and citizenship training, the hon. members of this House can take pride in what has developed over the years as one of the outstanding programmes of its kind anywhere. We have always kept in touch with other jurisdictions and we have yet to find anything in Canada, on the continent or in other jurisdictions which encompasses within the overall package, the items which I have outlined so far in this language and citizenship programme.

It is interesting to note that so far as the department is concerned, the moneys involved have grown from those voted in 1961-1962. I see the expenditures then were roughly $135,000; in 1964-65, they were short of $300,000, and this year we are getting up to voting and I think we will probably spend, during the course of the year, up to $500,000 in this field.

I will touch very briefly on other aspects within the department. One is the translation service we provide which has a remarkable history within the department. This is a service which is provided for newcomers whereby their status documents, which are necessary to integrate them into a way of life especially where education and trade are concerned, are translated free of charge and I have all the statistics here.

In 1959, the number was 800 documents; in the following year, 2,300; in 1964, 8,700, and last year, almost 10,000. A rough breakdown shows 2,700 for trade experience; 4,000 births and marriages; 2,100 educational background and professional status, and 1,000 of official correspondence and the like. This is producing a very useful, concrete service.

Within the branch, of course, a very large portion is in the spirit of co-operation working with the various community agencies. In this, our very small department, compared to its numbers, has had manifold contacts with all the social agencies involved with newcomers and in citizenship programmes generally.

Last year I mentioned that I looked forward to the coming into being of the Ontario folk art conference and I am delighted that during the course of the winter this is now a fact and a reality and will be playing a role in the immediate years ahead.

The department has, in the past five years, either directly or indirectly, completely or on shared costs, undertaken a host of research projects which always led to implementation of programmes either on an experimental basis or on a full-time basis. These I have before me and I can give the details if required.

The hon. members will have noticed on their desks the latest edition of the government brochure in the English language, and if the other one looks like Greek to the hon. members that is exactly what it is. So far the booklets have been produced on Public Welfare, Health, Education, workmen's compensation board, Labour, Reform Institutions, Highways, Transport, Attorney General, Lands and Forests and the structure of government, in 13 languages—that is, 11 in addition to English and French.

There is at present at the printer's a publication on community services—that is to make known to the newcomer the services that are available to him as a resident or a citizen of the community. These booklets are merely an immediate assistance in order to enable the newcomer to immediately inform himself of what is available in this field. Of course, again, if he gets a knowledge of the language then he has available to him all the other publications, all the other reports, details of which the members are fully aware of.

I conclude this portion, Mr. Chairman, by saying that in the overall picture we are emerging within all departments and at the local level with well-balanced, rounded-out programmes. We are far short of perfection, we are far short of what we should have in this field, but we are advancing every year. There are additional funds being expended in this field. I will not read the letter, but I have before me a copy of a letter which was sent at my request by the Deputy Provincial Secretary to Mr. Tom Kent, Deputy Minister of The Department of Citizenship and Immigration as it was as of the date of this letter, in which we outlined some of the problems that we either have noticed, or taken notice of, or become aware of, and what we believe some of the solutions are so far as we are concerned, and what others have suggested. In the overall picture, we have suggested to them that the cost-sharing programme which so far is circumscribed to that relating to adult newcomers should be extended in that field, because all they share with us are purely the teaching costs and the free textbooks. But there are, of course, all the host of other costs involved. As we expand our programme within Metro and throughout Ontario, our rental is becoming a sum to be concerned about.

We believe, as others do at the municipal level, the federal government has a responsibility in the whole range of the newcomer, right from the child, the pre-school and in-school as the child is going through. The federal government has come into the scene with their retraining programme, programme 5. We believe that in respect of—I will just read the outline, at least the main points—the special language classes for non-English-speaking immigrant children in attendance at day schools in the province of Ontario; academic upgrading classes for adult newcomers; and classroom rentals for classes operated by the Ontario government; and then a very broad range, that we are prepared to discuss with them, other areas of potential need in the integration of the newcomer in the social and economic life of this province. The letter has been acknowledged by Mr. Kent to the deputy and we look forward to the two departments meeting together, and again working hand in hand with all other agencies to work out a programme.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the position that the unique quality about the way of our life in Canada—especially within this province, as exemplified in this province—is that men and women can come from all over the world, as they do to no other place in the world, and work out their own destiny and prepare a destiny for their children. I am convinced—and I say this sincerely—I know of no other place in the world so good for so many people to live in. I believe that the programmes that the hon. members of this House will have heard from all the other hon. Ministers and from this department are a key and a crucial factor in this idea.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, when I first looked at the estimates of the hon. Minister's department, and I noted the sum total that was to be expended by that department, and the items for which these expenditures were to be made, it had occurred to me that one perhaps could question the need for this particular department to exist in the first instance.

For instance, one of the largest expenditures of this department is with reference to corporations, and in view of the fact that a new department to look after commercial affairs has been established, one perhaps would not be wrong in concluding that the best place to put the matter of corporations and corporations' returns would be with that department, with securities and with fair sales practices and the like.

So far as the department of the Speaker and the Clerk are concerned—and incidentally, while I am on the subject of the Clerk, I was most interested in reading the Min-

ister's speech to this House last year when his estimates were before the House, and at that time the Minister pointed out that the Clerk of this House has sat at the table at which he now sits for 19 years. That would mean that this year, marks the 20th year during which the Clerk has been connected with this assembly and has sat at the same table, and I wish at this time to extend to him my congratulations on his 20th anniversary here.

So, Mr. Chairman, as I was pointing out, I thought that perhaps the office of the Speaker and the legislative library and the Clerk of the assembly could very well be put under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister.

As far as the fourth estate is concerned, perhaps a case of consciousness delivered to them would enable them to look after their own affairs.

When I started listening to the hon. Minister give a summary of his department's activities, I was not very moved by the mundane matters he brought up. As a matter of fact, I was not stirred to give attention.

Mr. Sopha: It brought tears to my eyes.

Mr. Ben: Oh, it could not have brought tears to your eyes, because no onions were mentioned in that superlative menu that he read to the House. If one does weep it is because one wonders how this province got along without those menus to this date.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, it was not until the hon. Minister reached vote 1603 in what are his estimates, that I was more or less compelled to give strong attention to what he was saying, because finally, with all due respect to the hon. Minister, I found some justification for his portfolio. Up to that time, I had thought to myself that since his riding was being wiped out and being merged in mine, that perhaps the portfolio should go with him. I was most interested in hearing what the hon. Minister had to say about The Department of Citizenship and especially with reference to education.

For me to get up now and offer any criticism, frankly, Mr. Chairman, is like criticizing motherhood. I find it rather difficult under the circumstances, except that one phrase refuses to leave my mind, and that is the startling statement that last year this government discovered the immigrant child. I congratulate the government. Immigrants have only been coming to this country, well we are having our centennial next year, and they have been coming since long before that.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Fourteen hundred and ninety-two.

Mr. Ben: No, it was 1498, I think. At any rate, it is gratifying to discover that after all these years, on the eve of this country's centennial, the government of the province of Ontario has discovered the immigrant child. Perhaps a cairn ought to be erected in the exact spot where this government made that wonderful discovery.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must compliment the hon. Minister on what he has started to do, or intends to do, since this wonderful discovery has been made. The only criticism I have to offer, and I find that this pertains to almost every department whose estimates we have discussed to date, is that all these fantastic discoveries of things that need doing, and have needed doing for many years, is made on the eve of the submission of the estimates of that department to this House.

I am very much surprised that it took this particular Minister so long to make this discovery. I have known this hon. Minister personally for a long time, and I want to state that I accept the proposition that the Minister is sincere in everything that he has said about The Department of Citizenship, and especially about the classes for newcomers. But once again, I just cannot understand how this particular individual, if I may dwell in personalities, Mr. Chairman, this particular Minister who should have such a wide and broad knowledge of the problems that these newcomers have been facing, should take until the year 1966, or let us say, 1965, to make these discoveries.

The hon. Minister, in discussing these particular estimates, that is item 1603, touched very lightly on the problem of citizenship and how it involves the problem of immigration. Earlier, during the session, the Minister drew to the attention of this House that immigration offices had been established in Great Britain. Now, since we are constantly reminded in the press and elsewhere of the need for immigrants to this country, it is very surprising indeed that to the present these offices to encourage immigration to this country, have only been established in the British Isles.

Mr. Sopha: It is not surprising to me.

Mr. Ben: And I thought that perhaps the Minister, since he was discussing the problems of newcomers, and the education of newcomers, might have spent a little more time dwelling on that particular subject.

Mr. Sopha: He might have established some in the Ukraine, do you not think?

Mr. Ben: Oh, I do not know if the hon. Minister would be too anxious to do that.

So it is with rather deep regret that we note that there are no plans afoot to establish immigration offices in Europe, other than in the British Isles, especially in those central European countries which have recently liberalized their immigration policies. Poland alone, as the Minister well knows, can supply Canada with a steady source of about 15,000 young, technically qualified immigrants annually.

The same could be said probably for these other countries.

Now, these countries that I have just mentioned, at least Poland, are behind the iron curtain, but I do not think anyone, especially the Minister, would deny that they are western countries and have always been oriented toward the west. They may be temporarily under the sphere and influence of Russia, but these communistic ideals that the Russians have tried to impress upon them, have simply not taken root among the younger generation as has been recently demonstrated.

In Czestochowa in Poland the people showed their allegiance to their church and denied the efforts of the authorities there, the communist-dominated government, to tell them to do otherwise. Not only that, but these people are readily assimilated in our culture and in our economy, and that can be attested to by the hon. Prime Minister who, as late as Sunday when speaking during the opening ceremonies of the millenium of the coming of Christianity to Poland, gave a recitation of the economic, political, social and educational contributions that had been made to this country by people who had emigrated from Poland, or children of people who had emigrated from that country.

Now, these same arguments I have presented could apply equally well to the Portuguese, the Italians, the Japanese, the Greeks and the Chinese in any of these other countries. It is surprising that this particular government has not seen fit to take much action, especially when one reads articles such as this one in the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record*—this was for last year, Mr. Chairman, the issue of Saturday, November 13:

> Stanley Marvin, president of Marvin Engineering Limited and Marvin Precision Equipment Limited, both in Waterloo, has expanded his complex every year for the past 39, since he went into business for himself. This year he was planning another expansion, but has given up temporarily, due to lack of labour.
>
> It has got to the point where ability to do forward planning is pretty well stagnated by the fact we know it is useless to do it; we could not get the people to staff it.
>
> Mr. Marvin described the labour shortage as "the most critical I can recall in my life of industrial activity."
>
> Two years ago Mr. Marvin urged the government to open up the floodgates of immigration and allow a couple of million people into the country. Some laughed at his suggestion. Today he feels the same way. "One of the biggest drawbacks in this country is the lack of people. It is a drawback in the continued development of industry."
>
> The industrialist said the country badly needs a continuing immigration policy "to present Canada as a land of opportunity.
>
> "The old policy of turning the immigration tap off and on is not a good one. In two or three years secondary industries in Canada will be in trouble," he said, "because there are not enough people to fully exploit the opportunities we have."

I was attracted to this particular article by this reference to "turning the immigration tap off and on" because that is exactly the kind of policy that this government has been operating. It seems that the only time that we do try to institute some kind of a policy with reference to immigration is when we are being strangled by lack of trained immigrants, but in this regard our policy seems to be, as far as other countries are concerned, "give us your trained and your rich."

We seem to have lost that pioneering spirit that made this country. This country was not made great so much by the people coming in already with skills, but by the skills that were developed by this country. We seem to have forgotten that. Oh, we do permit Jamaicans to come and work here. They work here almost like indentured labour and as soon as their work is finished, we ship them back from whence they came. Our treatment of these people is no different than was the treatment of the Chinese coolies 100 years ago when we were constructing the trans-Canada railroads.

It would appear to me that all we want at the present time is the trained and the rich, or cheap labour, but we are not prepared to train our own people. In this respect I am

rather at a loss, because during the educational lifetime of a child, born here let us say, we must spend from $7,500 to $10,000 for his education. This is disregarding the physical plants and what-have-you, but we must spend at least that much. We educate a child for 12 to 14 years because what we educate him to do is going to be of use to this country and it seems incomprehensible to me that we will not spend $1,000, $2,000, $3,000 or $4,000 to take a person who can absorb in one year all the education we gave to the child for 13 years, and become a useful individual in this society to help Canada grow.

All we want to do is to take the trained people from the other countries, often from undeveloped countries, and bring them here so that we do not have to pay for the cost of their education.

Now, in this regard, Mr. Chairman, I must make reference to an article that appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* yesterday, entitled "Inside the UN with Aaron Einfrank," who just recently won an award for his reporting of events at the United Nations. The article is captioned: "The brain drain flows to the west—sophisticated slavery."

I draw this article to the attention of the House because of the controversy that has been stirred up here by the doctors from India who are seeking licences to practise. In the first instance, I must say that my sympathy was with the doctors, because I felt that they had received a certain amount of training and perhaps there may have been a little bigotry—and I use that word advisedly—in not permitting them to practise here. After reading this article by Mr. Einfrank, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps we are taking the wrong attitude, that as a nation perhaps we should be ashamed of our policy of taking trained men from underdeveloped countries, that if we had any morals we would refuse entry to this country as immigrants the trained technicians and the professional classes from countries which the UN considers to be underdeveloped, or as they are frequently called, the "emerging" nations.

It seems rather silly and immoral to me that we should be taking their trained people while at the same time we are sending missionaries, be they religious or in the way of teachers, engineers and other trained individuals, to help them to develop their own countries while the people whom that particular country educated, scamper off someplace for their own financial benefit.

This particular article, as I said, is most interesting. I will read from it:

> The UN special fund (UNSF) asked Iranian sociologist Dr. Ehsan Naraghi to make a study on the exodus of highly trained people from the poor countries to the rich countries. After touring Latin America, the Middle East and North America, Dr. Naraghi came up with a report which was so critical of the national governments concerned and the UN itself, that the UNSF ruled against publication of the report.
>
> The suppression of the report highlights certain embarrassing facts:
>
> That while the western countries are sending technicians to the poor countries, these same western countries are knowingly siphoning off the native educated élite which is needed in the poor countries. Thus, Ottawa can blatantly announce an immigration policy aimed at attracting highly skilled people from the have-not world while External Affairs Minister Paul Martin talks about the need to help the poor countries.
>
> That the UN and its agencies are being deluged by highly trained "refugees" from the poor countries who instead of wanting to improve their homelands, prefer the soft living and high wages of the rich countries.
>
> That the governments of the poor countries are generally doing nothing to stop the brain drain because their ruling classes are quite happy to have their sons and daughters find *la dolce vita* in the rich countries instead of forcing these youngsters to emulate the peace corpsmen toiling in these poor countries.
>
> That the rich countries have come to depend on the imported élite from the poor countries primarily because they have not allocated enough funds for the education and training of their own people.

I could go on, but just to give some examples:

> Dr. Naraghi says that U.S. medical schools produce only 7,000 graduates a year, but that hospitals need 14,000, thus creating an import demand for 7,000 doctors from abroad. Dr. Naraghi also says that in spite of the great medical need throughout the world, there are 20,000 foreign physicians in the U.S.

I should venture to guess, Mr. Chairman, that these same figures adapted to the difference in population between United States

and Canada could very well apply here. I would just like to read that one phrase again:

> That the rich countries have come to depend on the imported élite from the poor countries primarily because they have not allocated enough funds for the education and training of their own people.

I must compliment, in this regard, the hon. Minister for being a financial genius. I had always thought that this woman Gerda was a financial genius because she had converted a couple of Canadian marks into 400,000 Tory marks—I should say, German marks. But when I see an estimate of $272,000 here under teaching costs—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: When I see a sum of $272,000 for teaching costs—

Mr. Sopha: Gerda is the subject of another inquiry and is sub judice.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury reminds the chair that this is out of order.

Mr. Ben: I think she was operating pretty well.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): How would you know?

Mr. Ben: We get it on good authority these days in Ottawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: As I was trying to say, Mr. Chairman, I was amazed. I had been looking at this figure of $272,000, which is allocated to teaching costs under the subcaption citizenship branch, which is vote 1603, and listening to the hon. Minister recite the wonderful things that his department was doing in the field of education of newcomers, I was amazed that such a small sum could go so far. Frankly, I looked upon it as another miracle of the fish and the loaves, and I congratulate the hon. Minister in that regard. Mind you, he later pointed out that some moneys are coming from other departments, but when we pressed for the figures we could not get an exact sum, which perhaps caused the hon. member for Niagara Falls to say that the answer given by the Minister was certainly in round figures—zero.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that this government, however belated it may be, is finally endeavouring to do something about recognizing the handicaps under which newcomer children labour. Everyone I think will agree that the most important task faced by our society today is the education and training, not only of our young, but the education and training or retraining of all those lacking the necessary skills in today's technological society. One of the largest segments of our population is that where another language is spoken in addition to or in place of English. The Minister gave some rough figures—he also gave some figures as to the numbers in school, but unfortunately he read those figures off as rapidly as I sometimes speak in this honourable House and I was not even able to catch them.

If I may, I would like to refer to a report which was prepared by the board of education, office of the director of education, dealing with the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. On page 10, it reads as follows:

> Data from the ongoing study of achievement indicate the diversity and the extent of the multi-ethnic population. Data are based on all senior kindergarten pupils 1961-1962. Thirty-seven different countries are represented when father's country of birth is reported for these students. In all of Canada, Italy is the most common country of birth for fathers and the British Isles rank next. Of the pupils, 40 per cent come from a home where another language is spoken in addition to or instead of English.

It is quite conceivable, since this report was based on 1961-62 figures, that the percentage may be closer to the 50 per cent that the hon. Minister mentioned.

Now, these children that the Minister expresses so much concern about, and their parents, must be educated not only to speak the English language, but to understand our social, economic, political and cultural structure. In this regard, notwithstanding the good news that the Minister gave to us this afternoon and this evening, this government has been failing badly. The Minister mentioned some of the courses that had been going on at the present time, and I should like to deal with them. But first I would draw to the attention of the Minister that before anyone can take these courses they must have knowledge of their existence. I think the Minister pointed out how little knowledge there was of the existence of these courses; that most knowledge was acquired by word of mouth.

To my knowledge, there was not a single publication in any language, other than English, drawing to the attention of the people we wanted to draw into these courses that these courses were available. I was surprised to discover that some children actually found out by their parents attending the international institute.

It is surprising also that it was only today — and the hon. Minister mentioned this article although he did not specify what it was—it was only today that the board of education revealed a pilot project, that is the board of education of the city of Toronto, a pilot project to talk to immigrants in their own language. They are preparing brochures and are participating, perhaps preparing reports and other material in languages other than English, to assist these newcomer children.

The government, through local boards of education and on its own, as was stated by the Minister, is offering courses to speakers of other languages. The Minister said courses run four nights a week. That is true. But perhaps I misunderstood how these courses actually operate, because, as I understood it, although they may operate four nights a pupil can only attend two nights a week because only two units of work are offered a week. In fact, that is one of the criticisms I have of this night course, that only two units of work are offered a week. Although a student may be capable of absorbing more than those two units of work a week, he can only proceed with what you might say, the slowest, and attend to get those two particular units.

In some cases the hours are not too convenient. Courses are held from 7.30 in the evening until 9.30 in the evening. Perhaps, if the time for the commencement of these courses was postponed until 8 o'clock, many of those who work out of town and are brought to town in trucks might have the time to go home, have their evening meal, clean up and attend some of these courses.

I was rather amazed that the hon. Minister seemed to express satisfaction that almost every church basement or social service centre was running some kind of a class for these newcomers. I would have suspected that perhaps the Minister would have been ashamed to make such an admission, because it would indicate on the part of the government a failure to appreciate how serious the situation was, and make it rather difficult for the hon. Minister to justify their having discovered only during the last year that there were immigrant children in this country with problems. To me, it indicates a clear failure on the part of this government to have grasped the magnitude of the situation, an admission that for years they did absolutely nothing and that the education of these children who had difficulties not experienced or faced by native-born children were being completely ignored. Why should these church basements—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): What would the hon. member do?

Mr. Ben: I am getting to that. Why should these church basements or social service centres be running this kind of classes? For that matter, I can honestly ask this House, why should The Department of the Provincial Secretary and not The Department of Education be running these classes? For the life of me, I cannot comprehend why this situation is so except, if I may be forgiven by this House, except perhaps for political expediency. I see no other justifiable reason for this silly situation.

Now, I was very pleased to hear that finally this department, which should not be charged with the responsibility, has taken the first step towards qualifying some of the teachers in this province to teach English to speakers of other languages, because one of the statistics that bothered me in the past was that although most classes would start with about 30 pupils in the fall, by Christmas this attendance had dropped to 15 or below. I believe it is a departmental regulation that if a class attendance drops below 15, that class is discontinued, so this bothered me. I also tried to determine why there was this high dropout. I can offer many suppositions—it is difficult to pinpoint a cause because undoubtedly there are many causes—but one of the contributing causes in my mind was that the department was not using a cultural approach to education. Because authorities in the field have discovered that a child can be given a vocabulary, but many words in that vocabulary are meaningless to that child without an accompanying concept. If I may read again from this report from the Toronto board of education—although I have called that board of education many names, I must say that in my most recent opinion they are really starting to take an enlightened approach to education in this city:

> Incidents that have occurred in Toronto classrooms illustrate the relatedness of culture and language.
>
> In a primary class in a lesson related to pets a teacher found that pets were

outside the meaningful ideas of some new Canadian students. Though these students would speak the word, a pet to them implied wastefulness in supporting an animal that would not provide food, shelter or protection. Many words are meaningless without an accompanying concept. The concept of pet was strange to some students who came from poverty, yet it is a common concept in Canadian schools.

One new Canadian boy on arrival in Toronto thought that he had arrived on Fiesta, a feast day, because the wires, telephone and hydro, were strung across the road. Another student had trouble with the sentence: "He had to dress in a hurry." Though the words could be read, it was puzzling for the new Canadian to think of a boy, he, in girls' clothes, dress.

Concepts, ideas, values, are all parts of a culture. Saying words out loud does not equal understanding the meaning of them. Knowledge about an idea or value does not mean, nor does it require, acceptance of the idea. To understand and to meet the needs of the people from many lands requires an understanding of the traditions, beliefs, values, attitudes and expectations of each of the ethnic groups.

Hence, there does not seem to be a school programme for new Canadians which is suitable to all ethnic groups. A new Canadian pupil lives in a home that differs in cultural aspects from the homes of most teachers and most fellow pupils. A new Canadian pupil faces many conflicts because of such differences.

Then again there is a reference on page 49 of the same report, Mr. Chairman. It is captioned "Method of teaching English as a second language."

The Ontario curriculum institute modern language committee was critical of the teaching of English as a second language to French-speaking students. On the basis of their argument there appear to be grounds for questioning some current practices and assumptions relative to teaching English as a second language to immigrants. Their programme suggestions concentrate mainly on language with cultural reference, although they use the biculturality of Canada and unity to justify language teaching.

So in this respect, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that there has been a failure in this department to go about tackling this problem properly. Now, perhaps I may be a little unfair when the Minister states that it has only been since last year that this programme was instituted by his department.

Such a criticism, I suggest, would be unfair, if any man other than the present holder of that office was the Minister of Citizenship and Provincial Secretary because, as I stated earlier, I am quite satisfied, more than satisfied, that the Minister has an intimate personal knowledge and has had an intimate personal knowledge of these problems for at least the last 10 or 20 years. Therefore I cannot forgive the Minister for not having taken action earlier and I cannot applaud him for admitting that last year the immigrant child was discovered in this province.

These classes have been run before the hon. Minister took an interest in them. The troubles were that they were run by teachers who were not qualified for the task, as the hon. Minister himself indirectly admitted, because it does take a special type of teacher to operate these classes. I am referring to the classes run, not by this department, but by the board of education.

Usually in the past the teachers who taught these newcomers were doing what might be called legalized moonlighting. They were taking these night classes to supplement their low salaries, which were usually low because they had the minimum of teaching experience or they did not have degrees which would qualify them for higher income. So I am most pleased to hear from the hon. Minister that during the summer courses teachers are qualifying themselves to teach English to speakers of other languages. I think they are referred to as TELSO—I wonder is that Roberts?

Mr. Letherby: We will take it for granted.

Mr. Ben: Well you are most generous and I thank the hon. member.

The Minister mentioned at least three different types of classes being operated or being directed or being supported by his department. He mentioned the summer classes and the evening classes and some day classes. But what provisions are there? What master plan does the Minister's department have for the co-ordination of these different classes? For instance, for a transfer from one type of course to another.

As I pointed out earlier, Mr. Chairman, in the night courses one cannot even take an accelerated course because they only give

two units of work a week. They may operate four nights a week, but there are two different sets of classes on these two nights.

Now, the hon. Minister mentioned a course. He was speaking rather rapidly, I was trying to make notes and absorb it all, but it seemed that finally some action is being taken towards offering a programme to the mothers to learn English. I thought that this reference was made specifically in relation to the international institute, and I was amazed in listening to the hon. Minister recite the wonderful work that this institute is doing. I was amazed not that I did not know that the institute was doing this wonderful work, because I did; but what amazed me was to listen to what this institute could do with a grant—if we are to believe the public accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965—with a grant of $4,000. Now, surely, Mr. Minister—as I say, that was at the end of 1965—surely if this institute is doing such a wonderful job, and I am prepared to admit that it is, certainly it should be entitled to more than $4,000; if in fact it is not the duty of this government to be operating such institutes rather than have them rely on the charity of well meaning and warm-hearted people in this city. Perhaps the hon. Minister might tell me where this institute is going to be relocated, for on coming here this morning, I noted that there were "for sale" signs on the property itself. Has the department finally decided to take over and operate an institute of the same type itself, or has it provided alternate quarters to this institute? What is the intention of the government; what has it done in this regard?

I started to talk about mothers, because to the present time it appears that all this government was interested in was helping fathers and youngsters to speak the English language, and to become acclimatized to our cultural habits, but the mother has seemed to be completely disregarded.

No arrangements were made in neighbourhoods to look after the children of mothers, in order that the mother might progress more rapidly to becoming a Canadian, and it occurred to me that perhaps I was asking too much to expect this government would supply such facilities when it has not even seen fit to supply nursery facilities for mothers who are compelled by financial circumstances to go out and work, leaving their children in the charge of a well-intentioned neighbour, or perhaps leaving them as a ward of the streets.

I thought I had caught a slight suggestion that perhaps something was going to be done in that regard and I cannot be sure until I am answered. But if my interpretation of the hon. Minister's remarks was not correct, I would like during the estimates to hear exactly what the Minister's intentions or what his department's intentions are in this particular regard.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is one point on which the member is correct.

Mr. Ben: Thank you. It is an admission from the government that perhaps the Opposition is correct sometimes; even an admission of being correct on one point is still some admission, I must say.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Better than the hon. Minister's average.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps it is only a discovery on the part of the government, similar to the discovery that we have immigrant children.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): If you are ahead you can—

Mr. Ben: Oh, these are not all the questions. I am being kind to the Minister, because he is a very personable fellow, but I have some questions to ask him.

The board of education estimates that it would need in the neighbourhood of $2 million to carry out a proper programme of the education of newcomers. What proportion of this amount is this government prepared to contribute, and what amount is it going to contribute? The hon. Minister made a statement that there is some plan whereby The Department of Education is going to be contributing some amount on some unpredetermined scale, but as I pointed out, we have not been able to obtain the figures, and I have no idea exactly what this is going to involve. Perhaps the Minister will give us the figures in that particular regard.

I believe it was the hon. member for either Rainy River or for Simcoe East—I am not quite sure, it was Simcoe East—who asked, what do I suggest? The first and most obvious suggestion is that the education of the citizens of this province, be they native-born or newcomers, should be the responsibility of The Department of Education.

Mr. Letherby: Well, go after the Minister of Education, do not talk to this Minister.

Mr. Ben: The Minister of Education is not here.

Secondly, the teaching of English to speakers of other languages should be the sole responsibility of the provincial government, if this is going to remain a responsibility of The Department of Citizenship.

Thirdly, adequate funds should be supplied not only to provide the necessary facilities, so that people can cease using the basements of churches and social halls, but also to train teachers in this highly complicated field.

The hon. Minister has admitted that there is a special requirement in the teaching of English to those who speak a second language, and I would suggest that in this regard it might act as an inducement to teachers to so qualify themselves if a premium was paid to those who have this special training. If we can pay premiums to teachers who teach domestic science and woodwork, or physical education, surely we can pay premiums to teachers who have the requirement to qualify them to teach second languages. I assure you, Mr. Minister, whether we have an open-door policy on immigration or a closed-door policy on immigration, teachers with those qualifications are going to be needed for ever and ever.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go much further except that I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question because, as I stated earlier, I was reading the Minister's speech given to this House when his estimates were introduced last year. I find on page 899, the following statement by the Minister:

> I am pleased to inform the House that changes during the past year have been emphasized and are well underway. They started indeed some four years ago, when there was a union of the division of citizenship, a very small group within the department, and a group from the community programmes branch which brought the name of citizenship for Ontario within this department.

What I would like to know is, what happened to the community programmes branch that was brought into his department? I have heard no mention of it. I can cite many instances where such a branch would be of service to this province. I have here a statement by Police Chief Mackie of the city of Toronto with many suggestions where this government could assist in setting up community programmes. Would the hon. Minister please tell us what happened to that community programmes branch or was it in fact just guillotined from this branch when your department was created?

An hon. member: What language are you reading that in?

Mr. Ben: Since there will be ample opportunity to ask the speaker some questions, and I do have a question or two here, I shall now yield to the hon. member for Riverdale and listen with attention to what he has to say.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, there are a number of areas that I would like to comment on in these remarks about the estimates of this department.

I think that the first one I would like to mention is that this is the department in which the estimates of the Minister without Portfolio are immersed, and I would trust that during the course of these estimates he would see fit to tell us about the discharge of the burdens of office that he has suffered since his appointment to that office. I regret the hon. Minister is not in the House. He was here earlier and I do hope the hon. Provincial Secretary will convey our request to him that he give an accounting to this House of the estimates of his particular Ministry. I think, Mr. Chairman, it should not go unmarked that the library is a very excellent improvement and one which I know all the members of the House will use to a much greater degree than even in the past. It is most attractive to have an opportunity occasionally to read in pleasant surroundings.

Mr. Chairman, one matter which has bothered me for some time and which I raise at the risk of embarrassing either you or the Speaker, is the concern which I have that in the increase in the remuneration of the members which took place last year, for some reason I do not think either the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker were properly remunerated for the services which they perform for this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renwick: The position of the Speaker, of course, needs no words from me to explain the importance of his position in any parliamentary assembly and the long and historic place which he holds and the important office which he occupies. I believe, and I am firmly convinced, that as the parliamentary system continues to develop—if it does so develop—it will in a large measure be due to the impartiality and the ability of the successive men who hold the position of Speaker in parliamentary assemblies.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I have not been in this House long enough to be able to compare your discharge of your duties

with your predecessors, but I do know that the way in which the committees of this chamber have been carried out in this session are of a very high standard and very much due in no small measure, not only to the way in which you conduct the committees from the chair, but in a large measure due to the time and effort which you spend outside this assembly in preparation of the discharge of your duties as Chairman.

And with those comments—and I am quite sure that I will have support throughout the House and from all parties—I would certainly think that the government should seriously consider the indemnity which is received by the Speaker and by the Deputy Speaker in relation to the indemnity which is received by the members of this assembly, and on the other hand, the indemnity which is received by the members of the executive council, in addition to their indemnity as members of this assembly.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Does that mean a raise for us?

An hon member: Not this year.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to record that it is the position of our party that serious consideration should be given to increasing the indemnity of the Speaker and of the Deputy Speaker if they are going to be able to discharge effectively the obligations and responsibilities which they are required to discharge under our system of government.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we need make no mention this year in any detail of the affairs of the companies branch, because, as the assembly knows, the select committee on corporations is sitting and will undoubtedly report in due course after it has completed what looks to be a very extensive and lengthy study of all aspects of corporation law.

Mr. Sopha: An arduous one—

Mr. Renwick: Very arduous, yes. Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister has the affairs of his department, other than the affairs of the citizensip branch, in such very good order and he is such an acccomplished administrator, I think it is now time that he should give consideration to increasing the burdens and obligations of his particular portfolio.

I think that I would like to suggest to the assembly one way in which this can be done. I expressed last year, and on another occasion this year, my concern about the way in which professional bodies, granted as they have been a very large area of self-government by statutes of this Legislature, are in fact so completely detached from any obligation to report to this assembly or any obligation to furnish information to this assembly, that I think it would be within the purview of the department of the Minister that he should assume—and I do not believe there is any necessary legislation that would require that assumption, but if so I am certain it could be introduced and passed—that he should assume responsibility for all the professional societies which have been incorporated or otherwise established by Acts of this assembly. I am thinking, of course, of the law society, the engineers, the dentists, the optometrists, the chiropractors and all the other many professional societies which have been not only granted large areas of self-government, but have been granted these exclusionary rights to determine who is to be entitled to practise the profession in the province of Ontario, and the terms and conditions under which that practice is to take place.

It would seem to me that the time has come that it is appropriate that a department of government, such as your department, Mr. Minister, should be in a position to obtain information about the internal rules and regulations of such professional societies; obtain information about the requirements which those societies have established and have in force for the admission of persons to practice the professions in Ontario; whether they are persons applying from within Ontario or newcomers to this province, wishing to practise their professions.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. Minister would take the time to study the research done by Dr. Rudolph Helling, presently at the University of Windsor, in this whole area of what he refers to as the culturation of people who arrive in our society, the Minister would find that there is indeed, in a very real sense, exclusion practised by professional societies against persons who come to this country qualified to practise their professions in Ontario, but who find it difficult, if not impossible, within any reasonable period of time to meet the requirements and meet the qualifications which the professional bodies have established.

I think under the work of the citizenship branch of this department, the Minister could very well take it upon himself to make a study and a review of all the policies of professional societies in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, the next matter on which I would like to comment is the standing committees of this Legislature. I would like to refer again to the standing committee on government commissions which has met on several occasions, but which has failed to establish any new procedures for dealing with the affairs of the commissions when they appear before that standing committee. We had suggested at the outset, and indeed a resolution was passed by the committee at its organizing meeting that the committee should be provided with a staff and competent people who could question on behalf of the members of the committee the various commissions who appeared before that committee. We also requested at that meeting, and it was included in the same resolution, that there should be a list of the commissions which are to appear before the committee and the dates on which they would appear.

For a brief period of time, Mr. Chairman, there was such a list, but certainly since the Easter recess we have had no notification, other than a day or so in advance, of the particular commission which is going to come before the weekly meeting of that standing committee on government commissions. I think it is absolutely essential, Mr. Chairman, that that standing committee of this assembly function properly and function in a way in which it can usefully question and usefully obtain information for this assembly, which over a period of time will provide a large area of understanding as to exactly the functions and exactly the ways in which the various commissions which have been established by this assembly discharge their functions.

This again is a matter which has been referred to on other occasions, but it seems that it is necessary constantly to harp on it, because there is no indication that the government has any wish whatsoever to make certain that the standing committees do discharge an important function for the assembly.

Mr. Chairman, the last two matters on which I would like to comment, again briefly, are ones to which I have had to give some consideration for some time; and they are the positions of the Ontario hospital services commission and of the Ontario medical insurance plan.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that again this assembly has fallen into the trap of allowing those two schemes, which are related to the prepayment by the people of Ontario of the cost of the services to be provided by the hospitals and the cost of the services to be provided by the physicians and surgeons in the province, that we have allowed the prepayment aspect of those plans, and the need for those plans to operate efficiently, to become confused with their relationship with The Department of Health. I would urge, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when the Ontario hospital services commission and the Ontario medical services insurance plan could very properly be transferred out of The Department of Health entirely and again be made commissions or plans which will report directly to a Minister, such as the Provincial Secretary.

It seems to me that the purpose of those plans is to make certain that people in the province of Ontario, by payment of premiums, get the very best service at the lowest cost and of the highest quality it is possible to get. It seems to me that if we continue to permit both the Ontario hospital services commission and the Ontario medical services insurance plan to be so closely related to the very profession and the very group of people and the very department of the government which is engaged in providing those services, we have no necessary counterbalance for making certain that the purposes of the plan are in fact achieved.

I think all of us here could well recall the debates on the medical services insurance bill. On both occasions, earlier this session and again during the great debate of last year, when one looks right at the bill and what took place, much time and effort in this assembly would have been saved had they been introduced and carried through the House by a Minister other than the hon. Minister of Health, because of the very close involvement which he as a doctor had with the medical profession and all the problems which the medical profession threw up in counteraction to the scheme which was finally put through this assembly.

I would suggest that the time has come when the Minister could very well, if he could persuade the government to do so, arrange to have the responsibility for the reporting of both the hospital services commission and the medical services insurance plan done through his department and that he is the one who should be responsible for those commissions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will appreciate that in the brief remarks that I have made I think that there is a large scope for this department to play in the government. I do not think it need necessarily be a grab-bag

of various isolated votes and various isolated activities. I think it is possible that this department has a very real and important job to play, in addition to its responsibility for the companies branch, by virtue of the second portfolio which the hon. Minister holds, of the citizenship branch. I think that the two roles which it could now perform, and which it could perform very well, are these roles of the gradual obtaining of information and gradually making certain that some government department knows what takes place and knows how these professional societies do function within our society; and second, to take upon itself, by legislation if necessary, the responsibility of the reporting to this legislative assembly of the functions of the Ontario hospital services commission and of the Ontario medical services insurance plan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not comment, we will leave our comments on the citizenship branch to that vote, but I would ask that the hon. Minister give serious consideration to these few remarks that I have made on his remarks in these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, as we come to the various votes I will extract those portions of the comments and deal with them in the context of the relevant vote. I think that would be an expeditious way.

On vote 1601:

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions to ask the Minister with reference to vote 1601, and specifically with reference to the government hospitality fund. I note that among the grants made, according to the last statistical figures, there was the sum of $250—

Mr. Letherby: You are not going to beef about $250, are you?

Mr. Ben: Perhaps you would answer this for me then.

Mr. Letherby: Probably I could.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: I note, Mr. Chairman, that last year there was a grant of $250 to the Canadian open lightning championships. Would the hon. Minister please tell us what these lightning championships are?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, in the great community of Oakville reside some of the outstanding lightning champions of Canada. In fact they have a world-renowned reputation. It is a very small sailing craft. I have never had the pleasure of either being in one or even seeing other than a photograph of the same, but last year the Canadian open lightning championships were held in the Oakville marina area and this was the grant that was made. These are amateur sportsmen within this relative field and they have a world-wide reputation; these were the Canadian championships.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on looking over these hospitality grants I am impressed by the societies and associations which benefited by the generosity of this government. We see the $4,000 grant to the international institute which I mentioned earlier; $600 to the international services of London; $300 to the national folk art council and $300 to the Ontario welfare council. Then there were the Canadian lightning championships, which I mentioned; $1,035 to the managing editors conference; $792 for the Canadian weekly newspapers; $2,618 for the Grey cup festival; $3,000 for the Sir John A. Macdonald dinner in Kingston, but only $20.73 for a dinner for the interprovincial relations meeting with officials from New Brunswick.

Tell me, Mr. Chairman, does this government actually hate the Liberals so much that they would only spend $20.73 to entertain these dignitaries from New Brunswick and throw an interprovincial relations dinner, when they spent $3,000 for the Sir John A. Macdonald dinner in Kingston?

Mr. Bryden: They were not hungry.

Mr. Ben: I would also ask the Minister this question—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Who said something about loaves and fishes? We really got our dollar's worth on this because this was a dinner when the corresponding officials from the province of New Brunswick were here. It was an exchange of information and we got our dollar's worth.

Mr. Ben: If only $20.73 was spent for dinner and entertainment, a lot of time must have been spent exchanging information.

Mr. Letherby: They brought their own food.

Mr. Ben: They must have.

I note by the public accounts, Mr. Chairman, that for the last fiscal year the allocation of $40,000 was overspent by 25 per cent. I understand that there has been an expenditure in this current fiscal year of

$13,800 to entertain the Canadian bar association. Expert as these people may be at the bar, surely an account of $13,800 is a little high, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All I can say is that the bar does much better in other provinces than in the province of Ontario: I think our hospitality in this respect is very reasonable. Any member of the bar who has had the pleasure of attending the Canadian bar association meetings in the province of Quebec will appreciate how they roll out the carpet there.

Mr. Ben: I am sure that an allocation of $13,800 for hospitality must have left the members of the Canadian bar association in high spirits.

Has the hon. Minister estimated by what amount he is going to overspend this particular fiscal year, as he overspent by 25 per cent in the previous fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, the amount voted was $40,000 and the expenditures will be $59,000.

Mr. Bryden: That is not much; 50 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, I have given the explanation in this House before that we know that this amount is going to be overspent and the hon. members are being asked to vote on the basis of this. It is much easier for me to say "no" in a gentle, polite, courteous way when I do not have the funds —when I am short of funds—than when I have funds. It is one of Parkinson's rules that if you put in $100,000, it will be spent, but if you put in $40,000—

Mr. Bryden: You will be overspent.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But not up to the amount that—

Mr. Bryden: On what basis does the hon. Minister gently say "no"? He obviously does not say it all the time because he regularly overspends his estimates on this vote. On what basis does he say "no"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If one were to review the public accounts over the past ten years, and I have a complete review of the last ten years, it would indicate the very broad range of persons and groups and associations in respect of which we have extended hospitality. One of the easiest ways to say "no" is when somebody has had hospitality either in the previous years or in the immediate year.

In some instances, it is a little difficult to say "no." I know that I have been trying to cut the umbilical cord with the junior chamber of commerce for five years but an hon. member has made very stirring pleas on their behalf and I have extended it. But by and large, if they are within the definitions as I have explained it—an international, national or provincial type of association—we endeavour at least once in a while, to provide hospitality for them.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I understand that within the last year or so the voice of women applied for sustenance under this fund for, I believe, a national conference at Ottawa. They were given the old line of malarkey that all the appropriation was used up. Apparently, the appropriation is used up if the Minister does not like the organization, but the sky is the limit if it is the Canadian bar association or some other organization of which he approves. Is that the basis on which he decides that the appropriation has been used up?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the basis.

Mr. Bryden: Then why did the Minister turn down the voice of women?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not have the file here but I can assure the member that in respect of all of my decisions, whether they be in respect of the hospitality or in respect of the exercise of my discretion, I try within the utmost of the powers of a human being to do so dispassionately, and I can assure the member that as far as the voice of women was concerned, nothing entered into the picture; it was dealt with as others were.

Mr. Bryden: But they did not get the money.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There were others who did not get the money eitther.

Mr. Bryden: Who were some of the others who were turned down, either during the fiscal year completed, or the one covered by these accounts?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The alumni association of the Niagara parks commission school of horticulture; the Canadian ladies open golf tournament; the Canadian open lightning championships; the Canadian society for education; the Canadian vocational association; the Canadian library association; the Canadian corps of commissionaires; the

Canadian society of forensic science; the international teaching conference; the Niagara Falls police department conference; the convention of the Ontario parks association; the Ontario hotel and motel association, and the police association of Ontario convention.

We have postponed the decision on the national council of Canadian daughters league, the Royal Canadian legion provincial command convention, the swimming awards, the voice of women, and the association of Ontario counties. I can assure the member these organizations do not encompass the remarks that he made that I have a dislike for these organizations.

Mr. Bryden: I know that the hon. Minister usually professes the wisdom of Solomon, but frankly I would like to know what is the difference between several of the organizations that he just mentioned and those which are listed in this table here. It seems to me to be a purely arbitrary business.

If they catch the Minister or whatever official is in charge in the right mood they will get something; if they catch them in the wrong mood, they will get nothing. Why should the Canadian women's open golf championship not receive assistance for hospitality, as it is called, when the international snipe sailing championship received assistance? I fail to see what the distinction is. And I would like to know from the Minister the principles on which he operates, if any.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have attempted in the past to outline the principles and basis for the decisions. In any one particular year I am desirous that any particular activity does not get a preponderance of grants. For example, in the sports field, I would determine that to the best of my ability, of all the sports types of events that we will be requested to favour, that I will pick a representative group and perhaps next year or in the next few years one of these groups will come back and I would be delighted to reconsider their application in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. Bryden: I take it the Minister enjoys dangling them on the end of a string year after year.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I do not. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's language is completely inappropriate. This is not an easy task to do, I can assure you, to try to administer the hospitality fund of the province of Ontario with seven million people, with a voted amount of $40,000. It is not an easy task. I ask the members of this House if they will stop and reflect for a moment, the hospitality of their own personal households in the course of a year. This represents the bulk of the hospitality extended by this government on behalf of seven million people to the literally tens of thousands of people who come to us, not as visitors, but really guests of ours within this province. It is not an arbitrary job, it is a difficult job and and a job in which I have the sympathy of all the Treasury benches—the hon. Provincial Treasurer's sympathy is toned down with the amount of money he has available.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister reminds me of the policemen in the "Pirates of Penzance," but if he finds his lot is such an unhappy one why does he not just ditch the whole thing?

An hon. member: Oh no, just a little bit here and there.

Mr. Bryden: Obviously he turns down organizations that are quite as worthy as those whom he favours. The whole thing operates on an arbitrary basis. It is a recognition of a tradition really that has very little merit in it, that some sort of free handout should be given to some people. The hon. Minister says he tries to avoid a preponderance of benefit to any organization, yet he tells us that in the past year very close to 25 per cent of the money expended went to one association, the Canadian bar association, an organization consisting of very well heeled men who put their convention expenses on their income tax anyway and thereby have The Department of National Revenue income tax division pay for a substantial part of it. Why can they not buy their own drinks for their own convention, instead of charging some of it up to the people of Ontario?

I will say that I had always regarded the term "government hospitality fund," as sort of a substitute for "booze fund," and I was very happy to note that in the 1964-65 fiscal year, the women's Christian temperance union qualified to the extent of $872.37. I really do not know how he got the figure up that high for that particular organization.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say to the hon. member that alcoholics anonymous this year received a grant of $1,000.

Mr. Bryden: I would now like to ask the Minister—I am still referring to the last issue of the public accounts covering 1964-65—I would like to ask him about the expenditure of $3,496.76 in regard to the Toronto

men's press club byline ball. Could he give an accounting of that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That has been an annual event, Mr. Chairman, and that is in conjunction with the byline ball which is held here in Toronto where the national awards in the field of the press are awarded. That is an annual event. The hon. member will see that that particular item has appeared, I think, continuously. There are three or four which appear on an annual basis. I am thinking of the civil service quarter century dinner. There are a minimum number of these.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I think—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is not the press dinner which has been—

Mr. Bryden: No, I realize that the boom was lowered on that one. I do not really think the civil service quarter century club is in quite the same category. What expenditures does the hon. Minister cover in connection with this byline ball? Does this represent the total cost of the affair? Is it an affair put on for this organization? Just what is covered in that expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is in conjunction with the awards dinner.

Mr. Bryden: But does this represent the cost of the dinner? Is the dinner put on for them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. You can almost use it as a rule of thumb that where you see an item that is down to the pennies, we are picking up the tab for the event in relationship to this. In some of those round figure sums invariably that is probably a portion of the cost, pretty close to all of it. But very often where they do not know the cost, we will say: " We will grant you up to $1,000 towards the cost of defrayal." If there is a greater cost, they pick up the difference themselves. In these other instances where the amounts are odd, we have picked up the tab; we have put on the affair.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I in my innocence, have always assumed that the Toronto men's press club in putting on the byline ball had financed it itself, but apparently the people of Ontario are financing it. Why can they not be like other people and put on balls for which they charge admission, so that they are self-financing? I do not really see any particular reason why this organization should become a favoured group eligible to subsidization out of the taxes of the people of Ontario. I would suggest to the Minister he might reconsider what apparently is now a traditional policy, but which is in conflict with his general policy as stated earlier that he does not like to continue to subsidize the same organization year after year.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just to be absolutely correct, do not hold me to the awards dinner. This is a function which is held in conjunction with the series of events that take place. I think this is a three-day event, and one of the affairs is sponsored by the province.

Mr. Sopha: I trust, Mr. Chairman, that we have finished this scintillating subject of the hospitality. For my own apart, there is Laurier's phrase that there are few things that are as tiresome as the monumental righteousness that our hon. friends from the left summon up when we get on the subject of a bit of good cheer.

I wanted to address a query to the hon. Minister in respect of the operation of the marriage office, under this vote. Now, I note with some interest that in the booklet published for immigrants, that reference is made to divorce laws, and I am a bit intrigued—which is the word of my friend from York South—as to why that was considered to be such an essential item of information to convey to people coming to this province—the state of divorce laws in it. I wanted to query the Minister on that same subject. I wanted to put it this way first, that I recall that when Miss Elizabeth Taylor announced her intention of betrothal to Richard Burton while they were resident in this city, the marriage office of this department was very quick in making an announcement that no licence for such a marriage would be issued in Ontario. The reason for that was, I suppose, that Miss Taylor had got a divorce in a jurisdiction in which she was not domiciled and, therefore, the marriage office of this department would not recognize the validity of her previous divorce.

Now, on that score, it has been a matter of concern to solicitors across the province in respect of divorces secured by returning wives to the United Kingdom. A good many of our servicemen, of course, in the province, married while abroad during the war and unfortunately, as must be the case in human affairs, many of the marriages were less than a success and the wives returned to the United Kingdom. Many of those wives, after their return to the United Kingdom made

available to themselves the advantages of certain statutes in the United Kingdom which permitted them to secure divorce on grounds of residence only.

Clearly as a matter of law, and my friend the hon. Provincial Secretary will readily agree with me, that the wife, upon return to the United Kingdom, was domiciled in Ontario, let us say, if the husband was resident in Ontario, but because of the nature of the statutes of the United Kingdom, the wife was able to secure a divorce in the courts of the United Kingdom.

I wish to inquire from the hon. Minister whether it has even been a matter of consideration in the department, that upon the wife securing a divorce in the United Kingdom, under what I believe is called The Matrimonial Causes Act—I believe it was enacted in the early 1950s—and on the basis of such a divorce, secured by a returning wife, a marriage licence might be issued to the husband, who continues to be resident in Ontario.

I understand the practice to be that before a licence may be issued, a solicitor must give an opinion concerning the validity of a divorce. Clearly, in the state of the law as apprehended, and I do not pretend to be a divorce lawyer, but as apprehended on the state of the law, one cannot say that a divorce secured by a wife who, in my example, has returned to the United Kingdom, would be recognized as being valid in the courts of Ontario.

But surely it is the better part of good sense that when we are dealing with a jurisdiction with which we are so closely akin, and our laws have such a close similarity, and certainly have the same basis in fairness and commonsense, as is the case between Ontario and the United Kingdom, it has occurred to me that it would be the better part of good sense that in respect of such a divorce, secured by a returning wife, the policy might be bent a bit and the department might accept such a divorce, obtained in the United Kingdom, as being valid.

To my knowledge, this matter has never been tested in the courts. I know of no case where the courts have been called upon to rule in respect of a divorce, as in my example.

If the hon. Provincial Secretary has managed to follow me in the manner in which I have explained this, I would invite him to tell us whether the department has a policy in respect of this very important matter. Indeed it is important in an age when there is such a demand for a change and the addition of greater flexibility to our divorce laws. I would think that here is an area where this department might adopt a greater degree of flexibility and permit the husband, who continues to be domiciled and resident in Ontario, to obtain a marriage licence for a subsequent marriage.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has quite correctly set out the situation. I have followed with a great deal of interest the debate in this House by members in respect of divorce laws, and most of their attention was devoted to the causes of action and the basis for the divorce. Few have turned their minds to the question of domicile, which is a very ancient doctrine which we took from the common law, and have still retained.

The situation that the member has referred to is one, indeed, in which if the husband were to apply for a marriage licence on the basis of our present policy, which is based on the interpretation of The Marriage Act, as we see it, the applicant must satisfy the Provincial Secretary in this regard. Indeed, it is a coincidence and the hon. Attorney General whispered into my ear, as the member was speaking, that this is the type of case that he discussed with me in a specific instance, not in the too distant past.

The member has highlighted one situation, but I can assure him again, because of the nature of our population, that this is repeated many times over. During the course of the past three years, we have issued 1,632 marriage licences, where people have been divorced outside of the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. Interestingly enough they come from 87 jurisdictions—that is 43 of the 50 states of the United States, and the balance of 44 from countries in Europe and around the world.

The ancient doctrine of domicile has produced hardships, not only in this instance, but in the tremendous upset after World War II, when families were broken up and the husband would be in Australia and the wife could be in Canada, or in Argentina, or behind the iron curtain. There have been a multitude of such things.

This, of course, I became aware of quite some time ago, and we have been making studies in this field from a departmental point of view. When the law reform committee was set up, the question of the whole of the family law came under review. To my mind, the question of the principle of domicile is one very basic to this, and it is

my hope that the law reform committee will direct its attention to this particular item.

We have been in contact with them, indicated to them our problems in this regard, invited them to look at this as part of their study, and we are hopeful that they will see fit to do so. If not, the department, I am sure, will take this particular phase under review. It is a very vexing one.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise some questions about this particular vote also, because there are circumstances similar to what my hon. friend has recited, but not completely identical.

For instance, there are many couples who come over here from Great Britain. They are people who were born in Great Britain; they come over her and the wife returns to Great Britain where she obtains a divorce.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member and to members of the House that we do not want to get into a full-scale debate on the divorce law, but what we should do is think in terms of the marriage office and the issuing of the licence for marriage.

Mr. Ben: Very good, Mr. Chairman.

In these particular instances, often the husband who has been divorced by his wife in Great Britain, cannot obtain a certificate from the marriage office on the grounds that he was domiciled in Britain. English law has long held that an Englishman always considers England to be his home; he may wander afield to make his fortune, to India, to Canada and to the colonies, but he always intends to return, so that, in essence, he never acquires a domicile of choice.

Should the hon. Minister not make some provisions to facilitate the granting of certificates to these people, not only in this particular instance, but to people who are divorced in jurisdictions where they had been born and where they had lived up to the time of the divorce?

The Minister mentioned the United States. The United States has its own rules whereby under the Constitution they must recognize each other's Acts, so that they have to recognize a divorce granted by another state. As a result we have been recognizing divorces granted in the United States to United States subjects. Could the Minister do something to facilitate that?

Now, I want to get back to this hospitality, and I want to rise to the defence of the hon. Minister. I want to rise to his defence because perhaps the point I was trying to make was not quite clear to the members.

First of all, I think that an allocation of $40,000 for hospitality for a province of this size and this stature, is actually an insult. It is actually an insult. How can this province live up to its dignity when it allocates a sum of $40,000? I might point out that it is only $15,000 more than the city of Toronto is allocating for hospitality and entertainment of dignitaries. I think the solution to this problem, Mr. Chairman, would be for the Minister to restrict the use of the hospitality fund to guests of the province of Ontario, that is only to international or interprovincial associations, those who come from outside to this province. In other words, as the Minister said, "into our household."

Mr. Bryden: There are few of those who come here.

Mr. Ben: Oh, there are quite a number, with all due respect to the hon. member for Woodbine. Most of them would come into the class that I am mentioning: the British parliamentary delegation — the magnificent sum of $153; Canadian amateur hockey association; the Canadian "Y" associations; the Canadian association for retarded children—again, it is Canada-wide; the Canadian conference of the arts—it is Canada-wide; the Canadian highway safety council — it is Canada-wide. I could go on into the international and Canadian associations, but frankly, I cannot see the Ontario Jaycees applying for a grant to the province of Ontario. We are not entertaining them here, they live here. They are like a tenant in this House that the Minister mentioned, and I honestly must say that the same would have to apply to the Toronto men's press club. The national men's pres club would be a horse of a different colour, or a liquor of a different strength.

They come from outside the province; they come from all over Canada, and I can see the logic in this province providing hospitality, so that if the hon. Minister's department became —let us use the word "honest"—about the question of hospitality and restricted their grant for hospitality to what, in effect, is entertaining people who come from outside of this province, I would be the first to support an increase in the allocation. The hon. Minister then would not have to be accused of abitrariness, because he could just decide whether this was, in fact, a legitimate organization that was coming to the province of

Ontario for a convention—after all, they are bringing business to this province when they come here—and whether they are worthy of an allocation and how much. That would end the problem, but I certainly would not go on supporting a resident association, simply because they come to the hon. Minister and they have a lot of members or something of that nature. After all, hospitality is given, it is not demanded.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would this be the appropriate place for the hon. Minister without Portfolio to comment about his estimate in this vote?

Mr. Chairman: I do not believe that the Minister without Portfolio has an estimate.

An hon. member: Yes, he does.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it is under vote 1601—it is the last item on that vote.

Mr. Chairman: It is a statutory amount.

Mr. Ben: Why is it cut in half this year; is he only working half-time? It was $5,000 last year.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the hon. Minister. I am a little confused between the hospitality fund and some of the grants that he has been handing out, and I would like very much to ask a question pertaining to the Big Sister associations.

Are there any grants given by some department of government—perhaps the hon. Minister's—that contributes to them—I have to take exception to what my colleague, the hon. member for Bracondale had to say. Here is a local association doing a good job for people in the province, and I make reference to the Big Sister association. They are in every city and render service to young ladies who come to that town and have no place to stay. They are housed and looked after; and they find that the united appeal fund does not provide sufficient money for them. If they are going to continue their service, Mr. Chairman, they must get money from somewhere, and I wonder if that comes under The Department of the Provincial Secretary, or do I take it up with some other department of government?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It would be within some other department. Actually, when one looks at the public accounts for the year ending March 31, 1965, it must be remembered that these accounts are related to the estimates of that period, and those grants relating to the international institute and the others and the next series will appear in the citizenship branch. Those relate to citizenship items. Then there are the hospitality items. But the Big Sister movement would have to come under some other department; it would not come under this jurisdiction.

Mr. Bukator: May I follow up on this, Mr. Chairman? I found that many of the speakers who have touched on these estimates have rambled a little. I do not know where else I could take this thing up; I would like to be put on the right track now, and I feel that I would like to say something for this organization. They need funds and I want to know where the government will provide, and if they do provide. Surely some hon. Minister could tell me where to look for these funds. Grants are given out to associations that do a good job.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any provision under vote 1601 for grants other than the hospitality fund? This is the question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko. No, there is not.

Mr. Bukator: I would like an explanation from the hon. Minister. If there are not, where does one go?

Mr. Chairman: I think that as Chairman of the committee, I would have to advise the member that at the present time we are dealing with vote 1601 and it is not within my particular jurisdiction to tell him where to look.

Mr. Bukator: May I again interject? I think the Chairman might be good enough to co-operate and tell me where. Maybe he could ask one of the Ministers a question. Perhaps he might be able to get through to them, I cannot. Where does this money come from, because I know they did give grants to organizations who need assistance, such as this particular group does?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I think it is Public Welfare, but it is not listed in the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1601 carry?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the vote, I would like to ask if the press clipping service comes under this department and if so, under which vote?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Under the Clerk of the legislative assembly.

Vote 1601 agreed to.

On vote 1062:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the companies branch which is covered by this vote, I would like to ask the Minister how many active charters of companies there are at the present time; second, how many companies were incorporated either during the last calendar year, or last fiscal year, whichever is the form in which he has his figures most conveniently; and thirdly, how many charters were cancelled during that period?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: During the course of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I indicated that during the fiscal year ending this year, we estimate there will have been 7,300 corporations incorporated.

Mr. Bryden: In the one year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In the one year. That has risen from a figure of ten years ago, of 4,600 and a figure of 20 years ago, of 2,000. I was interested when the hon. member for Riverdale was assigning new duties to me, that he has not taken into consideration that in some of these things there has been a tremendous expansion.

Now, in respect of the number of active corporations, we actually do not have a firm figure in that regard. I am hopeful that when we get automated, we will be able to produce these figures, but I would estimate that they would be in the number of between 75,000 and 80,000. Last year, the numbers that we cancelled were only 2,500 —this is for the same period. Now, the previous year, we had cancelled the largest number. We cancelled 3,885. That had been an increase over 1964 of 2,200, which had been an increase over 1963, of 2,000. We are hopeful now in this immediate next year, to be able to again turn our attention to cancellations. The problem of outstanding dormant corporations has always been a bugbear within the department, and finally we now have, as a result of legislation, the authority to cancel after one year's delay.

This last year we have not been able to do as much as we did, because we used a lot of our staff in producing the cards, which in turn were fed into the data processing machines for this year's annual returns. But in the coming year, we expect to take these personnel, who now have been taken away from checking into the field of cancellations, so that eventually we should have an accurate count of the number of corporations which are active within the province, or at least are filing annual returns, whether they are doing business or not.

Mr. Bryden: Do those who fail to file an annual return have their charters cancelled; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh yes, we are cancelling them as quickly as we can. We have got a policy of cleaning out. There are certain instances where there are circumstances. A solicitor may have been very ill for a significant period of time. Within the corporation, where a satisfactory explanation is given, we are lenient, but where there is no reasonable excuse, we are quite merciless in this respect.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in regard to companies that are incorporated—and it appears to be a very large number every year; of course a great many of them are very small companies, but there were 7,300 in the year just concluded—does the department make any effort to discover, when applications are made for incorporation, if any of the people who appear to be playing a principal role in these incorporations have in the recent past been associated with companies that have gone bankrupt, leaving significant amounts of unpaid wages and other debts? Do you do any checking along that line?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We do not, Mr. Chairman. This was a matter, as the hon. member for Riverdale knows, that we discussed in one of the early sessions of the select committee on The Corporations Act. The relationship of previous bankruptcies and future incorporations was discussed. I think that the committee will either make up their mind to either direct their attention to this field, or not. We will await the report and then the department will take such necessary action.

You must remember that in the broad field of business incorporation, the applicants are not the people who are going to be in the business. There are those who are called office incorporators, the members of a firm, and they apply continuously. We do not at the present time follow that course.

Mr. Bryden: This is, I think, one of the bases of a real evil. I am not a member of the committee and I do not wish to interfere with its activities, but I have never been

one to take the view that inquiry should hold up the remedying of abuses. There have been abuses in this field for a great many years and in my opinion we do not need a detailed inquiry to find, at least, a partial remedy.

One of the things that is objectionable about incorporation is the fact that the people whose names appear in the application are nothing but dummies. They could be concealing almost anybody. This business of going bankrupt is a grade A racket in the country. It is a racket on a big scale, and it is a racket on a small scale. When it is on a big scale, a great many suppliers are cheated out of large sums of money. In fact I gather from what I have been reading in other jurisdictions that this becomes the basis of financing other racketeering and is an integral part of the whole pattern of organized crime.

This is the pattern in the big sphere. We also have it in the small sphere, where it is not related to organized crime and probably therefore not as serious a threat to the welfare of the body politic. Nevertheless it produces most unjust situations. There are still people in the construction industry who fail to pay the wages that are due to their working people, all of whom are people living very close to the margin. They go out of business, go into bankruptpcy, and in no time at all, they are back in business under another name, and it is very hard to catch up with some of them.

I think the laws have been tightened up a bit to provide that you can get after the principal officers for wages owing, but this still is a form a cheating that I do not think our laws should tolerate. The hon. Minister, I suppose, at the present time may not even have any power to try to find out who are the principals behind applications for incorporation—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have that power.

Mr. Bryden: You have that power? Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the power should be exercised. Frankly, I have no doubt the government would claim that the fact that 7,300 companies are incorporated is a sign of great progress. I am not sure if it is or it is not. It is in some cases, but I get alarmed when I see this number of companies incorporated. I know too well what some of them are doing, the sort of shenanigans that they are up to and the sort of practices they are concealing, and I think there should be a more rigid scrutiny of the applications for incorporation than apparently takes place now. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, in regard to this matter of scrutiny, what staff is involved in scrutinizing a volume of 7,300 applications in the course of a year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The total staff of the companies branch is 113, and they do all the work in relationship to all the corporate documents in respect to this. They are quite capable of doing their present job. If we were to pass on the background of 7,300 corporations in the course of a year, we would have to have the equivalent of the Ontario provincial police and every other policing agency in the country to do this.

I say that this problem is with the select committee, sir, because the type of change that would be required is the kind of checking up which we do, for example, in relation to clubs, which is only a very minor portion of our applications. We may have 50 clubs in the course of a year and the amount of effort that is devoted to the processing and the checking of the applicants, who must be ten of the people who will actually be carrying on, is quite a chore.

I bring the hon. member's attention to the fact that in Ottawa on February 22, An Act to amend The Bankruptcy Act received its first reading.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it has been referred to the committee on banking, and some of the problems the member is referring to will be dealt with in The Bankruptcy Act. As a matter of fact, a great many people feel that that is exactly where they should be dealt with. We should deal with the corporate entities as we find them; The Bankrutpcy Act should cover the abuses.

While I am on my feet, with reference to what the hon. member for Riverdale was talking about in relation to professional groups, I would say that of course we have been following this closely. I do not know whether he is aware of the fact that the Manitoba Legislature did set up a special committee to study the uniform legislation in this field relating to the types of bodies that he has referred to.

Again this is a matter on which the select committee will determine whether, within its broad terms of reference, the committee should go into. If they do not, I would assume that the department will give this study, because I know that the groups themselves—that is, the people concerned—have initiated discussions and studies in this relative field.

Vote 1602 agreed to.

On vote 1603:

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two about this vote.

I would like to remind the hon. Minister I think it was ten years ago, that the then Prime Minister of Ontario sent a younger member over to Hungary and he did a very good job over there and was instrumental in bringing many citizens from Hungary to the province of Ontario. I remember that he gave a special report in this Legislature, the then Provincial Secretary took considerable credit and the Prime Minister was quite boastful about what the province of Ontario had done for these unfortunate people. Of course, over the years, they have been very good citizens and not only are we glad that these Hungarians came in the main part to the province of Ontario, but as far as Canada is concerned they have been very useful as citizens.

Over the years we in this Legislature have been reminded of this and we have been reminded that there is a Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in Ottawa whom we, in the Opposition, have always claimed had the firm right or the prime right to initiate immigration into Canada. But in this vote tonight and in other votes we have had under the Provincial Secretary, whenever there has been a large influx of immigrants into Canada, half of whom come into the province of Ontario, the Minister and his predecessors have been less than modest in claiming that they have been instrumental in getting these citizens or these immigrants to the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how many immigrants he has been successful in getting into this province in the last year or so. It seems to me that if he has been boastful in the past for getting citizens—who, heaven knows, we need in this province—then he should stand here tonight and say that as far as this past year or two is concerned, he has been most unsuccessful. I am one of those who still believe that the initiative must come from Ottawa and as far as I personally am concerned, I think the Ottawa government has made a very poor attempt. They have not been successful in meeting what we need more in this country than anything else, namely, more citizens.

But if they are not successful in Ottawa, then I say to the Minister that he too has not been successful, because if he was boastful in the past for what he has done, what is he doing at the present time? You and I, Mr. Chairman, all of us, as members in this Legislature, in my opinion should be ashamed of ourselves for the lack of immigrants who have come into Canada and into the province of Ontario in the last several years.

When one considers the large number of people that there are in other countries that are much smaller than our own—the Americans to the south with a country smaller than ours have 200 million people; there are approximately 700 million Chinese; 400 or 500 million Indians; 50 million in the British Isles, a little small island; 80 million Germans—we find you and I, Mr. Chairman, with the second largest country in the world, with only approximately 20 million.

This is something—and as I said before, I am the first to admit it—that Ottawa has fallen down on. They should be ashamed of themselves but, Mr. Chairman, with vote 1603 here, of approximately $500,000, the Minister should be ashamed of himself too. We need people in this country. Consider the distance from Halifax to Vancouver, and only 20 million people. This is why we are not known in the world today. How many times have I heard and read in the past—

Mr. MacDonald: We are known, but what are we known for these days?

Mr. Whicher: —number of years that the last half of the twentieth century belongs to Canada. This is a lot of nonsense, as long as we have only 20 million people here. It is up to you, who are leaders in the government of Ontario, and the leaders of other provinces and, of course, I am not forgetting Ottawa, to take the initiative and get people over here. I would suggest that if it were not for our Italian immigrants, we would not even have these subways here in the province of Ontario today.

The hon. Provincial Secretary is proud of what the Hungarians have done; many others are proud of the English immigrants or the German immigrants or the Polish or whoever they may be. But the fact is that the number of people coming into Ontario has almost dried up in the last year or two. And you will never get it sitting in your office here in Queen's Park. The Provincial Secretary did a good job when he was a private member; he took a trip over to Hungary. I have read in the papers that many of the Cabinet Ministers of this province have been over in Europe in the last two or three years. What are the results as far as immigrants are concerned?

Surely the thing that we need here more than anything else, is more people. And so

I ask the Provincial Secretary, just what has he done about this besides trying to look after the ones that he has brought over here and are now residents of this province and have come in the last five or ten years? What is he doing to get a few more million over here, because we have lots of room and we certainly need them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, Mr. Chairman, the matters relating to immigration do not fall within this field. I am the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship. Any matters relating to the operation of immigration agencies fall within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Economics and Development.

Mr. Sopha: Not so capable.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And he has been beating the drums in respect of immigration—

Mr. Bryden: You guys are always beating the drums.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —around the world.

Mr. Sopha: Steel drums.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have just been sitting here very quietly and patiently. My mind goes back, not just ten years, but 15 years, and if I have had one modicum of success in this House, I can hear my words coming back to me, as I stood here as a private member in 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1955, speaking on immigration, because my position on immigration is very clear.

I personally hold to the viewpoint of a wide-open-door policy.

Mr. Whicher: Why do you not do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The reason we do not do something about it, is because of a clipping that I will draw to the attention of the hon. member: "Do not interfere in Ottawa field, Ontario told." I ask the hon. member for Sudbury—

Mr. Whicher: You never got that before.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —whether that strikes a responsive chord in his constitutional heart, because this relates to what he was telling the province of Ontario, "You stay out of federal fields." I can say that this is one field we have not stayed out of and I am delighted that we have not.

Mr. Bukator: You should get into federal politics.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Without getting into any rancour about what has taken place in Ottawa, and the hon. members sitting in that House have done an admirable job in expressing their opinions in that regard, I can tell you that I feel personally that the disappearance within the last 24 hours of The Department of Citizenship and Immigration from the federal field is something to be followed in sorrow. Two outstanding games, citizenship and immigration. This government saw fit to introduce the word "citizenship" into its department, and I remember—

Mr. Whicher: How many citizens did you introduce?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —when the hon. member—

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to interrupt the Minister, but you have already indicated to the House that this properly does not come within your vote, and I would ask—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bracondale, as *Hansard* will show, devoted almost half of his remarks to the field of immigration, and because I am one who is vitally interested, I did not arise on a point of order in that respect. But I would like to say this; reference has been made to the opening of immigration offices, and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will indicate what he is doing in respect of getting people into this province.

I may say that a very interesting item has occurred. Those brochures that I have distributed, produced by a provincial Legislature, have been made available to the embassy offices, the visa-issuing departments of the federal government in Europe—and I think we shipped them some 7,000 in recent times—so that they can use those booklets which we initially produced to facilitate the integration of newcomers as citizens in our province. They are being used to indicate to the people of Europe what is available, because when they read those pamphlets they see.

Now, all I can say to my hon. friend from Bruce is this: What have I done, what has this government done, to attract citizens? To paraphrase the concluding remarks of my statement:

> Creating an environment and an atmosphere that has made Ontario, Canada, the mecca, if I may use the term, of immigrants from around the world.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, that is all very well.

Mr. Chairman: May I respectfully suggest to the members of the House now that we stay with vote 1603, please?

Mr. Whicher: Well, this is citizenship branch. I would like to—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): This goes over to Europe for some reason.

Mr. Whicher: I would like to ask how many immigrants from Europe have domiciled in Ontario in the past year, because I am sure you have a record? In the years that they were coming in here, you knew every one of them. How many there were. Half of the people who came into Canada settled in Ontario, because of this great place that we have. How many have you got this year?

Mr. Chairman: Would the member like to withhold his question and ask it of The Department of Economics and Development?

Mr. Whicher: The only reason is that this is citizenship branch, and I was wondering how many new citizens we had? I would further like to ask the hon. Minister, did I understand him to say that you had sent 7,000 of these over to Europe lately?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: At the request of the Canadian embassy—

Mr. Whicher: My goodness, you should send seven million over. You might just as well throw 7,000 away.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are assisting them.

Mr. Whicher: Well, how many new citizens came to the province of Ontario from Europe this past year? I am sure you have the record there.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think 52.7 per cent of all of those who came to Canada.

Mr. Whicher: Well, how many?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Just over 187,000.

Mr. Whicher: Well, is this true? Is that 187,000?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: About 67,000 came to Ontario.

Mr. Whicher: Sixty-seven thousand?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am just taking a round guess.

Mr. Sopha: Now give us another figure. It sounds like a bingo game.

Mr. Whicher: All I want to say, Mr. Chairman, and I make no excuses whatsoever for the people in Ottawa who really should be looking after this, if you only got 67,000, from Europe, there is something wrong. You are not doing a very good job as far as citizenship is concerned.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to remind the member to stay with this vote.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has made a number of references to the pamphlet that he put on our desks a little earlier this evening. I take it this is one in a series of pamphlets. I have read the English version, although I am not sure that the Greek version would be any more confusing. After I hear all the hon. Minister's accolades about this particular pamphlet—I will not speak for the others in the series, because I have not seen them—but I have heard all his noble statements about this one on the structure of government, and I am beginning to wonder if he has ever read it.

I read it through here a little earlier this evening. It makes the structure of Canadian government seem even more confusing than it actually is, and that is quite an achievement. It is by no means accurate, and it is most uninformative. Really, I shudder to think that the federal people are now using this over in Europe. One thing that really intrigued me was that the only specific functions of government, the only specific powers that are considered to be sufficiently important to be brought out into headlines in the pamphlet, are divorce laws, administration of justice and correctional institutions.

I wonder if the hon. Minister could explain why he and his department think that those particular items would be of particular interest to people who either have just arrived here or are contemplating coming here.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I direct the hon. member's attention to the list I read on the back. It shows all the pamphlets which are produced.

Mr. Bryden: I am not talking about those, I am just talking about this one.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The basis for the production of these pamphlets were based on seminars which were held by the division.

Mr. Thompson: You talked about labour laws.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We talked about the whole broad range of government services.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, and you talked about medical insurance programme at that seminar. Have you got something about medical insurance?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That would be in the Health department.

Mr. Thompson: Is it in the Health department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well not yet, but it will be when the revision is made. We went to the people and listening to them, found out the information they sought, what they were looking for, and on the basis of what they wanted to find out we produced pamphlets to inform them.

Mr. Bryden: Then I take it from what the hon. Minister says that they had a burning interest in divorce laws and administration of justice and correctional institutions, as far as structure of government is concerned. Are those the matters that interested them most with regard to the way in which Canada is governed, to the exclusion of any other functions of government that are either not mentioned at all, or only given most—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What functions of goverment is the hon. member talking about that should have been included? We have a whole pamphlet devoted to The Departments of the Attorney General, Education, Highways, Labour, Lands and Forests, Reform Institutions, Transport, Tourism, and structure of government. Now, these are also translated into Greek, if I may say, and any reader of this pamphlet knows that if he wants to get detailed information on other functions of government, these pamphlets are available. As a matter of fact, we try to make the pamphlets available now as a package deal, so if somebody inquires—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Minister that people frequently read one pamphlet in a series without reading all of them. This one by its title would suggest that it gives a general outline of government in Canada. I will not go into the general contents of it, because I really think that anybody who would read it would probably have less information about how Canada is governed after he is through than before he started.

The principle may be that we will try to make the newcomer as confused about Canadian government as the native citizens are, and thereby qualify them for citizenship. I do not know, but the fact remains that the only functions that are brought out are the three that I have mentioned.

Now whether or not you have special pamphlets on special subjects, I would suggest that in a general survey some functions of government that I would consider to be of greater importance, and perhaps of greater interest to newcomers, might very well be referred to in a pamphlet of this kind. We might even dispense with the charming face of the hon. Minister on the back in order to get in a little information about, for example, a broad outline of regulation of labour conditions in this province, about the nature of the trade union movement in this province, the extent that it is affected by the law—at least a bit of an outline of some of those things so that the reader's attention will be directed toward the more detailed pamphlets.

Also I feel quite sure that most of the people coming to this country who tend to be in the young adult group, people with families or contemplating forming families, would be far more interested in the educational system and educational opportunities of Ontario than in the divorce laws.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: So they read the whole pamphlet on it.

Mr. Bryden: I read No. 11; I am taking it as a self-contained entity and am suggesting to the hon. Minister that many readers will do the same thing with it. I have met a great many of these people, but have not met any who have a burning interest in the divorce laws of the province, important as those may be and antiquated as they may be. But I have met a great many who are interested in the educational system and I would suggest—

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): All they have to do is to read the pamphlet.

Mr. Bryden: As I suggested before, I think the Minister knows that people, when they get what purports to be a general survey of government, will look in it for at least some outline of what are considered to be the most important functions of government. If they are then interested in greater detail they can go and look for greater detail.

Education is hardly mentioned in this pamphlet at all, and then only in a rather curious listing that is made at one point of the division of jurisdiction as between

the federal and provincial governments. I assume that education is probably mentioned there; yes, it is, as being under provincial jurisdiction.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that if he has not done so he should read this pamphlet No. 11 himself; I am sure that he would quickly see many ways in which it could be improved.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, just to conclude the fact, I would say that I look at this in the overall picture. We have produced these pamphlets over a number of years. They are not an inexpensive item when they are produced in 13 languages.

As a matter of fact, again I know of no jurisdiction in the world that does this and we have produced them in a series. We produced No. 1 first and then we distributed it and then went on to No. 11, so when a Greek citizen comes to us at the present time he gets the packet and he reads about the structure of government. I can assure the hon. member that it is just as vital for the Greek immigrant to know what services are provided at the municipal level and what is the responsibility of the province—

Mr. Bryden: He would not find it out from this, I can tell the hon. Minister that!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He certainly will when he reads it in conjunction with the packet. I commend these very highly to the hon. members of the House.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, one of the lasting memories that one will take away from this House, of course, will be the vigour, the determination, one might indeed say the affection, with which this Provincial Secretary has responded to the introduction of any subject in this Legislature related to a person of ethnic origin. He was quick to jump to his feet as soon as a Slovak name was mentioned or a person from Estonia. This hon. Minister would respond with a lengthy polemic as being the great defender of people from other lands. In fact one can say that his fervour was only equalled by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, who has always vied with him as being the champion of that group which is identified by a word which I revile, the "ethnics."

Now they are not alone, sir, in representing in this House people from many different countries. The community that I have the honour to represent is made up of people from no fewer than 40 different lands; 40 different origins reside in the Sudbury basin. I would say, sir, in respect of the services provided by this branch of The Department of the Provincial Secretary, that this selection pamphlet is not good enough, even though it has on its back a picture of the hon. Minister, which certainly must have some vintage to it as there are certain differences in the appearance that one notes upon a close examination of it.

Now, I would not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: He certainly has not got fatter hair since he had this taken.

Mr. Sopha: I would not go into a detailed analysis of it except to say that while I read it, sir, I could hardly stop laughing until I finished.

For example, when I came to page 10 and saw this one on "Collision of Interests"—

Mr. Singer: I think that the hon. member should read that into the record.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I think this should go into the record.

"Collision of Interests" it says, in a pamphlet dealing with the structure of government:

> This brings us to an area where there may be, literally, collision of interest. If a car is travelling a provincial highway and collides with a train on a federally controlled railway, who should have to put up the safety signal?

One could say, in attempting to retain some degree of seriousness, what could be more ridiculous than this?

Mr. Singer: Well, read the answer!

Mr. Sopha: No, I cannot go on because it would bring tears to my eyes to read the rest of the thing.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Nice to have you back, Elmer.

Mr. Sopha: But I say this, sir—and my friend the hon. member for Woodbine and I were saying it, and indeed were joined by the hon. member for Halton, I believe it was, who was at the committee as well as other hon. members, the public accounts committee were saying the same thing to the Deputy Minister of Labour today—that there is a great need in this government for adequate translation services.

We were urging The Department of Labour to have available in that department

people who were fluent in the major, at least the major, languages of immigrant people who are employed in the various industries in this province and perhaps in the more centralized industrialized areas such as this one. The hon. Minister himself, during the introduction of his estimates, devoted considerable time to translation services.

Well then, sir, I ask of the hon. Minister what services are available to immigrants who have problems with the workmen's compensation board? I have always had the personal feeling that a good deal of injustice is done in compensation matters because of the inability of the compensable person to communicate his case adequately to the board. What amount of injustice is done in respect to the construction trades, and perhaps the needlework trades, to mention two more prominent examples, because of the inability of the worker to communicate in his own tongue?

Again I say that I can stand on the floor of the House and say with a certain degree of sureness that there are people who immigrate to our country who will never bother to acquaint themselves with any working degree of fluency with the English language. I am told that in respect of the Portuguese—a good many Portuguese have come to our country recently—I am told that they fit themselves into close-knit little communities and they never bother to attain any degree of fluency whatsoever with English.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): That is entirely wrong.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions says it is entirely wrong.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have the highest proportion of Portuguese in my riding and they learn to speak English very quickly.

Mr. Sopha: My information is otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, they were the third largest group attending our summer course.

Mr. Sopha: They were the third largest group attending where?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The summer course.

Mr. Sopha: To merely say they attend the summer course is a rather vacant piece of information. I am making the assertion that there are a good many acquired citizens of the province who are unable to communicate in their language and thereby become the victims of injustice because they cannot communicate.

I do not think it is sufficient for the hon. Provincial Secretary to say that he has in the department, translation services for various types of documents and formal applications and that type of thing. Surely what is needed is to have a group of people within the department who could be called upon in case of need to assist the person to make his communication, or to air his complaint or his grievance in his own language. That is the need.

Having said it to the Deputy Minister of Labour to date, perhaps the hon. member for Woodbine and myself were mistaken; perhaps it should be said to the Minister who comes onto the floor of the House in the evening hours and prides himself on the ability to translate in 13 or 14 languages. My point is, the translation is not good enough.

A person cannot help but be struck that an English-speaking person going to Europe has little difficulty in communicating his needs or his requests, because someone always speaks English. Certainly these new citizens who come to the province have the same right to have available to them, people who can assist them to communicate in their own language. Perhaps at this late hour we might be favoured by a dissertation from the hon. Provincial Secretary in respect of what I consider to be a very grave problem at present existing in the province.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, just to go back for a moment, I am very proud of the role I have been playing in respect to my position as a defender, not of any particular class, but of all citizens. When I use the word "ethnic" I use it in its purest sense to include everybody who resides in Canada, regardless of what his ethnic origin is. I do not classify certain particular groups.

The hon. member has, if I may use the expression, gibed at me in the past. I remember the Canadian football league. I did spring to the defence, and I was the first to spring to the defence. I am delighted to produce for him, if he has not noticed, a clipping that "the CFL sweeps rule under rug." If I played some part in the sweeping under the rug of that item, I am proud of it.

Mr. Singer: That was anti-American though.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is anti-American.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, it is not anti-American, it is pro-Canadian citizens, regardless of who or what they are.

In relation to the translation services, I have been acutely aware of this and that is why the translation service is provided within the department and has enjoyed, if I may classify it, a phenomenal growth. Any business growing the way this translation service has, has to be a phenomenal success.

As it happens, The Department of Labour in respect of this field is our third best customer from a departmental point of view, Welfare being the first, Education being the second and Labour being the third. We translate what I refer to as the status documents, the diploma of trade, whatever the case may be.

Within the department we are amply supplied. I think in answer to a question placed by one of the members last year, I think it was the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, Mr. Chairman, I informed him there were within our staff 50 people who spoke a language in addition to English and I think they almost reach two dozen languages. I am advised that they can speak, within the department, 30 different languages, so that anybody walking into the north wing can be very amply taken care of.

The other departments are aware—

Mr. Sopha: Let us get down to business. Will you send a person down to the workmen's compensation board along with an individual?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The other departments are aware of our facilities and facility in doing this. If they turn to us for assistance, I can assure hon. members we will not turn anybody down.

Mr. Sopha: Does the department get such requests?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am just saying if the request were made, the service would be provided.

Mr. Sopha: Supposing a person has a grievance. He has a complaint. He feels an injustice is being done to him by a department of government. Let us get down to brass tacks. Will the hon. Provincial Secretary supply a person who can communicate with that individual, an interpreter?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way. I am of the belief that no department official at this stage of this government's administration would ever for a moment see somebody suffer by a lack of interpretation or lack of presenting his problem. As a matter of fact I am of the firm belief from personal experience that the workmen's compensation board and The Department of Labour in the last half a dozen years were outstanding in making sure that people are not aggrieved—

Mr. Sopha: At five after 11 of the clock this evening, the hon. Provincial Secretary is dodging my question. I am asking him specifically that if an individual has a grievance or complaint, will he supply an interpreter to him, to enable him to communicate his side of the question, his side of the story?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Most of the departments have staff who speak many languages.

Mr. Sopha: Or does the hon. Provincial Secretary use his translators to translate formal documents and applications? One of the members in the public accounts committee today remarkably revealed an instance, I believe it was the hon. member for Scarborough North, where an individual applied to the civil service commission who could speak five separate major languages. He was told by the civil service commission that this was no advantage to him, he should go and apply at Ottawa, in The Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

I want to know what services are available to people who cannot communicate in English to make their grievances known. Does the department supply interpreters in such cases? In fact, has the department ever had a request from another department where some individual, let us say an Italian, has come in and tried to make a communication about some complaint. Has the hon. Minister ever had a request from another department to send over one of his interpreters? If so, on how many occasions? Is it customary for the department to supply such a service? I do not think it is good enough for the Minister to sit here and to say, "We have people who speak 13 languages, or 14 foreign languages."

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Thirty-six.

Mr. Sopha: Thirty-six. Oh, yes. I took the 13 because of an earlier statement the hon. Minister had made in the introduction of his estimates. But now it is seven minutes after 11 on this night, and the Minister is dodging the answer to this question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not dodging the answer to any question, Mr. Chairman. Every

department, to my knowledge, has people on its staff fully capable of dealing with the major languages. I know from personal experience and personal communication with The Department of the Attorney General in this respect, and with The Department of Health and with The Department of Labour. These were to my mind the major departments that could be confronted with this problem. I am assured that these problems are taken care of.

If the hon. member can show an instance where a person was aggrieved he will be on far surer ground than he is now.

Mr. Sopha: What about the poor people? You did not mention The Department of Public Welfare, which is indeed one of the most important ones. How many languages—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, and they are number one on the list, and their deputy can only speak one language, but he makes sure that everybody on the staff—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, but how many different languages can they speak in The Department of Public Welfare?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would imagine—

Mr. Sopha: The reason I am asking, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not good enough to print this trash; it is not good enough to acclimatize these people and to help them adjust in our community. What I am saying now at ten minutes after 11 this night, and still seeking an adequate answer, is that in order to make these people adjust into our community, to play their full role in our country, there is a necessity to assist them to communicate their complaints.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Absolutely, and I applaud that, too.

Mr. Sopha: We are still wanting for an answer from the hon. Minister about what services are available and on how many occasions other departments have called this branch and said, "We have a person who speaks Slovak over here; will you send over an interpreter and help this individual to communicate with us what his grievance is?"

You see, it is something more than holding seminars, and talking about the Polish flag flying over some festivity; it is something more basic than that. In this multi-national province—that is what this province is, multi-national, made up of people from many lands, who have played a great part and made a great contribution to the building of this province—it is something more than all this fol-de-rol and all this show, something practical and pragmatic in assisting them to adjust themselves to our ways, and to make known any complaints or grievances that they have.

I still wait for an answer and I suppose I am not going to get one, but I listened with great respect to the introductory remarks of the hon. Minister and it was with a certain degree of facetiousness that I referred to the vigour with which he speaks on behalf of people of ethnic origin. But he does not stand alone in this House, and he will not stand alone in this House as being one of those who wants to show some degree of determination of making their lot easier, while they attempt to adjust and acclimatize themselves to our way of life in this province.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I will accede the floor quickly, Mr. Chairman. Just to support what is being put by the hon. member for Sudbury to the hon. Minister, there are three simple points I would like to make.

1. He asked for illustrations and examples. The only study that is widely available in this field—Edith Ferguson's study of newcomers in transition, a study of 100 Portuguese families and 100 Italian families —is littered, and you are holding it in your hand, with examples of breakdowns in communication; indeed, breakdown in communication involving departments of this government. It stands on the record as a problem which this government simply has not faced up to.

The second thing, and this comes back—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is another matter altogether—

Mr. S. Lewis: —and this comes back to the intervention the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions made when the hon. member for Sudbury talked about the Portuguese group. Let us put it on the record. Of the 79 men studied from Portuguese families by Miss Ferguson, and the 81 women studied, five per cent could converse freely in English—five per cent of the entire study group. If that does not support the hon. member for Sudbury, nothing does.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How long were those people here?

Mr. S. Lewis: That was his point, the people who had arrived—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course, it takes time to learn it. They are not going to learn it overnight. Of course they are not. It is ridiculous.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis: It seemed to me that I heard the hon. member for Sudbury ask in the recent past, in the last year or two, "How many speak the language adequately?" Obviously if there is no adequate expression, or expression at the level of five per cent, then the responsibility of this branch to help the adjustment to the community becomes paramount. We will doubtless get into this branch—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is another matter.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is the same matter, it is not another matter. It is the same matter: the citizen's adjustment.

The final point, just again to support the hon. member for Sudbury, is that there were, according to my figures, some 61,000-plus immigrants to Ontario in 1964, originating in non-English-speaking countries. It is pointed out that over 50 per cent of them are likely to have documents requiring translation and in the calendar year of 1964, the translation branch handled 8,700 documents, which means that even if they only have one document each, you are reaching only 25 per cent of the documents that would normally require translation. That simply attests to the fact that immigrants often run from travel agent to travel agent, and from one frequently unscrupulous and not very kindly person to another, to get translation of documents.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One father, with a trade document, and a wife and three children—

Mr. S. Lewis: That is fine. You are in fact reaching these people and you are only translating 25 per cent of the documents? As a matter of fact, these figures are taken from a report prepared for the hon. Minister by his own department.

Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is it seems to me that on all three basic counts the hon. member for Sudbury made his case. The basic area of failure is the area of adjustment to the community, the social relationships in the receiving community—that is where the breakdown occurs.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to underline what has been said by the other two speakers. I have sat here year after year listening to the presentation of this department of the citizenship branch and I have grown more cynical about it every time I have sat here.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a pity you did not contribute more when you had the opportunity.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say this, I have listened to this little throw-back—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We filled a vacuum you left.

Mr. Thompson: You filled no vacuum. This to me is just vacant propaganda for the Tory party. Even in this day I would be ashamed if I had the responsibility that you have to come out with this kind of pap year after year, telling us that this is going to integrate the citizens who come here—reading this kind of stuff, with a picture of the hon. Prime Minister and a picture of the hon. Minister and even the Tory blue on it. Let me tell you this—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The envy shines from the hon. leader of the Opposition's eyes.

Mr. Thompson: They are fully aware of your typical approach, my friend, fully aware of it. They laugh at this kind of thing, for what they want from you and from this government is some concern about them in connection with their integration. I have heard your approach about language classes. Two years ago you talked about your TV programme. Last year you had to admit you did not have your kitchen programme. You stand up this time and start talking again about some one person. You take the Inn on the Park. Think of all the industries around here.

You have been wobbling around year after year, trying to encourage language classes, and every year you come in and you look more pathetic in connection with concrete results and what the hon. member for Sudbury is saying. You talk about 40 languages that you can translate, but it comes to a hard fact of reaching out to help people who have come to government departments. He asks you, can they come to this department

where 40 languages are spoken if they need help? I know of people who want translation help when they come down to government departments; the hon. Minister does not seem to know. They do not get help from his department by people going out and saying, "I will give you a hand."

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I challenge the hon. leader of the Opposition to produce one!

Mr. Thompson: Fine, I will. Four years ago—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: How many years ago?

Mr. Thompson: Now, sit down! Let me take another one, then. There was the whole scandal which was referred to as the "armchair pig farm." There was a man who came down here and wandered through Queen's Park and begged for someone to talk to him. He spoke German. I met him and talked with him through an interpreter and he told me what the problem was. I stood up on the floor of this House and I asked that someone would listen to him and the hon. Minister, if I recall—and I will check this in *Hansard*—laughed at me—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I never laughed at you!

Mr. Thompson: —including the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I never laughed at you!

Mr. Thompson: We were talking about a pig farm and the hon. Minister referred to my Irish background. But this was a serious concern to the man who wanted to communicate. What happened? There were thousands of newcomers who—because you would not communicate with this man and because you had not had the facilities—lost their money investing in that pig farm. That is one example because the hon. Minister did not have the facilities.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, there has never been, to my knowledge, anybody turned away from this department, in any respect of aid in this field. The hon. leader of the Opposition is a master in the use of what I call the "nasty" word. "Do not confuse me with the facts," he says. "Do not discuss in the light of day; I will use language to tear you down." The hon. leader of the Opposition had the opportunity in his day and he flunked it, and now he looks across this House and I see an expression, Mr. Chairman, of envy—not pride. He should be proud because he is contributing as a member of this Legislature—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is the epitome of self-righteousness!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is not self-righteousness.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Shame!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Shame! I am proud as I speak to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. members of this House, and the one thing I will be delighted about for having entered into public life is the contribution I made. I am delighted to have filled a vacuum. This government produced the first Department of Citizenship.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I say to the hon. member for Sudbury, there is no department of government that the Opposition has tried to get rid of as much as it has that of the Provincial Secretary, and especially the Minister of Citizenship. The hon. member for Sudbury said, "Send it back. Get rid of it."

Mr. Thompson: Because the hon. Minister is not doing a job.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And do you know what happened? Do you know where The Department of Citizenship vanished from the face of the earth? In Ottawa.

Mr. Thompson: Oh, come on. This is semantics.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will say this, that if there is one thing that the hon. members of the Treasury benches know—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the members that we have had a very productive day; let the Minister continue, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, no, I have the floor. I was paying attention to the chairman.

Mr. Sopha: Will I ever get an answer to my question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer is this, and I record it in *Hansard*. No person in this

province should ever feel that he has been aggrieved by not being able to communicate his problems to those concerned, because if that ever happens in any department and it comes to the attention of the Minister or any one of the 20 Ministers, I can assure the hon. members of this House that they will take a very serious view of the facts. No one will be turned away for lack of communication.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, because the hon. Minister will not give us an answer, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister will give us an answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I will give you an answer, if I may.

Mr. Sopha: No, I want to pursue this for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am going to give an answer, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. member asked a specific question: What happens when somebody goes up to a department and cannot speak English? What happens to that person?

There is no Minister in this government or in any government in Canada, who has the cosmopolitan riding that I do, and probably, perhaps with the exception of the Provincial Secretary's department, there is no department that has as many people visit it—the Minister and the civil servants of the department—who speak as many languages, other than English, as there are in my department.

I want to say that there are so many people in my department, Mr. Chairman, speaking so many languages that it has been unnecessary for me to send anybody to the Provincial Secretary's department. I use The Department of the Provincial Secretary for translations of letters which I get in languages other than English and I would say that the greatest protection that those citizens who do not yet speak English have in this province, is the employment policy of this government.

Every department has within it many people who speak every language that it is possible to hear in this province today. I venture to say that if we took a poll—and perhaps that would be an interesting thing to do—of every department of this government to find out how many languages are spoken, that would be a sufficient answer to the hon. member's question.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in reply to what the hon. Minister said, at the public accounts meeting this morning we were dealing with the accounts of The Department of Labour—a department that I may say is very well managed, in my opinion. We came to what is a very important branch of this department, the labour standards branch, the branch responsible for the enforcement of minimum wages, vacations with pay, hours of work legislation, and so on.

When the question was raised—not by me—as to the language capacity of that branch, we were told very proudly that they now have someone there who can speak French. No other language was covered as far as I could see. We were led to believe that there are people elsewhere in the department who can speak some other languages, but the labour standards branch is a branch that is operating day in and day out in a field where I suppose its greatest clientele consists of new Canadians—the people who are the least familiar with their rights and who feel strange in a new country. I raise this only because of the proud boast made by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions a moment ago.

I do not criticize this branch; it is hard to get all of the qualifications that are needed, but it again brings home very much the relevance of the question that the hon. member for Sudbury has been asking for the last hour and a half without getting an answer. There is need for people who can provide oral translations as well as written translations, who can provide it right out in the field, on the job, who can go to a group of Portuguese or Italian construction workers with the inspector and then get the dope from them. They are the people who can say, more than anybody, what abuses may exist.

I do not think that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has, in fact, answered the question adequately. I am still interested in hearing an answer from the responsible Minister to whom the question was directed.

I must confess that I am losing hope that an answer will be forthcoming, especially after listening to his performance a few minutes ago, which was nothing but a personal attack on the hon. leader of the Opposition and totally irrelevant to anything that was before us. It was strictly a diversion from the real issue, an *argumentum ad hominem*, designed to confuse the issue and to avoid the necessity of answering the question that is before the Minister.

Mr. Sopha: Leave the state of the record to say that I asked the question: whether there was under this vote, in this branch of

the department, in this sum of $484,000 of the people's money, available to a person who cannot communicate in the English language, in this branch assistance to him by way of interpretation of a grievance that he may have against any board or commission, any department of this government. That is my question, for which I have been wanting for an answer. I have not been able to get it from this hon. Minister.

Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister, who has been in the House during the last hour, is able to tell us whether such a service is available, to assist these people who come to our country, to assist us to build it, to find their place here for themselves, their families, who are entitled as a matter of law, and as a right are morally entitled to every benefit that may accrue to them, and who may be denied their moral entitlement for want of being able to communicate their grievances and complaints.

That is the best way I can put it, the question that I have been asking for an hour and a half and for which, like Pontius Pilate, I stayed not for an answer to the question.

I am in the same state. I will go away tonight at half after 11, now—we have kept a running record of the time—still waiting for an answer. I am not going to extend my remarks any further than that. But I am going to leave the record in that state with that question, which still begs for some intelligent explanation other than an attack by way of vituperation and abuse on the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has placed his question on the record. I will place my answer on the record.

I accept as government policy of this administration that no person need ever be aggrieved, need ever be deprived of any right or any privilege or anything which any one of his co-citizens is entitled to by reason of not being able to communicate in a language which will make him and his problem understood. Any such person appearing on the scene in any department of this government will have his wants attended to completely and fully.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister intend to answer any of the questions that were put to him on the lead-off? For instance, what is happening to the international institute; what is happening to the community relations branch? Can the hon. Minister answer some of the questions that were raised on this branch?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have tried to keep a memorandum of the questions of the hon. member for Bracondale. I think if we had had an opportunity of reading *Hansard*, perhaps his questions would be more easily followed.

In respect of the international institute, the member has not done his homework, if I may put the expression that way. He was looking at the public accounts and referred to a grant to the international institute of Metropolitan Toronto for $4,000. Three lines under that is "Miscellaneous – international institute of Metropolitan Toronto, $7,948.50." That is for the accounts of this past year.

We are now making provision in the grants for this coming year, to increase the grant. I think last year we expended pretty close to $12,000, that is to the institute itself, in addition to the facilities for which we pay for, such as the teachers and the staff that were conducting the courses on the plant of the international institute.

I have followed very closely the affairs of the international institute. The department has very close contact with it, and we are aware of its problem in moving to a building. The department has participated through the director in this activity. I have made suggestions in my particular field.

I think that the significant role that the international institute is playing as a community endeavour, shows an institute run by the government would not be the kind of institute that the international institute is. Knowing the temperament of the newcomers, they would shy away from that type of facility as opposed to the type of activity carried on by the international institute, which I place as No. 1 on my list of activities in this regard. I could take advantage of the situation and read letters from those in the institute giving high commendation to the division and its staff for what they have done in the past. I do not know what their future is; the department will render whatever assistance it can in this field. We are only a part of the picture.

The hon. member was deriding the fact that we were using church halls and parish halls and places like the Estonian house—

Mr. Ben: Did I?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is my interpretation. The board of education of the city of Toronto will provide the physical plant of its

educational institutions to whatever need there is; it will provide the classes. But as I say, we cut the cloth not to fit ourselves, but to fit the needs that will be accepted by the newcomers, and if the only classrooms that they will go to are to a volunteer class in a church hall, we welcome the opportunity of working with them in this regard.

I do not know what other major question the hon. member wanted to have. So far as the newcomers knowing about our classes, I want to make it clear that the hon. member for Bracondale was confused, and there was utter confusion, about the classes for adult training and the classes for children. The two things are completely separate. Our jurisdiction is within the field of adult training. Whenever we step into education with regard to the children, we are now acting as "friends in court"; we see the problem and we point it out to those whose responsibility it is.

Though this department does not have jurisdiction over the training of children in the schools, we were among the first to find out, inadvertently as it happened—and I am the first to say it—by the children showing up in our schools when they should have been in others, that something was wrong. When we saw this occurred, we took the immediate steps to intervene in this respect. As a matter of fact, I am on record here in the papers: "Yaremko criticizes English training lack for immigrant pupils"; "Yaremko deplores English course lack"; "Yaremko says newcomers taught English piecemeal."

I am on record as taking a very strong position in this regard, as I say. Fortunately in the Metropolitan Toronto area we have a very advanced board of education in the Toronto board, and they are taking very active steps in this regard.

Here I will read from a letter from the principal of our school, Mr. Kirk, and he says:

> I would doubt that any immigrant to Canada is unaware of the opportunity within reasonable access to attend English classes.

We use television, we use radio, we use the ethnic press, we use every possible means of communication to let the newcomers know that there are these facilities.

I will say this to the hon. member for York South before I sit down: He should not —I will use a minor term—poke fun at our pamphlets. I can assure him that they are not deserving of having fun poked at them regardless of what he may think of my picture on the back, or the hon. Prime Minister's message on the outside.

On the inside, if he were to take The Department of Labour pamphlet which I have, he would find, and I will read it here: "Understanding Ontario." "Education brings oportunity, training and the trades." "Ontario legislation." "Your rights are protected." "Hours of Work." "Vacations with pay." "Labour relations." The whole matter is set out. "The collective bargaining relationships." "Your safety is a major concern." "Inspection of boiler equipment." "Elevators are tested." "Know your rights."

Within the confines of a tiny pamphlet, which only takes a few minutes to read, we have boiled down what would take some native-born Canadians a lifetime to learn.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. Minister to send me a copy of all these. I would like to take a look at them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will be delighted.

Mr. MacDonald: The only one I have seen is the one he has put on our desks.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I used that as an example.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, and if this is an example, this is an indescribably incompetent presentation of the structure of government. It is just beyond belief. It is absolutely beyond belief. As a matter of fact, somebody intervened and said that this was a product of a seminar. You know the old quip that something reads as though it was the product of a committee — well this pamphlet reads as though it was the product of a seminar, as though you gathered a group of people.

This one, for whatever reason, unrepresentative of a general group, happened to be interested in divorce; this one happened to be interested in correctional institutions. So you have a pamphlet that comes out with what is ostensibly the structure of government and is, I repeat, a mish-mash. I defy the hon. Minister to pick a group of independent citizens who are familiar at all with the structure of government and put that before them and come out with a verdict that this is an adequate and a competent description of the structure of government in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1603 carry?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps we have exhausted the possibilities of any reasonable discussion on this particular occasion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 11.40 o'clock, p.m.

No. 105

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 11, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 11, 1966

Questions of Mr. Robarts re steering committee on negotiation rights for professional staff, Mr. MacDonald 3315

Estimates, Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, continued 3315

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3355

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: in the Speaker's gallery, Galt collegiate institute; in the west gallery, West Flamboro school, Dundas.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. My first is to the absent hon. Minister of Health. Perhaps I could put it on the record and get an answer when the Minister joins us again.

Is there any reason why OMSIP coverage for persons eligible in April but since removed from the welfare rolls, cannot be automatically continued until July 1, instead of requiring application for coverage to that date?

My second question is to the hon. Prime Minister.

Is the Prime Minister in a position to report to the House on his meeting yesterday with the steering committee on negotiation rights for professional staff?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, these people simply came to me yesterday in order to present a brief, which they did, and I have it in my possession and it is being studied at present.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Is the government considering legislation at this session, or at any time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, we could not possibly deal with this matter at this session. Within the brief there is a draft bill which we will examine.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-fourth order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

(continued)

On vote 1603:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not in his seat yet, shall we wait for him?

Mr. Chairman: He is en route.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. Minister is in his seat, I would ask the question I asked yesterday. When the new citizenship branch was formed, according to the Minister's speech last year, a community programmes branch was also absorbed by his department.

Would the Minister please tell the House what had been the function of the communities programmes branch; what functions are presently carried on by his department in connection with the communities programmes branch; how much in funds are allocated for that purpose; what functions did they carry out last year?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): In as kindly a tone as possible, I indicated yesterday that the hon. member for Bracondale should do a little bit of homework.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1603, please.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As pointed out, he referred to the fact and he made a big hullabaloo that the international institute got only $4,000, when two lines beneath it was a further $7,948.50. Now, he also has a book in front of him called the estimates and I direct his attention to the estimates of The

Department of Education on page 40, item 10, community programmes, field services, travelling, office expenses, and on page 41, community programmes division $628,700. I suggest the member direct his question to the hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Ben: Then I take it that what the hon. Minister is saying is that last year he was mistaken in the statement he made, and the communities programmes branch does not come under the hon. Minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not mistaken. I suggest you read the paragraph and give it some thought.

Mr. Ben: I did, and that is why I asked the question. But it was obvious that yesterday the Minister did not have the answer and today he tries to skirt around it, but he—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I had the answer last night.

Mr. Ben: Now, getting back to this business of education, would the hon. Minister tell the House how many teachers his branch employs in its language classes; where these teachers are located; what their qualifications are; and how much they are paid in relation to the salaries received by the Toronto public school system?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I shall undertake to get the details of that question for the hon. member.

Mr. Ben: Well, I shall ask another question then, Mr. Chairman. What has been the failure rate in the department's language classes, and what has been the dropout rate? I understand that it was estimated a few years ago that only 15 per cent of the students finished the classes. If that is true, could he give the reason for that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we do not have any failures in our classes. We enrol and accept every student that will take advantage and wants to take advantage of our courses. Naturally, we are very much concerned about the dropouts, because any person in education would delight in the fact that everybody who enrolled would continue to the end of the course. There is no doubt that the effectiveness of a course depends upon the numbers who complete the whole course.

However, the change in the student population, and the difference as between those who take the bulk of the course and those who drop out, does not alarm us. In fact, as I say, I take the position that every day that a student newcomer spends in class, is a day worthwhile.

Now there are a number of reasons for dropouts. Some students feel that after a short time they have learned sufficient English to communicate successfully for their own purposes. While this is a tribute to the quality of the course itself, perhaps there is a measurable quantity of English that can be part of a student.

There is a pattern of action amongst this category of person; they leave the classes thinking themselves to be proficient; they encounter unexpected problems; and then they return for further instruction. This pattern is followed in a considerable number of cases and the net result over a long period is a gain to the classes.

Some students leave because of change of residence or because of family or personal problems, and a few are simply disinclined to study.

As a means of researching this problem, the division conducted a study during the period November 1, 1965, to February 24, 1966, of student registration, attendance and dropouts at the division's programme long operated at COSTI. Hon. members will remember that I made reference to that.

The total registration was 460; the total dropouts were 228. The reasons for dropouts are as follows: Return to work or shift change, 64; left for programme 5 training, 84; returned to school—over 16 years of age—52, left for provincial institute of trades course—special welder's course, 17; special bricklayer's course, 1; apprenticeship training, 1; left for unknown personal reasons, 4; upgraded to higher level classes operated by The Department of Education, 7. I think of course, we do feel, our particular course is not to be taken as a complete scientific sample, because the type of course we operate has advantages which some of the other classes do not have.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister believe in segregated schools and classes for these newcomers who have trouble with the language? Toronto is now experimenting with a school like this on Main street and getting good results. When should these children be brought back into the regular school system, if the answer to the first question is "yes"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am sorry, I did not hear that last part.

Mr. Ben: If the Minister believes in segregated schools and classes for newcomers who have language problems, when should these children join the regular school system?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have difficulty following the member, but perhaps I can give an answer. The problem of the perfect way of bringing the non-English-speaking student into the ordinary stream has yet to be decided as to the best method. I think that ultimately it will be a combination of various methods.

Our own experience with the experimental programme that we made was very satisfactory—and it was this division that operated the first experimental programme in this field to counter the problem which we met outside of our own jurisdiction. Here were approximately 120 students who came from various schools to the course which we held at COSTI, as I explained. They stayed for varying periods of time, and their return into the normal channels was very successful.

As you will recall, that is a very recent development of last year and we are at present following up to see what happened to these children as a result of having been withdrawn and then brought into the course.

There will probably be a combination, of these things, ultimately. It may be that school boards, such as Metro, that have a large concentrated population, may see fit to set up those schools; it may be that within a school complex the children may be withdrawn for intensive periods of language teaching, and it may be that in some communities where there is a small number, the teacher will have to have some way of withdrawing them for a short period of time.

Of course, there is always the conflict of any possible ill effects of segregation, because there is no doubt that the child is getting into school not only to learn English and other subjects, but also to become—to use a fancy word — "acculturalized" to the community. What will be the happy medium to evolve from this has yet, I think, for the short-term future to be decided by us.

Mr. Ben: I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister has no definite plans afoot and he is still surveying the situation since discovering these immigrant children?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should make this abundantly clear to the hon. members of the House: The school boards within this province have the jurisdiction over school children and they are discharging their duty in this respect, as has been very evident by the interest that has been taking place in Metropolitan Toronto this past year. There is a provision in Bill 81 that this type of thing will be extended on a Metro-wide basis, if it is so seen fit.

The school children are the responsibility of the jurisdiction of the boards of education. We are there—to use an expression within another profession — *amicus curiae*. We are there as friends to assist, to co-operate, we have some of our very experienced people on our staff who co-operate with the boards of education. We do not propose to move in on the jurisdiction of the boards of education.

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister is the Minister of Citizenship for this province. He has become involved in education indirectly—ex officio, you might say. Now, is it the attitude of the Minister of Citizenship that simply because a certain segment of the immigrants coming into this province are children, his responsibility as the Minister of Citizenship should cease because being children, they fall within the jurisdiction of the local school boards? Is that what the hon. Minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No; the hon. member should not put words in my mouth. My responsibility is set out in the Act setting up the department. It is to work in co-operation with federal departments and provincial departments, municipal agencies and local community agencies, and it is in the discharge of our responsibility that we work as we have done through the years, hand-in-hand with the local boards of education. We propose to continue in a spirit of co-operation in this regard.

Mr. Ben: Could the Minister not deem it within the scope of his duties to set up teacher-social workers, for instance, who would go into the homes of these newcomers, speak to them in their own language and impress upon them the need for education in this country or elsewhere, indicate to them where they could obtain, not only for themselves, but for their children, special classes, and assist them by one means or another to go to these classes and continue in them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I went to great length yesterday afternoon and last evening to indicate the full scope of what we were doing in this field.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I have some particulars in respect to this branch that I would like to deal with. Then perhaps I could make a very precise observation about the nature of the branch and its work.

I was interested in the discussion which has just taken place, because I think it impinges directly on one of the difficulties the hon. Minister may well have.

Let me say at the outset that as I see it, and it is the observation of someone who is not terribly well versed, the overall language education courses provided by the department are, in some respects, enviable. I have to grant that at the outset. But I suggest to the hon. Minister that there are several rather serious deficiencies which delimit the programme in important areas. In thinking it through and judging it in my own mind, these deficiencies seem to me to fall into four broad categories. Perhaps I could take a moment to outline each.

First, I think the situation in terms of the numbers of students who actually receive a certificate or graduate is in fact very alarming, because the percentage is so low in the province of Ontario that it suggests that somewhere the adult education English courses are falling down and falling down badly. It is very difficult to ascertain by numbers or by percentages precisely what the situation is but perhaps I can make an effort again from a report which was internally prepared for the hon. Minister.

In May of 1965, 805 students in Metro Toronto wrote the annual English and Canadian examination; 462 of them were certified. It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that most of those students would have begun studying in 1962. In 1962 there were some 8,056 students in the province who enrolled. That means that ten per cent only—and I impress that figure on the Minister—ten per cent only actually attempted certification, and only five per cent actually achieved some kind of certificate in the important course provided by this branch—five per cent of all those enrolled. This is even less than the estimate which I think was attributed to Mr. Davidovich, who estimated 15 per cent—on roughly the same basis.

When the hon. Minister says that many of the students leave to go to the adult retraining programme, that is also not an answer, I suggest, and I will tell him why in just a minute, because that is one of the four points I want to raise. The basic proposition remains that in terms of actually achieving a certificate, in terms of actually finishing a rounded course of instruction, we are running at the rate of roughly five per cent in the province.

Now, the second area of serious deficiency seems to me the record and the statistics which the department keeps. The department has only a monthly record of attendance. It has no individual analysis on the basis of the classes and boards in various areas. And I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the dropout rate is spectacular; that it is serious; that there is no way of ascertaining how high, how bad it is across the province except for these little efforts that have been made by the hon. Minister in relation to COSTI. And the figures he gave us in relation to COSTI are in some regards startling. There is no statistical device in his department to analyze across the board the percentage enrolments, the number who graduate, the number who drop out—the situation in the province as a whole. That is the second point.

The third deficiency in the whole education process, it seems to me, is that at the moment the timing of the courses is dubious, and the constitution of the courses is dubious. Most of the courses across the province run on the two-nights-a-week pattern, when it has been shown beyond dispute that four nights a week is surely desirable. The Cathedral high school in Hamilton has demonstrated that to be true beyond debate. And obviously this kind of pattern should extend around the province.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the classes tend to end in the month of March, and most—that is putting it too broadly—a great many of the immigrant people prefer to attend classes in the late spring and summer when there is a greater freedom to do so. Yet they find that the classes have been cut off.

One of the greatest deficiencies of all in this general area is the absence of education for mothers. Now, I do not know where this comes from in the citizenship branch. I personally find it suspect. It is again the feeling, apparently, that only males can be educated amongst the immigrant groups, because I suggest to you that were it not for the pressure of outside groups you would have very few mothers educated at all.

Last Friday, I think it was, a delegation met with the hon. Minister. I guess it was the delegation with Mrs. Norquay in attendance, I think that was the name he mentioned. They emphasized that there must be classes for mothers. It is obvious that across the

province of Ontario what we require are classes for mothers who can bring their children to a nursery environment during the day; classes which in size are not much greater than six or eight mothers in any given class for all the cultural factors with which the hon. Minister is more familiar than I; and classes which can be run in facilities like churches around the province of Ontario, where there will be no inhibition in terms of getting staff or getting facilities.

The hon. Minister has talked about four experimental classes across Metro. I suggest to you that that abbreviated number—perhaps embracing 24 immigrant mothers in Metropolitan Toronto, four classes, that just demonstrates the myopia of the department in respect to this situation. I do not think we can measure up by going for a very few experimental classes in a limited way. There has to be a concerted drive on the part of the department, on the part of the branch, to educate the mothers all round, and to do it in a large number of classes, bringing the children with them, throughout the province. And the assumption which underlies this discrimination towards the immigrant mother, which is reflected in this branch, is an unfortunate one.

The fourth deficiency, Mr. Chairman, I suggest, and to me it is an almost unbelievable fact, is that there is—and I stand to be corrected on this—there is no bilingual instruction presently given under programme 5 anywhere in the province of Ontario. If something has happened, it has happened since October, 1965, because at that time there simply were not any. Now, the interesting point about this is not merely that, as the hon. Minister himself pointed out, fully a third of the dropouts go to programme 5, but the interesting thing is that there is no restriction, Mr. Chairman, in the federal-provincial agreement on languages to be used, on the number of languages that are used in programme 5. The Minister can incorporate whatever he wishes in the application of programme 5.

I do not pretend that this would solve everything, but it seems to me to make a great deal of good sense were it possible to have two languages in programme 5 relative to the immigrant group involved—trying to facilitate English instruction in the process of acquiring the trade—for women as well as for men.

Again, you would overcome one of the very real deficiencies. After all, I remind the House, Mr. Chairman, that in 1961 fully 60 per cent of the 100,000 labourers in the province of Ontario were born in a foreign country. These are the people who will be requiring the retraining over a long period of time, and these are the people for whom bilingual programme 5 courses might well be an admirable feature.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the basic problem of the division, the problem which limits its language instruction in these ways and develops certain inadequacies, is that the division is infatuated with the present methods and is not inclined to extend itself very far.

In one sense that is natural, because no one could possibly impugn the excellence of Mr. Martin and of the textbooks and directions that are being taken. But there is very little experimentation beyond that, and there is a very cautious acceptance that mothers and children may also need help, very cautious, Mr. Chairman, because of the ambivalence the branch feels about is own role, the ambivalence the branch feels about its relationship to The Department of Education.

And that ambivalence is justified. I think we have to question the whole rationale of the citizenship branch.

The hon. Minister, when he is talking about his branch, talks about it in glowing terms, and when he is talking about the work he wants to do he talks about it in glowing terms. There was one stirring quote from last year's estimates which I want to refer to. If you will forgive me, it sounded a little like John Diefenbaker and I think he will notice the resemblance when I read it into the record. He said:

> So long as there is one man that is hungry, so long as there is one man without proper shelter, so long as there is one child that has not the opportunities to which it is entitled as a human being, that one man in each category, that child, is and should be my concern.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Does the hon. member agree with that?

Mr. S. Lewis: There is not a thing wrong with it at all. But, Mr. Chairman, when people on this side of the House point out some of the real problems of the immigrant population in Ontario, the hon. Minister retreats and tells us it is not his responsibility, it is the responsibility of other departments. When we say in this House that in the Kensington area of Metropolitan Toronto the census track shows that the average income per family is $3,140, and that the average income for immigrant families across

the rest of the province is $4,800, and that that represents a difference of $1,700 in family income in one given area. The hon. Minister replies that it is not the problem of his department; it is the problem of economic policy of this government.

When Earl Berger writes his articles in the *Globe and Mail* about the shocking housing conditions that prevail in certain areas of immigrant congestion, the Minister says that is not his problem, that is the problem of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

When Edith Ferguson writes about the breakdown in communication at hospitals in the city of Toronto—in immigrants' understanding what is being conveyed; when we have a sad inquest as we did in 1965, when a young child died and it was revealed that the immigrant parents had not been kept informed of what was happening to their son, and the jury recommended a language clearing house because the situation was so bad; then again the hon. Minister says that is not his responsibility; it is the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is not so. I did not say anything of the kind. I have never said anything was not my responsibility.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, when we talk about wage exploitation in the province of Ontario and the enforcing of labour standards, the hon. Minister says that is The Department of Labour, that is not his responsibility.

Now, Mr. Chairman, by and large it seems to me that that is not an argument which is necessarily wrong. In great measure it is not the hon. Minister's responsibility, and I want to suggest to you that there are other responsibilities which he presently has, which he should divest himself of, and that is the responsibility of language education. That should be in The Department of Education, and should not be part of the citizenship branch at all.

Indeed, for some reason, the branch has become obsessed with this one function it performs, the function of language education. In his reply to the hon. member for Bracondale, I would say that the powers given to the hon. Minister are rather broader than he suggests. Let me quote to him from the Act establishing his department. It gives the Minister power to deal—and he might have drafted it himself, Mr. Chairman—quote:

> —in the cause of human betterment, advance and encourage the concept and ideal of full and equal citizenship among the residents of Ontario in order that all may exercise effectively the rights, powers and privileges, and fulfill the obligations, duties and liabilities of citizens of Canada within the province of Ontario.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that gives the Minister tremendous scope to move into various fields. But 83 per cent of his branch's time is involved in language education courses and translation. I did not know the figure was that high, but that in fact is what the figure is. Seven per cent of time is involved in the community liaison about which this House became somewhat animated last night. Only seven per cent of the time of his department is involved in allowing the immigrants to adjust to the receiving community. That is deplorable. There is no other word to describe it.

I know the hon. Minister will object, but I must say that it is equally deplorable that the branch has taken this total and inflexible hold on language education training, because in fact it is desirably and logically a function of the Minister of Education, and what is really happening is that we are facing a retrograde situation on all fronts. The Minister of Citizenship has certain deficiencies related to adult education because he is not sure how far to go before he transgresses on The Department of Education, and The Department of Education has certain very real deficiencies in the area of immigrant children's education because they do not know how far to go.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I was speaking about the boards of education.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right, and they are the responsibility of The Department of Education. It seems to me that just as labour standards belong with Labour, and hospital liaison belongs with Health, and housing belongs with Economics and Development, so education belongs with Education. I think nothing could be of greater consequence than to move the functions of this branch in that area into The Department of Education.

I know the civil servants in the branch worry about this, and I am sure the Minister himself has some qualms about it. They worry—one can understand it—about whether or not The Department of Education will be as flexible, will experiment as much, will do as much with the portfolio. I suggest to you that The Department of Education has shown a real capacity in some of these things, a capacity that is equal to the Minister's own

branch and that does not denigrate this whole area of adult education by tucking it away in a department which the Minister himself described as a catch-all department.

This, I think, is the key question: what then becomes of the citizenship branch? I suggest to you, sir, what would happen is that the function it should truly perform, as implied by the Act which set it up, could then be performed. Instead of only seven per cent of its time being spent on social relations—and I cannot get over that figure—100 per cent of its time could be spent on social relations.

That is the basic problem with the immigrant community—beyond the language barrier, is the problem of adjusting to the Ontario environment. The immigrants arrive, and in large measure, in social and economic terms, they are abandoned to the frailties, often not so friendly, of the receiving community. Except for central neighbourhood house and travellers' aid and an occasional greeting at the station or the boat, the responsibility for the adjustment devolves upon a family already having difficulties of its own, and upon a community which at times is exceedingly unsympathetic. Although I do not represent a riding, as does the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, which has a strong cosmopolitan population, I have worked extensively in ridings with cosmopolitan populations, and one of the factors which hits home most vividly is the problem of adjustment.

The role of facilitating immigrant adjustment, it seems to me, could be carried out on several levels. I want to suggest them to the hon. Minister, as a new rationale for his branch. I am not taking away from the branch's work. Indeed, their very success in education may be the reason for now moving education into the department where it logically belongs. Their success in other fields should now be expanded.

The first thing we need, desperately, is a series of citizens' advice bureaus—that is the best name that has been developed; spread across the province of Ontario—to which bureau any immigrant can turn for the translation of a document, for information about social services, for problems of appearing before government commissions, and for the adjustment to the economic and social environment generally. At the moment that is simply not available, although it has been recommended in the strongest possible terms by people who have worked in this field, as the Minister knows.

Indeed, advice bureaus connected with the child care centres, or public health departments, would make an excellent idea, because many of the immigrant mothers and their children are now going to those public health departments, and I think this could be an excellent project for the Minister. That is the first thing.

The second thing is that we are again desperately in need of an interdepartmental committee, a committee which would evaluate the entire situation and try to sort out the conflicting jurisdictions. There is something very odd about the human rights commission sanctioning the study of immigrant adjustment in Windsor. This is really the work of the Minister of Citizenship. It should not devolve on a human rights commission to do that kind of thing.

There is not always the best liaison with the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration, particularly between the field workers at the various levels, although the Minister will have to admit that the field worker part of his five-year plan is the part that has not yet been taken off the ground, Mr. Chairman.

In addition to this, sir, there is very serious liaison to be evolved with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and the hon. Minister of Labour. One gets the sense that there is too much dismembering, too much fragmentation, too much uncertainty from branch to branch.

There was uncertainty expressed, albeit with the exception of the Minister of Reform Institutions, last night, in terms of the issues raised by the hon. member for Sudbury, because no one is sure of the situation. The Minister said, "Let us take a poll and find out how many languages departments do speak, what facilities they do have available for immigrants." I suggest to you that that should be known. I suggest to you that the whole thing should now be available. Systematically, it should have been worked out and the deficiencies corrected and an interdepartmental committee set up for that purpose.

The third area in which it seems to me the department might function better in terms of the liaison with the receiving community, is to set up a series of leadership conferences around the province where leading representatives of the—to use the hon. Minister of Citizenship's purest term—"ethnic" community would speak to the primary leaders of the receiving community, such as teachers, social workers, public health officials, and see if it

is not possible to develop some kind of programme of orientation.

The breakdown in knowledge from one group to the other is astonishing and I think it is fair to say that when the various groups came before the select committee on youth, COSTI, central neighbourhood house, and one or two others of the settlement groups, one of the basic points they made was the problem of adjustment and the lack of recognition on the part of the community of immigrant problems. So the leadership conference pattern could be an enviable one. Finally, I suggest that there should be a series of studies of immigrant adjustment to the receiving community undertaken by this department in the pattern of "Newcomers in Transition."

The second half of Miss Ferguson's study, I understand, is now at the printer's. I imagine it will be out almost any day. I would venture to bet, Mr. Chairman, that her study will show not only the importance of liaison but the fact that education should belong in The Department of Education and not in the citizenship branch.

Mr. Chairman, those seem to me to be the areas in this branch. I do not detract from the education work being done, and I do not detract at all from the intentions of the branch; but I suggest that we have reached the point where the entire orientation is wrong. There is something definitely amiss in a branch which pretends to facilitate immigrant adjustment and spends almost all of its time on language education and almost none of its time on the vast spectrum of social and economic problems which totally overpower the immigrant at his point of arrival in this province.

The hon. Minister, who feels deeply and genuinely about these things, might shift the emphasis within the department.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent East.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question under this vote. I think last night he stated that there were 86,000 immigrants who came to the province of Ontario last year. Could he give us the percentage of these who are skilled and unskilled?

Mr. Chairman: I am going to suggest to the member that this is something that comes under federal jurisdiction and not under The Department of Citizenship. We are dealing with the training of the students and the educational setup for it.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with vote number 1603 which deals with the citizenship branch.

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Mr. Ben: And this would fall totally within the Minister's department. In order to carry out his functions, surely he must know how many people come into this province, what their qualifications and skills are and where their point of origin is. I cannot agree with the Chairman's ruling in this regard.

Mr. Chairman: I should point out to the member that in connection with this, I do not want to get into the field of immigration; this is The Department of Citizenship.

Mr. Ben: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the Chairman can look at it this way; perhaps the hon. member could ask how many of those who came under the hon. Minister's jurisdiction in his capacity of Minister of Citizenship are skilled or unskilled.

Mr. Chairman: How the member phrases his question is up to the member for Kent East.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to follow up on this; the hon. Minister is having citizenship classes, English classes, and surely one of his interests would be on the basis—this is on a point of order, sir—

Mr. Chairman: Would the leader of the Opposition state his point of order?

Mr. Thompson: My point of order is that the question of the hon. member for Kent East is very relevant to the discussion—that if the hon. Minister's knowledge of the background of the immigrant; the standard of education that the immigrant has acquired prior to coming here, surely that would gauge the kind of teaching programme that he would give in the schools, just as one aspect, and I am quite sure that the hon. Minister could answer this. He has some idea of the number of skilled immigrants.

Mr. Chairman: I do not want the leader of the Opposition to gain the floor on the basis of a point of order and continue with his speech. I think he should state his point of order and then let us move on it.

If the Minister feels that this is within his jurisdiction or his department's, I would ask him to answer it. Otherwise, I rule that matters of immigration are a federal matter and are not properly before us.

Mr. Thompson: It is in his jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I am in support of your point of order. Last night we did get off on a wide-ranging discussion of immigration, and it is because of my personal interest in that that I did not stand on a point of order. But The Department of Economics and Development is the department within the provincial government that has the jurisdiction relating to immigration.

We, with our limited facilities, try to keep a statistical record of who is settling where, but our statistics, of course, are based on the federal statistics and in some respects, they leave something to be desired because they do not keep a record of, when an immigrant gets off at Halifax or Montreal, where he ultimately ends up. I may say that we work with whatever statistics are available in order to assess where and what needs there are. I think that answers the hon. member's question.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, last night, the hon. member for Sudbury raised the question of the possible difficulties an immigrant may find in dealing with government departments because of his difficulty in making himself understood due to language difficulties.

The hon. Provincial Secretary stated quite emphatically that there was no reason for anyone in this province to feel aggrieved in his dealings with government or government agencies, because of the language barrier. I then rose and pointed out that, in my view, the best protection an immigrant could have against this possibility of being aggrieved was the employment policy of this government, where there is no discrimination against any race, colour or creed. In fact, because of this policy, practically every department—and it probably should be every department of this government—has many people in them who can translate in any language, and I suggested that perhaps it would be interesting to have a poll taken of the various departments.

The hon. member for Scarborough West mentioned that, a few moments ago, when he said that he thought this might be an interesting bit of information to have.

This morning I asked the people in my department to take a poll of our own department. I have the figures now, Mr. Chairman, and I think they will be very interesting to the hon. members of this House.

In the Department of Reform Institutions we have personnel who speak the following languages: one speaks Armenian; one speaks Bulgarian; one speaks Chinese; one speaks Cree; one speaks Croatian; three speak Slovakian; three speak Danish; 13 speak Dutch or Hollandsch; two speak Estonian; five speak Finnish, and 35 speak French; one speaks Gaelic; 24 speak German; one speaks Hindu; three speak Hungarian; four speak Italian; one speaks Latin; two speak Latvian; one speaks Malay; two speak Maltese; one speaks Norwegian; 12 speak Polish; one speaks Portuguese; six speak Russian; one speaks Slovenian; six speak Spanish; one speaks Swahili; two speak Swedish; 14 speak Ukrainian; one speaks Welsh; two speak Yiddish and one speaks what he calls Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian. And, I should add Mr. Chairman, they all speak English as well.

An hon. member: How about the Indian language?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One speaks Cree.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): You are going to have to do a lot of studying to keep up with your staff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in our department there are 153 who speak 32 different languages, in addition to English.

Mr. Chairman: The members of the House are glad to have this information.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the real breakdowns occur.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1603 carry?

Mr. Thompson: No, sir. I would like to say, in view of the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. member for Bracondale, I think they have put up a very strong case with respect to the English classes. I want to say this as calmly as I can, so that my good friend on the other side will not feel I am being personal. But I would say this, that first of all in your reports, I notice where you mention the one general hospital, and out of interest I found there were 180 hospitals—actually 322 if you include a number of other convalescent, chronic care and so on.

Now, I am fully aware that a number of those hospitals probably do not have a large proportion of newcomers, might not even have people who need another language, or who need the teaching of English in the hospital. On the other hand, I am quite convinced that as well as Toronto general,

which represents a very multi-cultural background in its staff, that St. Joseph's and some other hospitals also give an opportunity of employment to the newcomers and that there could be opportunities there for language. My question is really that the hon. Minister in his presentation pointed to one hospital throughout the whole of Ontario. He pointed to one hotel and yet in looking at hotels you see that there are over 1,200 throughout Ontario.

Was this an experiment that the hon. Minister tried this year and if it is not an experiment, why has there not been a concerted effort where there a number of employees who do not speak English, or French, as the case may be, and would like to learn one of those languages? Why has there not been a concerted effort on the part of your branch, since the Minister is taking this over, to provide language classes?

I would also like to say that the concern I have really is for people who are working in industry. The hon. Minister mentioned about someone from Bell who came from Montreal to have a look at your language setup and I have talked to a labour organizer who works predominantly with immigrants who come from the Latin countries and were working on construction. He was describing some of the difficulties of the construction workers, and I would like to just quote this to the Minister, because a lot of these people are represented in his riding, as well as in mine.

He gives, first of all, two letters which have been sent directly to persons. These are from your department, or from the workmen's compensation board. I will not bother to read these letters into the record, but they are concerning claims, and I would say that I, myself, in a small office I maintain in my riding, constantly get immigrants who have settled here, coming to us because of confusion over claims in workmen's compensation—and I am sure there are many others like this—as well as confusion over other departments of government.

This organizer is stating that these attached letters, and he gives me two of them, which I would be glad to send to the hon. Minister, were sent directly to the persons whose names appear on the letterhead. Neither man speaks English, and as implied in the letters, the workmen's compensation board, Ontario, had had previous contact with both. According to the official of the labourers union, letters such as the ones from the workmen's compensation board, Ontario, to these two men are being turned over to the union office at the rate of about two a week and it is the union that takes the initiative in getting the matter explained to the men in their own language.

It was pointed out that there was no correspondence from The Department of Labour in any other language than English and yet we have a very large number of people who do not speak English yet who are working on construction jobs. There is no on-the-job language instruction, although there are a couple of men in the labourers union who do give advice to men in their native language.

When a person is forced, as a result of an accident, to leave the heavy construction industry, there is no effort made to teach him English, or at least familiarize him with English terminology in other trades. Many who speak either Italian or Portuguese—those are the two groups that I think principally make up the construction industry—if they do not turn to COSTI or other services on their own, are forced into cleaning or low-paying jobs. Again this labour organizer points out that many who come to this country highly skilled are forced into low-paying jobs because they are not familiar with English terminology in their own profession.

I see this even in this Parliament building. I see men who have a background in their own country, and who have come here and are cleaning the floors. Frankly, I feel a little ashamed that in this assembly here, if I walk through, I see men with a very rich background in talent and ability who had the tough job of trying to readjust when they got here, but because of language difficulties they could not make the immediate step and so they took whatever they could get, and most of them are menial jobs, and there have not been opportunities within the professions to have some kind of way by which they could get employment, at least to fit some of their talent. I have brought this up before.

I am thinking of the law society as well, that there could surely be some understanding with people who have come, to try to see if there is some area that they can search titles, or do something, rather than be told, "Well, you can forget all about your background and your past, and you can go out and get a job cleaning."

I also think that in dentistry, medicine, and so on, in all of the professions, the Minister perhaps through his citizenship branch might have called professional heads

together to discuss whether there could not be some meeting of the way with people who have backgrounds in Europe.

Having said all that—and that is an area which to me very much pertains to integration, helping people over the barriers that there are, to get some kind of work, according to the background they have—I would like to emphasize myself that over quite a period, I believe, that in having taken the teaching of English into this small department, even though you co-operate with school boards, has been a mistake. I think it should have stayed with the community programmes division. I say this because of the wide contacts they have throughout the community, and unless you are going to duplicate a similar staff, it seems to me that you cannot do the same job as the community programmes branch can do.

I can see the citizenship branch in the teaching area going back into the community programmes. They are working with school boards on a number of other programmes which are given in the schools. I also believe that because of your small staff —you have not got field men up in Sudbury and so on—consequently, when you come before the House, there is a concentration on what the international institute has done and on what COSTI has done, but we hear very little about what is done in Windsor, or what is done in Hamilton, or what is done in Sudbury, or in other areas.

Oh, you give us a few facts on that, but I think that where you already have an established department—Education—for these community programmes, this is where again the educational programmes for new citizens should be, because like the hon. members for Scarborough West and for Bracondale, I am deeply concerned that we really scratch the surface in this whole aspect of language training.

I believe that there is a real concern about women, for example, and there have been some valiant efforts. I know the hon. Minister came into the House at one point and he was enthusiastic and said we were having these kitchen programmes and then they failed. And they failed, I think, because there was not a wide promotional approach and staff to develop this.

I think community programmes probably could work in this area of volunteers. I think there has been imagination in trying to promote programmes, but again if you had an interdepartmental committee it would help. For example, the hon. Minister of Labour is working on apprenticeship courses; his pamphlets go out to industries. He says that is the reason why the apprenticeship courses are with his department rather than in The Department of Education.

Surely as he is moving into these areas with industry, if there was an interdepartmental and close committee you could be thinking of some kind of sandwich courses or on-the-job training for immigrants who are working in industry. I know the difficulty attached to that is the time, but I do think that this, if it was encouraged more, could be done far more than it is being done. I did not hear much of a report about industries that are carrying courses for newcomers.

I simply want to say that the hon. members for Scarborough West and Bracondale have raised what I think is a very logical argument, that the language training should go back again with The Department of Education on the basis that this is the traditional job of The Department of Education. It has the knowledge to look at the problems of teaching children as well as adults, and it has community programmes. It should also be done on the basis that that department has a large staff, and on the basis that they have contacts with school boards and with others. Therefore, I find it very hard to see why the Minister holds onto the language training in his own department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Of course, Mr. Chairman, we have here a very fundamental difference of opinion. The difference of opinion stems from the fact that in the year 1960 this government came to the conclusion that this programme, which was in the community programmes division of The Department of Education, could grow further and be more successful in achieving its goals by being brought out of The Department of Education where, to use simple language, it was lost in the gigantic explosion of all the educational problems confronting this province by virtue of the explosion in population.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is not what the hon. Minister said at the time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh yes, I did.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have the hon. Minister's quotes in front of me here, and the Minister said at the time: ". . . work of the branch so admirable, the importance of this work cannot be overemphasized, I commend most

heartily the hon. Minister of Education in regard to these matters." He went on in flowery terms.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. What year was that?

Mr. S. Lewis: 1952.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: 1952?

Mr. S. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And it was in 1952 that as a member of this Legislature I became aware of the work of the community programmes branch.

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, fine.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And in the years that followed, I took a particular interest. It was as a result of my following the work of the community programmes branch that I became of the opinion that the seed was there, the potentiality was there in respect of newcomers, because community programmes encompass the whole of the population and all sorts of activities, as the hon. member is aware. I became aware of the potential that lay within the community programmes branch, but to grow to flower, it had to be brought out from that. I was fortunate that at that time the hon. Prime Minister was Minister of Education, and he and the then Prime Minister, Mr. Frost, having checked it out on my persuasion with those who were in charge of it, all came to the same conclusion. This was not wrenched from The Department of Education, it was done with the concurrence of all, including the top staff of The Department of Education.

I may say now in looking back, without any aspersions on the community programmes division and the personnel—I think they would be the first to agree—that in retrospect this was a very wise decision. The Minister of Education in the past six years has had his share of the problems confronting The Department of Education as a whole. It was because of the emergence of this division that we had the staff, small in number—I am the first to admit that they are doing a herculean effort in this regard—but they have—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am subject to the influence of the hon. member for Sudbury. I should use a word like "colossal" that everybody understands.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Or big.

Mr. S. Lewis: Best in the world.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a result of having taken this division out, we were able to do all the experimentation and see the needs in the field of education—and I will be quite frank with the hon. member for Scarborough West, I am committed to the language end of it. I am committed, because I know this, my father went to school for perhaps three years, I went to school for 23 years, and you could write the history of the world in that difference. And I know that fundamentally the differences—

Mr. S. Lewis: Or at least the history of the hon. Minister's family.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —are in the language. The language is the key factor, and the hon. leader of the Opposition having started out in support of the hon. member for Scarborough West ended up on my side. The talents and the knowledge in the heads of men and women who come to this province does not come to light because they cannot be produced. That is the whole factor, the barrier of the language. It is that barrier that we are trying to destroy.

I may say in respect of the teaching of mothers, that is one of my first goals. I am aware of the fact that within the immigrant family, it is the father who is on the job all day, who gets worn out and tired and he does not have the communication with the children that the mother has. The rapport is much more between the immigrant child and the immigrant mother than in the ordinary, even suburban, Canadian home where the father is away. And that is why I have sought, to find out ways and means and adopted Mrs. Norquay's recommendation right on the spot, that we proceed on this basis.

Now, in respect to dropouts, we are trying to attempt some statistical survey. And there is no doubt about it, that we act as a catalyst. We cannot duplicate the school system, we cannot duplicate The Department of Labour, The Department of Health, The Department of Public Welfare. But in the matter of apprenticeship, the problems of apprenticeship, it was our division being in contact with the immigrants that saw the first problems in the apprenticeship through consultations we held with COSTI and other groups, which then went on to The Department of Labour, which set up the select committee, which in turn brought down its report

on the whole of the apprenticeship branch. The same thing happened with The Department of Education about the grants for the immigrant children for boards of education.

We saw the problem, brought it to the attention of the proper authorities and action was taken. And that is where we are able to play a great role in the community effort within the terms of our reference. I may say that I have never taken the attitude—and the hon. member for Scarborough West was, I think, rhetorically quoting me as saying, "This is not my responsibility." I have never said that anything is not my responsibility. I will say it is within the jurisdiction of some other department. But my job is to co-operate with that other jurisdiction to see that we fulfil our responsibility and assist the department at any level. We can only persuade the federal level—we cannot really do anything more than that—to do their end of the job, and I think this is where the measure of our success has been.

I may say in conclusion in respect of the hon. member's percentages of the community services, the contact concerned, I assure him, is far greater than seven per cent. I do not know where he got that figure of seven per cent. I could take up time of the House in reading a sheaf of letters relating to the work we have done in the community field.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, because I think this is important, I will remind the hon. Minister that after the estimates last year, the suggestion went to a member of his citizenship branch that a critique be made of the Opposition presentation during the citizenship vote. That critique was made on a normal paragraph by paragraph basis. It is very interesting that the Minister should have, in effect, commissioned it. Part of that critique was to analyze the use that was made of the citizenship branch, and the researcher from within the government branch—from within the Minister's branch—appointed to that task, prepared the material and analyzed the branch, and I read to the Minister what he has in his own document.

Entitled, "Legislative debate on the citizenship division." March 2 to 4, 1965. "Fifty-eight per cent of time spent on language and citizenship education; 25 per cent spent on translation of documents."

That adds up to 83 per cent which is the figure I gave you—7 per cent spent on community liaison and support.

That is a document prepared within the hon. Minister's own department at the request of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The effectiveness on the community is not the parallel of those percentages. I can assure the hon. member that this province and this community, without the citizenship division, would be a far different place to live in as a community than it is.

Mr. S. Lewis: But, Mr. Chairman, let us not dispute that there would not be offices in this building, and there would not be people hired and so on, I am not going to debate that kind of assertion. I am singly suggesting that the nature of the branch and the orientation of the branch are sorely mistaken and that the hon. Minister should move into other fields.

Let me put it quite strongly, Mr. Chairman. We are, as a result of the work of this branch, defeating the primary objective where the immigrant population is concerned, and that is: facilitating the process of adjustment. We are consciously making it much more difficult for them to adjust by using the one branch we have in this field for purposes of language education almost exclusively, and not for social and economic purposes. That seems to me to be just about as wrongheaded as you can possibly be, for a Minister who feels the problem deeply, and I have never doubted that for a moment.

But the essential, the basic problems of the immigrant community, as the Edith Ferguson study pointed out—and we have to work from the facts that we have—are the problems of relationships, the problems of liaison, the problems of communication in frustrating circumstances. If there were people available to facilitate that liaison, that relationship, that communication, then those problems would subside. And that, surely is the responsibility of this branch.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have accepted that role.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, then, accept it in more than words, Mr. Minister, because it is now words alone. All the pretensions about the finest citizenship branch in the world will not stand to refute the fact that your own works deny your assertions. I do not suppose that we will ever get the Minister to accept it or reflect extensively upon it.

I was very sad that the community programmes branch gave this up. It may be that it has developed more under the Minister than it would have under The Department of Education, one cannot know. There is no way of analyzing that kind of thing, by hindsight or otherwise, but there is no

doubt that at this point of time, all the education classes of this branch should revert right back to The Department of Education where they belong. Where, indeed, I predict they will be within the next three to four years, and the force of events will render the hon. Minister's branch obsolete in the area of language education.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Longer than that.

Mr. S. Lewis: When we seriously start on the programmes for the disadvantaged immigrant children, and recognize the need to involve their mothers in that programme scheme, and then recognize that there is a tremendous overlap between that and the adult education for the father—either after work or on the job—the force of events will be irresistible, language education will move holus-bolus into the education branch, and all we will have lost will be four years of community liaison and development with the immigrant community. That is what will be sacrificed for the sake of this obsession in one area which does not properly belong in this branch.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, before closing, I would just like to suggest to the hon. Minister that in view of the number of charters that he has been signing, if he were to buy himself a rubber stamp with his signature on, and use that instead of pen and ink, he would have twice as much time to devote to this most important department.

Vote 1603 agreed to.

On vote 1604:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, under the office of the Speaker, do I take it that we pay the Speaker $3,000 per year for his duties in the House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That would come under the sessional requirements.

Mr. Sargent: Vote 1604 is the office of the Speaker, is it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Vote 1604 agreed to.

Vote 1605 agreed to.

On vote 1606:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, before this vote is passed, I would like to make brief reference to the press clipping service which I believe is provided under this vote. I think it is proper to say publicly what a fine service is provided there. I do not know what system they use but I am always amazed at the uncanny way in which they seem to be able to dig up almost any press reference you want, even though your own recollection of the surrounding circumstances is quite vague at times.

From time to time commercial press clipping services approach me to see if I would like clippings on some subject or other in which the commercial service thinks I might be interested. I am always in the happy position where I can tell them that I have access to what appears to me to be the best clipping service in the country, and that, therefore, I will not require the services of the commercial firm.

Vote 1606 agreed to.

On vote 1607:

Mr. Sargent: My only point was that I was amazed at your paying our Speaker $3,000 per year for this executive post. This is about $50 a week to head up his office, and I would like to ask the Minister if he thinks that his salary of $12,000 means his job is four times as great as the job that the Speaker does. Further to it, I would like to suggest that the Chairman of the House receiving $2,000 per year is a disgraceful recognition of his executive ability, and I would like, as a member of this House, to say that the government should be embarrassed at this recognition.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In view of the excellent job that both the Speaker of the House, and the Chairman of the whole House, are doing, who am I to dispute any comments in respect of their remuneration? I have noted the comments made on all sides of the House.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in the years to come there may be other Chairmen of the caucus and Speakers who cannot afford to accept such low pay, and I think it behooves this House to pay for services rendered, and I think the hon. Minister should take this to heart and have the Cabinet deal with it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, having served as the last unpaid Minister without Portfolio of this government, I am very sympathetic to those who discharge responsibilities and to the lack of remuneration they get.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I see estimated $100,000 for *Hansard* for the coming year.

I was in Quebec last summer, and I was through the Legislature there. *Hansard* is on the desks, or out, the next day after each session. I am not being critical of your staff who prepare *Hansard*, but I expect it would cost more to have *Hansard* on the desks or out to the members the next day. Sometimes here it is three or four days before we receive *Hansard*.

Of course, that is not anything against your staff whatsoever, Mr. Minister, but it is slightly old news then and I often think that if *Hansard* were available to the members the next day after the session, it would be news and it would be a lot better for the members and we would be able to send it out to constituents so that it would be news to them.

I wonder if the hon. Minister could outline to me what would be the cost? I know there would be extra cost to have *Hansard* out the next day, and has the hon. Minister made any investigation into this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My comments in this regard, Mr. Chairman, will be very limited. The Speaker has had under consideration the various comments of the hon. members which were made earlier this session respecting the time lag in respect of *Hansard*, the size of it and the make-up of it, and it would be my intention, and I think he would agree that after this session we will make a complete review of everything having to do with *Hansard*, and see if any improvements or changes may be brought about.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I have comments about the innovation in this session of regular private members' hours. I think it would be useful at this point to make a brief résumé of what has taken place.

There have been in the period since the House commenced this session, some 23 private members' hours, and some 21 topics have been the subject of a one-hour, and on one or two occasions, a two-hour debate in the assembly.

The topics have been both of current interest and of very real importance and I think it worthwhile at this point to list what those topics have been, for the purpose of the remarks that I wish to make.

The topics covered hate literature; the appointment of a select committee on the rules and procedures of the assembly; on two occasions a debate on electoral reform; on financial assistance to the tourist industry; on divorce; on therapeutic abortion; on students' assistance in harvesting cash crops; on piping water to drought areas and fresh water supply; on hospital insurance coverage to aged persons in nursing homes; on Confederation; on professional societies and human rights; on the repeal of the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to contraception; on water and air pollution; on the cost of automobile repairs and the relationship to insurance rates; on bankruptcies, Arbor week, parents' liability for the acts of their children; on injunctions; and on schools for children with learning disabilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a considerable improvement over other years. In my questioning of hon. members who have been here much longer than I have it would indicate that it is indeed a very substantial improvement. I would, however, make this comment, that the focal point of the real interest of those private members' hours was on the occasion of the two debates at the early part of the session when votes were permitted on the debate, or on the resolution that was placed before the assembly. The first one, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, was on hate literature, which was the first resolution called on January 28, and the second vote that was taken was on divorce, on February 22.

I would urge, Mr. Chairman, that serious consideration should be given by the government to allowing a free vote on each of the resolutions and bills which are put forward during private members' hours, that it should not be taken that in some way or other government policy is under debate, or subject to debate, but that one of the principal functions which this assembly can perform is to debate in the assembly and on the floor of the assembly, matters of topical importance and matters of urgent importance that are current at the time the debates take place. I think it is helpful in the formation of public opinion on matters which require attention from time-to-time, that individual members be permitted to have a free vote, and that we do record the opinion of the House on these matters when they are brought before the assembly.

Unfortunately, on the only occasion on which a vote was allowed, on the matter of divorce, the House split on strictly party lines. On the other occasion, the vote was, of course, unanimous on the hate literature resolution. It would seem to me that if private members' hours are really to fulfill the function of attracting interest and attention to the debates in this House on matters of current and topical interest, the best way in which this can be done is to

permit the members on each occasion when a private member's resolution or bill is called, to permit the House to vote on the merit of the issue without regard for party affiliation or party lines. I would urgently request the government to take this matter into consideration in anticipation that the tremendous progress which has obviously been made this session—in permitting debate on private members' matters in a regular way, and in an orderly way—that we now take the further step and permit votes on each and every one of the bills and resolutions which come before the assembly during private members' hours.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I realize we have moved beyond vote 1604, and the office of the Speaker, but I wonder if you and the House would permit me to make a comment on that item?

Mr. Chairman: The only way I could reopen this vote would be with the full concurrence of all members of the House.

Mr. Singer: Do not start to delay now—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I do not wish to delay, Mr. Chairman, my comments will not be argumentative. There is a question I would like to ask, through you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Rather than reopen the vote, would it be permissible if we allow the member to ask the question under this vote?

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is this. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if either he or the government has considered appointing a permanent Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That has not been a topic of discussion, Mr. Chairman, but no doubt all hon. members of the House, including members of the government, have taken judicial notice of the discussions that have taken place in other places and other times.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I just want to ask briefly under this vote, what the intentions are this year in respect of the Commonwealth parliamentary association? What will the funds be used for? What plans?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that this meeting will be held this year in Ottawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just a moment, let me conclude. They will travel throughout the rest of Canada, and there is no doubt that they will be spending some portion of their time in the capital city of this province, that is, Ontario.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, first of all I must apologize to the House for turning my back for three minutes. During that interval you went through three votes, which is probably some kind of a record, and I am sorry that the previous speaker did not get a chance to reopen these votes. On the other hand, perhaps I deserve a vote of thanks from this House for the fact that I was not here and you could go through the votes that fast.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I note that there is an allowance of $2,000 for art. I have enjoyed looking at the art work in the corridor leading to the lunch room, and I cannot for the world of me determine when they were painted, or who the artists were, and I am very much in the dark as to what the hon. Minister proposes to do with the magnificent sum of $2,000 towards art work on this. Perhaps he has in mind a donation to the Moore sculpture fund that his worship the mayor is running. You certainly cannot buy very much art work with $2,000, unless, of course, the hon. Minister's tastes run along the same lines as Controller Dennison's, and might buy some from the controller's wife. Would the hon. Minister please tell us what he is proposing to do with this magnificent sum of $2,000 in connection with art work for this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will not go into the question of other people's tastes, but this government, as a matter of fact, through The Department of Public Works, is the very proud possessor, in my opinion, of one of the great art collections of this province. There is much within this building that we take for granted, but there are paintings that we walk by through this Legislature and in various offices that, were they to be placed on auction, would bring five, ten, fifteen, twenty and twenty-five thousand dollars per painting. They may not fall within the category that the hon. member was referring to.

Now, as a matter of fact, sir, the hon. Minister of Public Works has, I think, very recently compiled a complete inventory of all the art works of the province of Ontario. I have a personal interest in these matters. We have, for example, one of the greatest collections of paintings of G. A. Reid, who was one of the outstanding painters in the traditional style of Ontario. I am delighted

to say that his widow is a constituent in the Bellwoods riding, living back to back with the hon. member for York South in Wychwood Park.

On the $2,000, I have been debating what I might do with that this year to give vent to some of my interests. In the past, it has been historically retained for the painting of the Speaker and previous Prime Ministers and composite pictures of the members. Now, the $2,000 is not spent annually because we do not change either Prime Ministers or Speakers that often. So that figure there is really a nominal sum for this year.

Mr. Ben: Well, if the hon. Minister thinks so highly of the art that we have throughout the Parliament buildings, sir, could not some plates be provided to indicate to viewers who the artists were and what fame these paintings have?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, I think now that the hon. Minister of Public Works has compiled this inventory, I look forward to the day when there will be an art exhibit on the ground floor and we will bring forth—

Mr. Bryden: Where are these fine pictures at the moment, Mr. Chairman? If we have some fine pictures, I would suggest we hang them in place of the trash that is hanging in the corridors at present. Where are they being kept?

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to stay with 1607, please.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: G. A. Reid gave 150 paintings and they are hanging through the schools and normal schools and colleges of this province, they are all over the province.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): May I ask the hon. Minister if he has a committee to advise him in the expenditure of this $2,000 or is he the sole judge of what should be done with this amount of money? I am quite serious about that. Does he take the whole responsibility himself in deciding?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that this year, I think it is for the first time, that the word "committee" has not appeared. For the last four years it used to be the legislative art committee. I wondered who this committee was. Not having found the committee, that word was dropped. It is now to the discretion of the hon. Prime Minister or the Speaker. They choose who does their portrait, and that is why we have the very fine selection that we do.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in view of the hon. Minister apparently being the sole arbiter, could I ask him if he advocates cubism or surrealism or does he prefer realism? Where does he stand?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have a big heart and a big taste, I embrace them all.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, with reference to *Hansard*, I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister excerpts from debates being sent out of this House. I will not mention the hon. Minister's name, but in this one instance the front plate of *Hansard* was used, including a picture of the hon. Minister. Even the caption at the bottom: "Price per session $3, address Clerk of the House, Parliament Buildings," was on this front page.

Now, I see nothing wrong with the Ministers, at their own expense or any hon. member of this House at his own expense, obtaining excerpts from *Hansard* to send out to his constituents. But I do believe that it should state clearly and unequivocally on the front page that this is not *Hansard*, and it is being paid for by the member. If the type from the normal *Hansard* page is being used, certainly no picture should be allowed, and it should state that interjections have been deleted.

I think it does not become the dignity of this House to have excerpts sent out in that manner. It is deceiving of the public I suggest, and especially when they even have the little caption on the bottom indicating what the cost of *Hansard* is per session. It implies that this is *Hansard*, and it is not. I would suggest that this not be permitted in the future.

Mr. Oliver: May I ask the hon. Minister: Was the matter to which the hon. member refers—the placing of the not too good a likeness of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions on the outside of the *Hansard*—was that an innovation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am unaware of the subject-matter of the debate.

Mr. Oliver: My hon. friend could be made readily aware of it. *Hansard* was sent out, as the hon. member for Bracondale said, with the picture of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions occupying almost the whole of the front of the *Hansard*—

Some hon. members: No, no!

Mr. Oliver: It is a small picture, I am told, but it was a picture at any rate. It was a picture of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions on the front of *Hansard*. I agree with my friend, the member for Bracondale, that that is against what should be the privileges of the members of the House. I want to know from the hon. Minister if this is the first time that this has been done? Are we breaking new ground, are we allowing something this year that we have not allowed heretofore?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not aware of the instance of the picture. I do not recall an instance where there was a picture; I do recall when the former leader of the Liberal Opposition sent out *Hansard* throughout the province of Ontario and it was marked as "John Wintermeyer's speech in the Legislature"—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just a moment, let me finish.

And on the *Hansard* front was—I do not remember the exact words—but it was "Crime in Ontario," on the frontispiece of *Hansard*. That is the only other instance of which I am aware when the frontispiece of *Hansard* was changed.

Mr. Sargent: I take it we are still on 1607. Before I ask my question on this, Mr. Chairman, do the liquor licences come under this department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is not one of the "other requirements" under vote 1607.

Mr. Sargent: I am asking what vote it is under.

Mr. Chairman: There is no vote at all for the liquor licence board.

Mr. Sargent: How do we talk about that?

Mr. Chairman: Under the liquor licence board and the liquor licence commission which will come before the commissions.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, it is a well-established procedure that the LCBO and LLBO come before the House in committee as in effect the last item or as an additional item, let me put it that way, under these estimates. This has been going on for several years and I hope we do not have to go through the battle all over again that we went through about 1960 in order to get that practice established. It certainly has been recognized that if hon. members in committee of supply wish to raise matters with regard to those commissions they can do so at the end of the estimates of the responsible Minister, and I hope that this procedure will be followed.

Mr. Chairman: I think that the member for Woodbine will agree that the function of the committee of supply is to deal with the estimates and we are dealing now with the estimates of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. There is nothing in the estimates whatsoever from the standpoint of acceptance of any money or the payment of any money or the spending of money for the liquor control board, and it would not be properly before us now.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was just calling to your attention that it is a well-established procedure. It was established after considerable dispute in the House. I hope the government is not trying to smuggle in by the back door a new ruling on this matter, about which we heard nothing until now.

I may say, sir, that I appreciate that in your position you have to take the votes as they are before you, but I am putting it to the government that this arrangement has always been agreed to, and the Chairman can always accept an agreement of the House. I am not saying that we have done it every single year, but no inference is to be drawn from that. There may have been some years when the members did not find it necessary to refer to the LCBO and LLBO; but certainly the procedure is established that we have a right to do that.

Mr. Chairman: May I respond to the member for Woodbine in this way: Personally I would agree that opportunity should be given to ask and to answer questions; all I am saying is that as Chairman of this particular committee, at this time there is nothing before me under this vote and I think that what has happened here previously has been that perhaps a report has been tabled and the report has been discussed, and I think that this is a good idea.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in my experience in this House that is not what has happened. The LLBO and LCBO simply come as a matter of course as the last item under these estimates in exactly the same way, sir, as the workmen's compensation board, Ontario, although it is nowhere listed in the estimate book, comes in as the last

item under The Department of Labour by general agreement and concurrence on both sides of the House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on your point of order, the Opposition are continuously accusing the government on this side of the House of changing the rules when they themselves have the habit of doing that, and if the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have *Hansard* and *Hansard* records what goes on in this House. That is one of the advantages of having *Hansard*. What has taken place in recent years—there was a time when they were discussed during the course of the estimates of the Provincial Secretary and they were improperly so discussed—

Mr. Bryden: I am in agreement.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No; this goes back a half-dozen years. The Prime Minister provided a procedure under which, if the members of the House requested it, the reports tabled in this House with respect to the liquor control board, and/or the liquor licence board, were actually put on the order paper and a discussion took place relating to the report and not to the estimates of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Bryden: That procedure did not work out because he never called the orders.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Last year there was no discussion either on the estimates or on the report.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate: If the hon. Minister is now arguing that the traditional procedure is that you must place it on the order paper and it will be called as a separate item, I would suggest that this is an unnecessarily elaborate procedure, whether in his view or not we were acting in violation of the rules of the House. Certainly for years it was an accepted procedure; my friend, the hon. member for Woodbine, is correct in this connection.

We had, as I recall, in the years 1957, 1958 and 1959 a battle royal every year as to when there would be an opportunity to discuss policy and details in relation to policy in the LCBO and the LLBO. Finally there was established a practice that was continued for some time, that they were understood to be the last items, at the end of the estimates of every department so that any Minister who was responsible in this House to report on behalf of an agency would know that at the end of his estimates questions could be raised with regard to that agency.

Certainly it appears to be the general consensus among the Opposition that the hon. Provincial Secretary is changing the rules.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, no. Mr. Chairman. Let us get this clear. We are not changing the rules and *Hansard* speaks for itself; it is a matter of record and we could check back last year and the year before and the year before that.

Now, I am one for the rule book all the time; not just when it suits me! Mr. Chairman, I have no objection, after these estimates are over, if the hon. members wish to discuss it. I am quite willing.

But do not say what we are doing is in accordance with the rules; we are doing it in accordance with a breach in established precedent.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the hon. Minister's proposal I think if he will take a look at his rule book and all the discussion of rules, he will find that the basic principle applying to rules of any body of this kind is that procedures in time become established. They become the rules even though they are not necessarily written down anywhere. I can give examples of interpretations by the Speaker to that effect that were—

Mr. Chairman: If the member for Woodbine will pardon the interruption, this subject is not before us at the moment. We are dealing with 1607 and the member for Grey North asked where he could introduce this question. The hon. Minister has said that he will be willing to answer the question at the conclusion of the votes. Will it be acceptable to the members of this House if we wait until the conclusion of the votes and at that time ask the question?

Vote 1607 is before us and the member for Grey North has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Possibly 1607 and 1608 should be taken as one. I suggest that whoever concocted this mess that we have before us should have some sense of putting things together properly, because the Queen's printer in his—

Mr. Chairman: Does the member mind if we pass this first vote?

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about 1607, Mr. Chairman, which has to do with the printing of *Hansard*.

Mr. Chairman: That is all right; that is item 5 under 1607.

Mr. Sargent: Right!

I see where *Hansard* printing and reporting has gone up $25,000 and in stationery, under vote 3, it jumped $13,000. Now, in 1964-65 in *Hansard* reporting and printing the total was $74,000, and we had Queen's printer, $30,000 and Ryerson Press, $25,000.

Why is it that Ryerson Press was called into the act when we have our own Queen's printer for *Hansard*? Does Ryerson Press print *Hansard* and, if so, is it on a bid basis? How is that let out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The *Hansard* is printed under a contract which is negotiated between the Speaker and Ryerson Press on an annual basis. I may say that the increase in the cost of *Hansard* should be apparent to all and sundry sitting in this House. As the sessions grow longer, there are more words recorded and naturally the cost of *Hansard* goes up.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that the increase is justifiable because of today's printing costs, but the Ryerson Press contract is a low bid deal, is it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a negotiated contract between the—

Mr. Sargent: That does not answer my question; is it a low bid deal?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, it is not.

Mr. Sargent: It should be a low bid.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, *Hansard* is not something new and the experience through the years in the development of *Hansard* I think has caused the Speaker to come to the conclusion that he can negotiate a better contract with Ryerson than anyone else in the field. I think that was his considered decision.

Mr. Sargent: There must be some mechanics here that I do not understand insofar as the internal features are concerned, but I suggest that if $31,000 of *Hansard* is given to the Queen's printer, why is 40 per cent given to Ryerson Press; why not in total to the Queen's printer?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Queen's printer does not print.

Mr. Sargent: Well, we have on the next vote, we have $248,000 that says they do.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1607?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, before we conclude 1607—

Mr. Sargent: I am not satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that I am getting the right answers. I do not see why the Speaker has a right to negotiate an exclusive contract with a printer without a low bid deal, because if the hon. Minister or members of the government are going to set up these rights to make special deals then out goes our free enterprise system.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this vote, hon. members of this House—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is being glossed over here. There is a principle at stake here, that a member of the government, or the Cabinet, can make a deal, a special negotiation deal with a party, to have an exclusive on government contracts. This is basically wrong. I think that this House should make a stand on it, that you cannot make such deals with anyone. We know it is being done all the time, but here is evidence that you are doing it.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I should explain to the member that we pass a motion in this House and it is the House that passes the motion, that *Hansard* is printed by the direction of the Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: And that this House will give exclusives to certain parties?

Mr. Chairman: No, this House passes a motion giving that power to the Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, I am sorry, I did not know that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, before we conclude 1607, the hon. members of this House are wont to, in a very happy tradition, pay tribute to people. We have heard tributes paid in your direction, well deserved, Mr. Chairman, and to the Speaker, and by other hon. members in the course of the deliberations, to the members of the civil service, the permanent civil service staff as a whole.

I want to take this opportunity on behalf of all members, to pay tribute to those

listed in item number one—clerks of committee, sergeant-at-arms, messengers, pages, sessional writers, office, secretarial, research services. They are the people who make our job a little lighter, a little easier. We are apt to take the scamperings of the page boys for granted, and yet they are making their very vital contribution to the efficiency of our job. I ask all hon. members to join me in a well deserved tribute to all those unnamed persons coming within category number one.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): The hon. Minister can show his appreciation to civil servants by giving them small increases in pay.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, under the Clerk, the hon. Minister having drawn attention to this, I have had some concern about the people who keep the minutes and who help on committees. It seems to me that in Britain, in the Parliament of Britain, that they have from the Clerk's staff a secretary for each of the committees. I know that in the background of committees in this Parliament, that we were smaller and, therefore, there was a time when we used newspaper men who acted as secretaries. This was abolished after a while, I think, at the request of the press gallery itself. They did not want to do it. I do not think they should do it, frankly.

However, now we have departmental representatives, who act as secretaries, and with all respect to the members of the civil service of any department, I think that this puts them in rather an embarrassing position. The secretary of any committee is surely a servant of the Legislature, and I would feel that today, as we are going into far more committee work, that under the Clerk's office we could have a staff who act as secretaries of committees.

I am thinking particularly that when we have standing committees and select committees there is obviously a need for secretarial work, and it would seem to me that there could not be a better training ground for a person who wants to move up on the legislative staff than that he would start as being secretary of a committee.

As I understand, in Britain—and certainly it is something we do not wish to see happen —but there comes a time when the Clerk of the Legislature will retire and there needs to be the training of someone else to take over this important position, the man who gives advice concerning the functioning of the Legislature. I would think that today we should be thinking of this Legislature as a most important function, and the people who advise concerning the running of the administration of the Legislature as a very important profession. It is for that reason that I would like to ask the hon. Minister, is he giving consideration to having the secretaries of committees? First, they should belong to the servant of the Legislature, the Clerk, to be part of his staff, rather than that they should be part of a department.

Hon Mr. Yaremko: This is the first time this matter has ever been brought to my attention, and I think the experience of the present secretarial staff is that they are drawn from the relevant department that is related to the committee that is sitting. My personal experience has been, at least I have been under the impression, that it has worked satisfactorily, much better than in the old days when it was just a part-time job on the part of the members of the press gallery. There is someone who is well versed in what is taking place, and has a certain technical knowledge. I am thinking, for example, of the committee on labour and legal bills where there is a member of the staff who is in contact with that.

However, that is a suggestion which might be taken under review.

Mr. Thompson: I just think again, if we look at Parliament in Britain, that one of the things they have always wanted to show was that there was complete impartiality on the part of reporting of minutes and setting up of a meeting. I am convinced that on the whole there is. But I think that there could be a questionable situation at some point where a civil servant who is taking the minutes of a meeting, if there was something that was left out somewhere which reflected on the good grace of the Minister to whom the civil servant is responsible, there could be created a misunderstanding about it. I am saying that I do not know of any such situation. But in order that there should be complete impartiality demonstrated, and also because of the fact of the importance of the Clerk's office, I would like to see that the hon. Minister might give consideration to the fact of having a permanent secretarial staff.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1607 carried?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is another matter I wish to raise here. Item two provides for the payment of indemnities and allowances to members. I would like to take a moment or two to discuss some of the

conditions under which members have to carry on in earning their indemnities.

Early in the session, the hon. Prime Minister announced that it was his intention to have sittings three night per week. We in this group thought that was sensible. I may say that it has sometimes been suggested that he is a dictator and he seems very sensitive to the idea. He keeps bringing it up whenever we make any suggestions, that we are accusing him of being a dictator. Well I want to make it clear right off the bat, Mr. Chairman, that I am not accusing him of being a dictator. As a matter of fact, I think he has been, in the main, very reasonable in considering the suggestions made by members of the Opposition in relation to conduct of the business of this House. The hon. Prime Minister has many different matters that he has to take into consideration, and I appreciate the problems he has in weighing the various alternatives. But there is one matter that I would now like to put before him, because I think he is being somewhat unreasonable.

As I said, early in the session, the Prime Minister announced that we would have three night sittings per week. We thought that was sensible. We agree with the proposition that you start doing a regular day's work, a regular week's work, right from the beginning and avoid what used to be the case some years ago—and is the case in many parliamentary bodies—where not very much is done early in the session and there is a tremendous jam-up and crush of business at the end. So three night per week seemed to us to be reasonable.

At the same time, the Prime Minister made what we thought was also a reasonable proposal, or statement. He said on page 371 of *Hansard* for February 9:

> While I am on my feet, let me say we will meet every Monday, Tuesday and Thursday night, and we will set 10.30 p.m. as a target for the completion of these night sittings. I do not want rigidity on this because sometimes, as the hon. members know, the debate just naturally continues longer, but I would like to sit on a regular three nights a week basis and attempt to finish at 10.30 p.m.

Now, that seemed to us to be reasonable too. Three nights a week with a reasonable adjournment hour. The Prime Minister said that he did not want it inflexible and we made no objections. We could see a situation such as he envisaged arising where we might be able to clean something up by sitting another 10, 15 or 20 minutes. I am sure all hon. members would agree to do this, but this is not what is happening, Mr. Chairman.

It seems that as we get into the estimates, year after year, the adjournment becomes later and later. I just checked back through our adjournment hours, starting from the beginning of April when we were getting into the estimates. You will find that during April adjournment time was more often than not 11 o'clock rather than 10.30 p.m.

Then we get into this past week: On Monday May 2, it was 11.35, Tuesday May 3, 11.30, Thursday May 5, 11.20. Then Monday of this week, May 9, we were back to 11 p.m. again, but last night it was 11.45. It seems that the government gets, I do not know exactly what happens, but they get fidgety. No doubt, they do not like listening to us over here. There is always a dispute as to just how much going over the estimates need. The government thinks we waste a lot of time. We think it is our duty to give these estimates very careful scrutiny. After all, the total amount of money involved nowadays is pretty close to $2 billion. We think that that deserves a lot of scrutiny. There will always be differences of opinion as to whether we are wasting time or the government is getting impatient.

But I do not think that the differences of opinion should be taken out on the members in forcing upon them what are nothing but inhuman hours. It happened that Monday, May 2, when we started to move towards this 11.30 routine, was also the day when we started the 2 p.m. starting time. We did not object to that either; we think it is reasonable after the session has proceeded for a period that we change the 3 p.m. starting time to 2 p.m. But I, for one, object, and I think most hon. members object to sitting on to 11.30 at night, after we have started at two in the afternoon.

Everybody knows that our duties are by no means completed merely by sitting in this House. There is a great deal of preparatory work to do, especially by Opposition members, and it is just plain unreasonable. I think 2 o'clock in the afternoon until 10.30 at night, with the normal supper adjournment, is a fair and reasonable sitting period in any day, especially when we have three of those periods in a week. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that even though some of us may inadvertently irritate him sometimes he should still figure on winding up proceedings in the evenings at 10.30.

Indeed in most Parliaments, as far as I

know, there is a set time for adjournment at night. This House is a maverick in that respect. Here there is a set time for adjournment only for supper. I do not know, if supper played a big part in the minds of our predecessors here, but failing a set time for adjournment I think we should have an agreed time, that will be observed most of the time, of 10.30.

If it is necessary for the total length of the session to be somewhat increased thereby, then I say that is a better way of doing it. Let us sit here for more days and make sure that the days during which we sit are productive. Members are simply beaten to death by having to sit well on towards midnight. Members are now paid sufficient money, I think, to compensate them for sitting for five or six months of the year. I do not think that should bother them. If they do not like the prospect of sitting on into July and August, if that may turn out to be necessary, I suggest the hon. Prime Minister might give consideration to holding a fall session to clean up some of the work before Christmas so that we can possibly get out of here before Easter.

At any rate, I do not think we should try to reduce the total length of the session by this ridiculous practice of sitting on long past the time when any reasonably productive work can be done. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he go back to his original intention of February 9 and aim at finishing most evenings at 10.30.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Secretary about something that is being done in a number of Legislatures. I am thinking of Australia and New Zealand and the fact that they are using mass communications. Not just the press, but also television and radio.

I notice where your leader, your federal leader in Ottawa, has brought up this proposition. I believe that this would be something worth considering and I say this because, with all respects to the press, they have to make a judgment themselves of what they think is important. First of all up in the gallery; then secondly there may be a city editor, I do not know all the machinery down there, and he also makes a further judgment.

It seems that one of the most essential things that we have to see is done in a Parliament in a free country is that there is a reflection of debate and of serious issues which is presented fairly to the people. There is no question that today in this year 1966, the media of television and radio are being used a great deal by people throughout this province.

I think that they can record, perhaps too accurately in some ways, what is going on in this Legislature—vacant seats in the Legislature—and there may also be a danger of someone trying to hog the time the television is on on the other side of the House. But I think that kind of administrative aspect can be worked out whereby just as with the press today, they are going to decide what they think is of most interest to the public in this debate. They will make the judgments.

Similarly, I think that if there were television and radio and they were permitted to edit this themselves and send it out that this might be a method by which much more of the deliberations which take place in the Legislature would be brought to the people of Ontario.

I think it would sharpen us up. I think it would create an interest on the part of the people in knowing just how effective their representation is. It is for these reasons that I ask the hon. Minister to consider this matter. Almost 21 years ago in Australia they had radio, and they have, in certain city councils across the country—I am thinking of Toronto—they have television. I wonder, have you considered the fact of television and radio in the Legislature itself?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually I have never given the matter, in that light, too much consideration. I have listened to and witnessed what has happened, through radio and television, what has taken place in other jurisdictions. My own personal opinion has been that nothing would delight me more, as a career politician, than to be followed, 24 hours a day, by a radio man, a newspaper man and a television man. In fact there is nothing that would please me better than if they would focus their attention on me for the full 24 hours a day and my constituents and the people of Ontario would be fully informed of everything I do the whole day.

Vote 1607 agreed to.

On vote 1608:

Mr. Ben: Has the hon. Minister given any consideration whatsoever to setting up a printing department whereby the government would do its whole printing, and second, has the Minister given any consideration to the possibility of the Queen's printer acting as a central purchasing agency for

stationery pads, account books and all the other stationery that is required for all these departments in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer to the first part is "no."

The answer to the second part may be best stated in pointing out that the Treasury board has requested the organization and methods branch to make certain surveys, and one of the surveys relates itself to central purchasing and stores, regardless of who that officer may be.

Mr. Ben: Could the hon. Minister inform this House when he expects these reports will be tabled in the House?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not saying that the report will be tabled in this House, I am just saying that the Treasury board, in the discharge of its duties, has requested that this be made, and this is being proceeded with.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, does the Queen's printer not fall under the hon. Minister's jurisdiction and should he not be either making this survey or at least have control of the survey?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Treasury board makes these surveys on behalf of the government. It is not related to any one specific office, it is related to making a survey of the government and then determining whether there should be a central purchasing and stores; and if so who and where that should be.

Mr. Ben: When does the hon. Minister expect to be informed by the Treasury of the conclusion of these surveys?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In due course.

Mr. Ben: In due course.

Vote 1608 agreed to.

On vote 1609:

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, is there any intention on the part of the hon. Minister to co-operate with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development to set up a new bureau of statistics for the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The necessities and needs of The Department of Economics and Development are actually unrelated to the statistics that are within the registrar general's branch. We keep the statistics on births, deaths, marriages and changes of name, that is, the civil status of our residents.

Mr. Ben: Is there no need in this province of having a central statistical bureau to supply all statistical information to the different departments of government?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would think that the type of statistics to which the hon. member is referring, the questions pertaining to that may be best directed to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development because the Act—there is a Statistics Act apart from the statistics we keep—comes under his jurisdiction.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I have one other question. Since the registrar general's department does much searching for information which could readily be done by a computer, is there a computer, to the hon. Minister's knowledge, within provincial departments that could be utilized for doing these searches? It would be almost similar to an IBM machine where the information would fly out in a few seconds.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Our present use of the IBM machine is for the keeping of statistics. We have not yet advanced to the searching aspect, but that is one of the long-range plans of this department.

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister is proposing to do that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. There is government activity in the whole data processing matter.

Mr. Sargent: In this field of data processing information in the hon. Minister's department, does he have data processing in his department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, we have a small installation. It is in the registrar general's branch but the data processing for the government is pretty well centralized in The Treasury Department.

Mr. Sargent: The point I would like to ask is, what information does the hon. Minister have? Does he have information on every bit of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We keep the registration of births, deaths, marriages, change of name.

Mr. Sargent: Then I take it that the hon. Minister's policy is not to collect information on individuals from other departments and to collate this into this file?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No.

Mr. Sargent: Then there is no data processing, a master data processing file in the government on all citizens of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No.

Mr. Sargent: May I suggest then that you are miles behind other jurisdictions if you do not have it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know whether we are miles behind or not.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): May I ask a question of the hon. Minister? Whether this comes under this vote or not I do not know; it is to do with the registration and the changing of adoption orders for adopted children. There was a suggestion made the other day by the children's aid society that the original name of the child not appear on the court orders of adoption any longer. Is any consideration being given to this type of request, say, that they be designated by a code number rather than a name?

Hon Mr. Yaremko: I am not aware of that particular problem and I shall be very pleased to look into it. The deputy registrar general has always, and especially so in the last few years that I have had communications with him, been aware of my position; we have both decided that this type of information which does not insure to the benefit of the child in any way, should be secluded as completely as is possible. The information is not destroyed, mind you, but it is kept out of the ken of anybody except the official authorities. If the hon. member can send me the specific recommendation, I would be very pleased to check into it.

Mr. Wells: Yes, I will do that, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. Minister realizes what I am talking about. It is the court order that you get officially granting you adoption of a child. It says that such-and-such was the surname of the child and the name is now changed to the name of the adopting parents. Under the present arrangement the adopting parents know the name that was registered for the child when it was born and presumably the name of either the mother or the father, whichever name has been used when the birth was registered. The thought now is that it would be better perhaps if a code number were used so that the adopting parents do not know the name of the mother or who registered the birth of the child.

Vote 1609 agreed to.

On vote 1610:

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on 1610, during the last federal election, an hon. member of this House, using franking privileges, sent out notices in support of a candidate in that election. When this was found out by the press, a statement was made by the hon. member that he would pay back to the government the cost of the postage on that election material. Did he so do, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am personally unaware of the instance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ben: Am I to understand that the hon. Minister charged with the responsibility of the post office, to whose department election material in support of a candidate of his party—federal party, of course—went through the franking system and had this drawn to his attention by the press, does not recall it?

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the member, is this a federal department?

Mr. Ben: Provincial department! It was a federal election, but a provincial member of this House, using the franking privileges, sent out election material in support of a federal candidate. When this was discovered by the press, the hon. member made a statement to the press that he would repay the government. What I want to know is, did he in fact repay the government?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I must say that I follow the press very closely and I do not recall having noted the incident. If the hon. member will give me the particulars, I will be very glad to check into it.

Mr. Ben: Let me put it this way, Mr. Chairman. Was any money paid to the post office by any hon. member of this House who had improperly used the franking privilege?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that I am completely unaware of the incident.

Mr. Ben: I will try to put it in a general way: Has any hon. member of this assembly made any payments to the hon. Minister's department for postage, because he improperly used the franking privilege?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, that is equivalent to the "have you stopped beating your wife" question. The answer to that is neither "yes" nor "no." I am unaware of the

incident. It may have taken place and it may not have taken place.

Mr. Ben: I did not ask you about the incident. Was there any incident whatsoever, to the knowledge of the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There was not.

Mr. Ben: There was not. All right. I just wanted to see how familiar the hon. Minister was with the operations of his own department.

Vote 1610 agreed to.

Mr. Sargent: If the Chairman is willing, is it in order to discuss the LCBO?

Mr. Chairman: This is not the chair's ruling. I would have ruled against it, but the Minister has decided that he would answer any questions on policy and this is his prerogative.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has always been pretty well accepted, by at least the Opposition, and maybe by most of the people of Ontario, that liquor licensing has generally been a source of revenue for the government, and I think that the government and the hon. Prime Minister are using these boards for their friends in many ways.

I do not want to flog the whole issue of the glaring inequities in licensing across the province. I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister a situation that exists in Grey South with regard to improper licensing for friends of the government. Some months ago in the area of Grey South, the Talisman ski resort held a referendum for liquor privileges and this was turned down by a resounding vote, some 300 to 13, or something like that—a very definite "no." About three or four weeks later, possibly because—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think you will recall that what we had decided on was that questions of policy could be discussed concerning this thing. The hon. member is referring to a specific instance, and I would suggest to him that the proper time and place for a specific instance of that kind to have been discussed in order that all the facts of the case could be presented from the point of view of the board, would have been when the liquor licence board appeared before the committee on commissions. I think that dealing with specific instances of this kind goes beyond the realm of this type of discussion—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member for Grey North if he will deal with general policy matters.

Mr. Sargent: This is a policy matter, Mr. Chairman. I think that the House will agree that this is a case where the liquor board should be responsible to the Legislature and the policy set insofar as the people of Grey South said, "No, no liquor." Within three weeks, this ski resort area, because they had some government friends on their management, had a licence and were in full operation. Adjacent areas in Collingwood, Georgian Peaks, Blue Mountain and all those lush areas that cater to the public want equal privileges and they cannot get them, possibly because their management is not of the Conservative stripe. This is my submission to the House, Mr. Chairman. I have spoken of this to the hon. Minister and he laughed at me.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never laughed at any time at anything that any hon. member of this House comes to me with. I think it is completely—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I will tell the House what this man—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, I do not think it is right and becoming for the hon. members opposite to continually say that so-and-so is laughing when a serious matter is being discussed. That is not the thing, and if ever we do have television that will be one of its saving graces. If I were to say right now that the hon. member is laughing—he laughs more than anybody in this House—

Mr. Sargent: I am looking at the Minister; that is why I am laughing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —because he has a cheerful disposition, but the fact is that I never laugh at any serious subject—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I broached this to the hon. Minister in the House and I told him the mechanics of how these people received their licence and how wrong I thought it was because I am interested in a licence myself, and he said: "What do you want to talk about, getting a licence yourself, or how they got their licence?" I said: "What do you mean?" He replied: "Talk about getting a licence yourself." That happened in this House and the Minister brushed the matter off. But I do want to talk of how they got their licence;

that is very important to the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think it is most unfair of the hon. member to put words in my mouth—

Mr. Sargent: Well, I am doing it right now.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —because my recollection is that that was not what the hon. member said. He was interested in his own place and his question was: "How do I get a licence?" I did not explain how he or anybody else got a licence. I explained to him what the law was, and that is the only thing that I am entrusted with, to explain to him what the law is!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, my prime consideration was equity. All people should have the same rights. Adjacent operators want those rights and they cannot get them, and I think the Minister should show the House why these people, when they were turned down three weeks before by the people of this province of that area, the Minister's department saw fit to grant them a licence. I think he should spell out how they got it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I granted no licence and the department does not grant the licence. The Liquor Licence Act spells out the duties of the liquor licence board, and under what circumstances they are empowered to license various types of establishments. The hon. member says that the people of Grey South said "no." It was not a case of their saying, "No" period. They said "no" to certain specific questions that were on the ballot, so the member is completely off base.

Mr. Sargent: If the hon. Minister checks the membership of the management of that company, he will see why they got their licence.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, as I say, this is a specific instance. The liquor licence board of Ontario which does the licensing, when it is up before the committee on commissions, this is exactly why that committee is set up, to ask questions of that nature.

Mr. Chairman: I think it should be pointed out to members of the House that when the committee on government commissions is sitting, they have all the reports and the figures. The officials of the department are available and they are in a position to answer all questions in connection with it. It would be helpful if members of the House tried to restrict their questions to general policies, not specific items.

The member for Wentworth East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would say to the hon. Provincial Secretary that I have again received the perennial request from the united council of veterans associations in Hamilton, who represent 28 affiliate organizations, the armed services service clubs, requesting that the quota system in regard to their gallonage allowable per member per year be abolished. I wonder if the Minister has received the same correspondence and if the department intends to take any action on the request.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, it is not the department that takes action. If it is a matter of policy it is a matter of administrative policy which the board itself in the discharge of its responsibilities puts into effect. I did get a copy of that letter, as did hon. members of this House. I believe it was very widely circulated, and, Mr. Chairman, had I known that this discussion would have taken place, I would have brought my correspondence with me.

I was in communication with the chairman of the liquor license board of Ontario with respect to this, and I may have to call on my recollection as to the situation.

Now, the legion branches throughout the province of Ontario are licensed under the terms of the Act in the same way as clubs are. That is, the licensing is for the purpose of permitting the membership of the organization to enjoy the benefits of the license which they get. Now, in administering and seeing to it that the basic requirements of the licensing are met, the board in its wisdom and judgment and experience, has come to a conclusion about a yardstick whereby they can judge whether a club is meeting its requirements and that is by having this so-called quota. It is not a rigid quota, that is it is not a gallonage that is stated and computed on a very rigid way, it is more or less a yardstick.

The board is in the position of knowing the consumption of every licensed establishment across the province, every club, every legion, every union hall, that is licensed, every veterans club, every organization of that kind, and they pretty well know, they are in the position to judge on the basis of membership, how much consumption there should be. Now, this is not again a rigid

amount, because one man's capacity for consumption exceeds perhaps that of another, but this is a yardstick by which they go, and I have seen the statistics of the number of legion halls that have under ten gallons per member, under 20 gallons per member, under 30 gallons per member, and under 40 gallons per member. The higher the gallonage, the smaller the number of clubs that fall into the category. The board has come to the conclusion that 30 gallons per member is a good yardstick.

When a club of any kind—and I should not just say legion—when a club of any kind exceeds this consumption, gets up into the 40 and plus gallons, the board will then communicate with the officers and check into it more closely and under circumstances give counsel that in the opinion of the board that there is an excess in the consumption. The board has a very thorough licensing procedure and inspectors do visit this establishment. Much is taken on the fact that it assumes people will run their clubs on a good basis so that the inspectors would not have to go in and count the number of members, or their guests, which they are allowed under the regulations and policy, to check up whether somebody off the street has walked in, and I realize that these people have pleaded their case in this way.

It would appear to me on a review of all of the circumstances, that the position taken by the board is a fairly reasonable one. Now, whether the allowance should be greater than that is a matter of judgment and opinion. The board is aware of the representations, and no doubt will take it into consideration when dealing with this matter in the future.

But it is not likely—speaking as a legionnaire myself, and as one who has taken a very close interest in the affairs, not only of my branch, but in legions both in the city and throughout the province—to lift the quota completely. To throw it wide open, might lead to some unfortunate circumstances, because there again, you have tens of thousands of men scattered across the province, and unfortunately there are the few bad instances that might occur in the course of the year to reflect to the detriment of all organizations.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanation given by the hon. Provincial Secretary, but I cannot find any logical reason for the continuation of the quota system. And certainly when the council itself, as they explained they have 28 affiliates in Hamilton alone, tell me in their correspondence that the resolution is supported by the provincial command of the army, navy and air force veterans in Canada, the provincial command of the Canadian Corps association, the federation of British Canadian veterans in Canada, they expect that the Royal Canadian legion also has a brief under consideration to present, that they should not be restricted in this manner.

I know from experience, being a member of a service club that they have to curtail some of their activities because of the quota system. I understand that, as they pointed out in their brief, the quota system was invoked during World War II, to conserve, as it says, grain, I do not know what they make beer out of, but—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, that was not the reason.

Mr. Gisborn: Well then, maybe the hon. Minister later will explain the reason. But as they explained, they are a service club. We know that these men who sacrificed during the world wars came back and established their service clubs to have some method of looking after their members who might run into difficult circumstances, needing immediate help in different areas, they are a non-profit organization. I understand they are subject to audits of the liquor control board, and for the life of me, I cannot see any reason why they should be subjected to a quota. They have a membership and they want to increase their membership both on the direct membership basis and the social membership basis. It seems to me, and it would be my opinion, and it seems to be the opinion of the officers of many of the associations, that it is the profit-making taverns that are complaining about the sale of beer in the service clubs.

They should be allowed, in my opinion, to sell as much beer as they can get across their bar in their own club, according to the number of seats they are allowed, under the supervision of the licensing board, to ensure that they run a good club. They elect officers in a democratic way, they are responsible men in the community, and they can certainly, and I feel in a much better way, govern what goes on in their establishment, than is done in many of the private and public establishments across the province. I do not see any reason why this quota should be continued at this time.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the last speaker?

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think what we should do is direct our inquiries to the Minister in charge.

Mr. Ben: Well, all right. I will ask the question to the Chair. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the last speaker to suggest that all legion outlets be converted into taverns and be free to sell beer to anyone who comes to their portals?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, because they are on the quota system they have to curtail some of their activities during the year, and this of course reduces their income. Now, I know that the quota system is flexible and in some cases it is used as a little bit of controlling element in how they operate. They get letters of reprimand if their quota is exceeded by a certain amount of gallons, and they are told they have to pull themselves together and drink less beer. This is a sort of restriction of activities. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell me just what the quota is at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, Mr. Chairman, the use of the word "quota" is again one of these terms of art that people use to simplify a procedure. The board, in its judgment and experience, has found that this is a good yardstick, this 30-gallon basis is the yardstick by which they can take a rough estimate of what the consumption of a club should be. Under the regulations, the member is saying one thing, but he is conveying another meaning. "No liquor shall be served in licenced premises in a club, except to a member of the club or his guests." There are no activities curtailed, the clubs are permitted to serve their membership and to serve their guests. They are not permitted, as the hon. member for Bracondale has said, to serve across the bar to anyone, which means anyone coming in from off the street. If the person consuming the liquor is either a member or a guest, that is perfectly proper, because again another provision requires that the clubs keep a guest register. This pertains to all clubs because the one thing that we have attempted to do is to treat all clubs alike.

Now the board has been, I may use the expression, sympathetic to the position of the legions, the veterans clubs, the union clubs, the so-called service clubs, because—when you think of across the province of Ontario—they are the social centre of the community. But they can only be the social centre of the community for their members and their guests. In addition to having this privilege, they are under the provisions of the fees which are payable, and only instituted a very short time. Clubs on the first 10,000 gallons pay 11 cents, whereas a public house, on the first 10,000 gallons, pays 13 cents. There is a difference in the fees which are payable, and this is an allowance which is made to the club.

Now, as I say, the 30 gallons is a yardstick, and, as I say, this is not a definite answer. The board has been made aware of the problem and I have no doubt that in the exercise of its judgment—good judgment and good experience—it will take under review that if any changes should be made, if they appear reasonable, I am sure the board will do so.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the statement of the hon. Provincial Secretary just now convinced me that there is no reason why he should not use his influence to have this quota removed. If they are controlled by licensing legislation, and the guests have to sign in—and I know this is the case—this is one of the areas where they have to reduce the allowable guests admitted to drink their beer.

Now, they are a non-profit organization, they are subject to audit, and they see no reason why they should not have the right to serve beer as long as they live within the confines of the liquor licence board. I hope the hon. Minister will review this situation with the board and see if there is any reason why they have to leave these restrictions on. I am content that the people that are barring the lifting of these restrictions are the public beer sellers in the cities and towns, and I think we should give as much recognition to the veterans and their associations as we do to the public taverns.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, last week, when the committee on government commissions was sitting, the hon. member for Halton addressed a question to the director of the alcoholic research foundation, asking whether there was anything that the government was doing or not doing, with regard to its policy of, or rather should do or should not do, to assist the research foundation in its work. The director avoided the question implying that it had political overtures. Now, I pointed out at that time, Mr. Chairman, that this commission, being subsidized with government funds, was answerable to this Legislature, and that we, the standing committee, were the arm of this Legislature, and we were entitled to know, or rather, entitled to have answers to the question which has been put by a

member. The caucus bell rang, and we never did get an answer.

But one of the things I drew to the attention of that committee was that the alcohol and drug research foundation had expressed its concern with the high rate of, not just alcoholism, but the use of alcohol by our younger generation, and should try to do something about changing the situation through its own research, and through the distribution of printed matter in our schools. While it is doing this with government funds, on television we watch alcohol and its uses equated with everything that is supposed to be fine in life—conviviality, hunting, fishing, conservation, baseball, good looks, good looking girls, and, as somebody mentioned, sex and everything else. They never actually show the bottle itself, but here we have two PR groups, you might say, the government's research foundation distributing literature through the schools, trying to impress upon youngsters the possible evils resulting from the improper use of alcohol, while on our television screens, everybody is encouraged to buy more and drink more, mostly beer, but liquor also.

Now, does the government have a firm policy on this? Obviously the brewers and the distillers have much more money at their disposal for advertising the use of alcohol, than this government gives to the research foundation for the purpose of advertising against the use of alcohol. In my humble submission, if I might be permitted an understatement, I think, the distilleries and the breweries are going to win out unless this government changes its policy, if it has a policy. Now, I would like to know, does the government have a policy in this regard? And not only in that respect, but if the government is going to say that we support and believe in advertising, because the liquor and the brewery industries being large industries, and radio being a large industry, and television being a large industry, and we must keep all those people working, then why not go to the other extreme, Mr. Chairman? Why not permit them to show beer actually being poured on a television screen?

Why be so phony about it? They sing all these jingles about it, every child knows the jingle for Labatts, or Dow, or—say, what if I get a free case of beer for mentioning those names, for all these different names—and yet, you cannot actually show the picture of the beer itself. Whereas, over the Buffalo stations, right after the Popeye show, you see Americans cracking cans of cold beer right after a Popeye show, a kiddies show. I am just baffled by the attitude of the government in this particular field, and I do feel that now is the time for the hon. Minister to get up and inform this House whether or not the government has a firm policy or thoughts on this particular subject and what is the government's policy, if it has one, or what are the government's thoughts on this problem if it has not a policy, but at least has some thoughts on it. I would like to have an answer from the hon. Minister now if I may.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is new in the House and he would not be aware of the fact these matters have been decided by the government. Approximately six years ago a code was adopted in relation to these matters, in relation to radio and television, of course, the ultimate decision and the ultimate authority are at the federal level. I will say this, that the liquor control board and those authorities have been able to work out a very satisfactory —from the point of view of our position in Ontario with relation to this—and a harmonious solution.

The activities of what the industry is able to do on radio and television are very limited. The hon. member is mistaken when he would have this House believe that liquor, that is, spirits, are on radio and television, because that is not the case. It is limited to beer, and they are very limited as to what they show and how they show it. Anything that is portrayed must have the approval of the liquor control board of Ontario and, as a matter of fact, the industry has complained and continuously makes its representations now that it is restrained in this way.

Up until six years ago, or roughly that period, there was no advertising of any kind allowed, either in the press or the other media. Then because we are unable to erect barriers around this province—and the press media, the radio media, the television media, do come in from outside sources—we arrived at this present position which I think is very limited. It is related to brand advertising as such, the lines of print. The wordage is spelled out, the limits are prescribed. There have been points of view expressed from both sides. There are those who would do away with it completely, there are those who would expand it further. I am not quite sure what the hon. member's position is. He seems to have one side in both camps, unless he is for an extension upon which he concluded.

I may say that at the present time the government's policy is to maintain by and large the status quo, that is, the situation which has existed in the past little while and which will continue for the foreseeable future in this regard.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Ben: I am not through, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of other questions, but first of all I would like to thank the hon. Minister for drawing this to my attention. Perhaps I made an error in supposing that liquor was advertised on radio and TV. As was pointed out by the hon. Minister, one sees so many of these transmissions from the United States where they do advertise liquor, that one could be confused. As far as my own stand is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record that I find it completely ironical that this government should be subsidizing a research institution, an institute which is trying to teach our children that the improper use of alcohol could lead to disastrous results, while at the same time a rich industry is trying to impress upon them, not directly, but by encouraging them to use their product that this will not happen.

I received the report, the little booklet, as all hon. members of this House probably do, from the research centre, and although the figures have been based on surveys in the United States, I was very distressed to see the high incidence in the use of liquor by persons under 21, and the number of motor vehicle accidents in which they were involved. It is frightening, because in most instances – I should think in every instance except for a very few isolated ones—the American statistics by pro-rating them to Canada's population could apply here.

Now, my position is that if the liquor industry—I should say the brewery industry—if the brewery industry is permitted to influence our youth on the use of alcohol, then I suggest that it is the duty of this government to take from the taxes being derived from their activities, sufficient funds to spend on the youth of this province to offset the efforts being made by the industry to induce our youth to take to alcohol at an early age, even though it is illegal. That is my position, Mr. Chairman, since the hon. Minister asked.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member permit me a comment on this at the present time? I think it should be a matter of record that we do have this limited advertising, and it is restrained, far more restrained, than other jurisdictions, even among our neighbours in Canada and to the south of us. I think it should be stated, and should be a matter of pride not for government members alone, but for all hon. members of this House, because members have spoken on all sides of the House on this, that the alcoholism and drug addiction foundation, which comes under the hon. Minister of Health and which was, I believe, the subject of discussion during his estimates, is doing one of the foremost jobs in the world. I say this advisedly, because it is a matter of record that outstanding men in this field come from all over the world.

I think one of the reasons for the success is that the present Minister of Health and myself agreed only a short number of years ago, and my colleagues joined in, with this extensive increase in the funds allocated to this foundation over a period of years that they would meet the problems that are created by a misuse or an abuse of what others find to be a social necessity.

Mr. Chairman: I was going to suggest to the member for Bracondale that he was really debating a matter which comes under Health estimates. I would rather he keep with the LCBO.

Mr. Ben: I was debating the Health estimates?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, on the rehabilitation and drug addiction.

Mr. Ben: All right, Mr. Chairman, you have such a handsome smile, I am afraid I am just persuaded by your logic that advertising by the liquor industry comes under Health estimates.

Mr. Chairman: The member missed the point. It was the rehabilitation and drug addiction that came under the Health estimates.

Mr. Ben: I was not discussing rehabilitation at all. I was discussing the influence that advertising may have on the activities of another department of government.

Could the hon. Minister inform us when did the Windsor raceway open; who were its principals; when did it get a licence; did any principals withdraw because of imputations of unsavoury character against them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this again is a specific instance which I think should be directed to the board when it

appears for the commission. It is a very interesting thing to note that the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville raised points of a question, the longest point during his participation during the Throne speech debate, and then when there was an opportunity two weeks later, or within a short period after, of addressing these remarks to the liquor licence board of Ontario, sir, nobody chose to do it. I suggest that is the proper place for this type of questioning to go.

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister is correct that this is a specific instance, and I would not expect the hon. Minister to be prepared, since he stated he was not aware the subject would be coming up after his estimates. I will perhaps expect an answer by way of a note from the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No.

Mr. Ben: I can expect no answer at all?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is the question that should have been directed to the board at the time.

Mr. Ben: I want to know when the track opened, and how soon thereafter they received their licence. That is not within your department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is a matter of public record.

Mr. Ben: Now, I am supposed to go and search the public records. I cannot come into this House and ask the hon. Minister of a department a question? Everything I have to do, I have to do myself?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are paying you to research.

Mr. Ben: I must say that the hon. Minister interjecting here was much more cooperative.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I had my officials here at the time.

Mr. Ben: No, I did ask the hon. Minister there to give me some information and he replied with a suggestion that I should do it myself, but he got it for me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is it possible that the hon. Minister, or the LCBO, for whom the hon. Minister speaks, could set out specific ground rules which would enable a restaurant owner to apply for a licence without the necessity of hearings, that is the LCBO, the government, would set out all the prerequisites, certain requirement for location, certain type of building, certain type of accommodation within that building, such and such a seating space, so that there would be no suggestion of favoritism in the issuance of liquor licences? Has the hon. Minister given any thought to such a procedure?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The procedure is fully set out in The Liquor Licence Act and the regulations made thereunder.

Mr. Ben: Then does that set out the type of accommodation that is supposed to be provided? Can anybody come up and say, "I have completed A, B, C, D, here give me my licence without a hearing"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a matter of judgment.

Mr. Ben: Well, being other than Tories there is a good reason why you should not! So then the hon. Minister does not intend, or this government does not intend, to set out fair and unequivocable ground rules whereby any applicant who satisfies those requirements can get a licence without any discretion on the part of the board?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The rules and ground rules are stated in The Liquor Licence Act and the regulations made thereunder.

If the hon. member implies whether the government will replace the present living, human mechanism of the board with a data processing machine into which you feed cards and the licence comes out, the answer to the latter part is, "No."

Mr. Ben: That is not what I was suggesting. The implication has been that favoritism is practised by this government. I say the suggestion has been made, I am not saying it. I am just saying that if you set out clear ground rules and a clear set of prerequisites there would be no such suggestion of impropriety on the part of the government; we would have no Melcher case or anything else, and come to think of it as the policy which the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions alleged he had instituted during his responsibility for this department. Are those rules still in effect about listing brands on the board?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. Prime Minister issued a complete statement on the procedures just a little while ago.

Mr. Ben: That is a complete statement.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three issues that follow on some of the points with which the hon. member is dealing.

Mr. Chairman, at various times members of this party have expressed our views with regard to liquor advertising, and in view of the discussion that has gone on I just want to recap it briefly and to emphasize one point which I think becomes more and more pertinent.

Quite frankly, I do not think there is any need for liquor advertising at all. However, the problem is that we do not live on an island unto ourselves. The advertising comes over the borders and therefore we are forced to enter into some sort of a national code. Even that does not solve the problem because you have got foreign broadcasts coming in, and therefore we have worked out a code which resolves some of the difficulties.

However, the problem that I think my friend from Bracondale was raising—with regard to adequate money that comes into the provincial Treasury, or is made available by the industry itself to cope with some of the social problems arising from excessive drinking, or the educational programmes required to get the right attitude towards drinking—I think there is an answer to this. We have presented it in this House before and I repeat it briefly again.

It seems to me that if you were to establish a dollar-for-dollar arrangement—that for every dollar that a brewery or a distillery spends on advertising they would have to contribute a dollar into a fund that would be used for the research and the educational problems involved in alcoholism—you would have a built-in incentive to reducing the amount of advertising, which I think is desirable. You would cut it in half, and yet half of that money would be available to the public Treasury for the alcoholic and drug addiction research foundation, or such other agencies as the government might see fit, to see that the money was going to be spent for educational purposes.

I think this is important, Mr. Chairman, for another reason that I want to go on to because it is something that I touched on briefly during the estimates of the hon. Minister of Health.

In the February 19 issue of the Toronto *Daily Star* this year, in the family section, Margaret Weiers had an article entitled: "Should children learn home drinking?" In it there are two paragraphs which I would like to read. I quote:

> H. V. Archibald, the director of the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation told the Ontario Legislature select committee on youth in September, 1964, that parents should be allowed to serve liquor to their under-21 children at home. He warned that banning liquor to minors sometimes enhances the attraction of drinking.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I emphasize that Mr. Archibald is not raising here at all the question of drinking under 21 years of age in public places. Nor am I raising it. That is not the question to which I am addressing myself. I am addressing myself to the question of our law as it now exists, which is: (a) unenforceable; which is (b) in the view of many experts really an invasion of the privacy of home and what families may want to do in the activities of their home; and (c) a growing body of evidence that it even defeats its purpose in terms of developing correct attitudes towards drinking.

Surveys have been made. I quoted some of them during discussions on the Health estimates—to the effect that the area from which the greatest influence comes with young people in terms of their attitude towards drinking is the home. Much less influential is the church, much less influential are schools. Indeed, in one survey that I quoted, those who said that they were not influenced in any way at all represented a higher percentage than those who felt that they were influenced in either the church or in the schools; and two or three times as large a group felt that they were influenced in the family home on their attitude toward drinking.

In other words, sir, this is the one place—according to all the evidence we can get in this rather difficult area to get scientific evidence—this is the place where you can get the correct attitude toward drinking and thereby avoid some of the excesses and the social problems that flow from it.

Now, you have a clear indication from a man who heads an institution which this government finances and which this hon. Minister says is one of the foremost institutions in the world. Obviously, he is in a very difficult position when he comes before the select committee or elsewhere, to pronounce himself on matters of policy, but he has had the courage to do so. Quite frankly I commend him for doing so, although he did it with great discretion. He did not rush in to repeat it when he was before the

standing committee on government commissions and, frankly, I did not know at that time that he had presented this to the select committee.

In going through my files for the hon. Provincial Secretary's estimates I came across this and I was interested to find the unequivocal statement on the part of Mr. Archibald. In view of that I would like to ask the hon. Minister what is the government thinking on it? Are you contemplating a change? Because I suggest if you do not you bring the law into disrepute, because it is being violated every day. Not only do you not serve the purpose of this law, you bring all law into disrepute. This is quite apart from the other arguments as to the desirability of developing the right attitudes toward drinking and therefore achieving the overall objectives of the alcohol foundation itself.

Hon Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not recall whether that was actually a part of Mr. Archibald's brief. It may be that having presented his brief, a member of the committee may have directed a question to him and this was his reply and I do not think he was expressing a matter of policy; he was expressing a matter which he believed to be a scientific fact. This was the experience that he was drawing upon.

It was only a year ago that the liquor matters of this province were very thoroughly gone into. Every aspect of both The Liquor Control Act and The Liquor Licence Act, and this and other matters were considered. Some were decided in the affirmative and some were decided in the negative. There was no change of the legal age so that one can assume that the decision was in the negative. There did emerge, however, at the time, a great misconception in the minds of the public at large of what was under discussion. The hon. member has, I think underscored and very rightly so, at the very beginning of his remarks, the two aspects.

Yet it will remain to be seen whether what he has underscored emerges even from this afternoon's debate, because a large segment of the public has confused the two issues. They do not draw the line as between the change in the legal age in overall consumption and a change in age limited perhaps to the home. In fact, it could be proscribed even further and it has been suggested if it were limited to the home, it must be where a parent, as a deliberate act, serves his child—not even to be extended to where the child might feel free to go to the cupboard and help himself—so that there would be a direct parent-to-child or, in other cases, spouse-to-spouse relationship. This does apply also where a spouse is under 21, so that legally, the spouse of that person cannot legally serve or give the other drinks—

Mr. MacDonald: That just underlines the absurdity of the law.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It highlights the problem, and let me put it this way: There is a distinction between the two categories and all changes must have public acceptance. In this I am not saying that the government follows the lead, for the government must assert leadership and has asserted leadership in aspects of this complex, very vexing and sometimes very emotional problem. There must be, in order that there is a ready acceptance by the public, an awareness by the public, of what the distinction is, and when the public is aware of the distinction to a greater degree, it will be then up to government to decide which aspect it will deal with.

I have no doubt that these matters which have received consideration in the past, will be taken under review in the future and changes made.

I will say that the hon. member for York South has very fully and very capably put the affirmative case for the change in law with respect to homes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister provokes me into commenting on his definition of leadership. He says that the government leads but they have to get clear in the mind of the public and the public must have clear in its mind, the distinction between drinking out of the home and drinking in the home.

May I suggest to the Minister that the way he could establish that distinction is to alter the law in the manner that I have indicated? Personally, I, for the moment agree that we should retain the law against drinking under 21 publicly outside the home, but you should eliminate the law—which is an ass if there ever was one—that says there cannot be drinking in the home. It is being violated, and it is unenforceable and conceivably undesirable in the views of men like Mr. Archibald.

If you want to establish that distinction in the mind of the public, you can achieve that tomorrow, and there will be no doubt about it. All you can do is enact the suggestion of Mr. Archibald.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would that not be considered just as hypocritical from the standpoint of respect for the law?

Mr. MacDonald: No!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would it not be just as difficult in the minds of the youngsters in whom you are trying to instil a respect for the law, to say to them, "What you are allowed to do at home, you are not allowed to do outside"?

This is part of the dilemma, Mr. Chairman, is it not?

Mr. MacDonald: I listen to the government side of the House so often talking about the obligation of parents to rear their children.

Here is one area in the context of the advice of Mr. Archibald—who is your expert, and whom you praise when it serves your political purposes—where you can come to grips with the problem of the attitude toward drinking and it is the only area, according to scientific studies to the extent that you can get scientific studies, where you really get effective change and influence of attitudes, and that is in the home.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has not really answered my question. In all seriousness, and I am sure he appreciates the dilemma, I ask him whether, in fact, in an effort to avoid this apparent hypocrisy—and there is a great deal of apparent hypocrisy in liquor laws throughout the world, and I am not going to go into the reasons for them because you come into such areas of dilemma. I have asked the hon. member whether, in fact, if you change the law so that it becomes legal to serve a drink under age at home, but not to have a drink at the same age outside the home, whether this is, in itself, going to be considered by the young people as being hypocritical.

Mr. MacDonald: One answer to the hon. Minister's question—and this gets back to a philosophy which he sometimes espouses but now he is discarding—is that the law simply says nothing about drinking under 21 years of age in the home. This is the law in many countries. This is a matter of parental judgment; this is a matter of privacy; it is a matter of regulation of the family. But if there is some obvious abuse or deviation from norm, other laws come into play, whether it be child welfare legislation, or what you will. I suggest to the Minister of Reform Institutions, let us not come up with specious arguments for debating purposes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I asked the hon. member if he does not think there would be any problem?

Mr. Bryden: There would be nothing like the problem there is now.

Mr. MacDonald: My hon. friend is correct; there is nothing like the problem that there is at the moment, and I have—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would you not be solving one problem by creating another?

Mr. MacDonald: No, no. You have both of them now, and I am suggesting that you eliminate one of them. I will leave the matter.

Let me go on, Mr. Chairman, to the final point that I want to raise. May I ask the hon. Minister who makes the appointments of liquor licence inspectors? Is it the government or is it the LLBO?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The liquor licence board of Ontario makes the recommendations and sends them up here, and I, as the Minister, sign the order in council. It is passed by order-in-council over my signature, and I may say that in the term of office that I have been here, I have, I think, just accepted the recommendations that have been prepared by the liquor licence board and the liquor control board without question.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the salary, is there a standard salary for liquor licence employees?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In recent times, they do not come within the purview of the civil service, but in determining the salary ranges, and the classifications both of the liquor control board and the liquor licence board, an attempt is made to use a comparable yardstick as is used in the civil service commission, and there are starting levels—

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister offhand know what it is?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I am afraid I do not.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to present to the House a little puzzlement on my part.

Each time the LLBO has come before the standing committee on commissions, there has inevitably been raised the issue of how you get licences, and the question of whether or not there are toll gates, whether it is done

strictly on the basis of the merits of the applicant and the property he has. Judge Robb has been quite insistent that he handles it on the merits, and if anything goes on beyond him, he knows nothing of it. And I have accepted his word that if anything goes on it is beyond his ken.

However, against that background that decisions are made completely without reference to any political machine, I would be curious to know if there has been a single person appointed as liquor commissioner in the past year, who was not a well-known local active Tory. For example, in my own constituency, we got into a local difficulty, because one of the councillors, who is well known as a Conservative—he was on the Conservative riding association—and I do not know of any place where you waste your time more than in that association. But there he was, on the council, and in the middle of his term, he was appointed a liquor inspector. Then we got into a bit of a schemozzle over who was going to be appointed to fill out the term, and I was very interested yesterday to notice in the London *Free Press*, that Campbell Miller had been appointed a liquor licence inspector in the area.

Who is Mr. Miller? He was the Conservative MP for Middlesex East from 1962 to 1965. When he ran in 1965 and he was defeated, he was also a past-president of the Middlesex East association. How does the hon. Minister explain the remarkable coincidence of a board which has no association at all with politics, making consistent appointments from the ranks of the Conservative association in each local community?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the last appointment, because it was I who suggested to Mr. Miller that he apply for that position. Mr. Miller was a federal member of Parliament, he was defeated last fall. For some time he studied a variety of employment opportunities. When this job became vacant, I suggested that he put in an application for several reasons. First of all, he is a teetotaler. In the second place, he is a prominent churchman.

Mr. MacDonald: Being a teetotaler is not necessarily a good qualification.

Mr. White: Third, he was a professional inspector before going into politics.

Mr. MacDonald: How did you know the job was open?

Mr. White: And fourth—

Mr. Bryden: I never heard of any vacancy there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: And fifth, let me see now, I had another telling point there and the interruption from my friend has—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. MacDonald: Did the employment committee of the local Conservative association recommend him?

Mr. White: He applied for the job, sir, and I do not know who else applied, I have no idea. But I have no doubt whatsoever that this gentleman was the best applicant because he is a very superior man. Oh yes, the other point I wanted to mention, he is a well-known union member in London.

Mr. MacDonald: I would say the hon. member for London has certainly brought up about four completely irrelevant points, and it is very interesting that he injected himself into this and we discovered exactly how it all happened. I suggest that if there is going to be a position to be filled, that there will be advertising of it, and it will be handled in an above-the-board fashion, and not handled as part of the official, or unofficial, employment committee of the local Conservative association. And, Mr. Chairman, I find it impossible to believe—even though I do not want to disbelieve any spokesman for the LCBO—that their operations are all removed from the Conservative association, because there is just too much evidence that they are operated in a very intimate, close relationship. And I cite but two instances that happened to come to my attention. In fact, may I ask the hon. Minister—I suppose this is unfair, you have not got your officials in front of you—how many liquor inspectors have been appointed in the past year?

Mr. White: Before the hon. Minister answers that, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on an inference that I got from the hon. member's remarks. I see dozens of people every week who seek employment with the Ontario public service. And, with very few exceptions, I have employment applications sent to them. I am sure that my hon. friend does the same, and the suggestion that this is in any way improper, I for one, take a strong objection to.

Second, this matter was never discussed by the Conservative association in London, and

I think they would not have known about it until they read it in the paper the same day the hon. member for York South did. It has absolutely nothing to do with them, and never had.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I have put in the record, and I do not happen to have it here, in Carlton, in Lanark county, and up in Timiskaming county, where there are employment committees of the Conservative associations, they actually made recommendations. The recommendations were made even before the vacancy had been officially declared down here at Queen's Park, so that the local Conservative association, is, in effect, the recruiting agent of many of the government agencies here.

Mr. White: This is not the case in any area I know about. Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday, here in this House, we gave an achievement award to a gentleman named Foxcroft, who was the NDP candidate against me in 1963. I did not know about that until after the event, either, but if I had had some foreknowledge, I suppose—

Mr. MacDonald: This is completely irrelevant.

Mr. White: —I would have been accused—

Mr. MacDonald: Completely irrelevant.

Mr. White: No, it is not; not a bit. Why, if he had been a Conservative candidate you would have called that patronage.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, nonsense.

Mr. White: The NDP candidate.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask the Chairman what an achievement award has to do with this vote?

Mr. Chairman: It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up on this because, whether the Conservative government wishes it or not, there certainly seems to be around Ontario a feeling that patronage has a role in connection with appointment of inspectors. Another thing that concerns me, and I should think should concern the Provincial Secretary, is the authority, the threat to livelihood, which these inspectors have over many of the licensed restaurants and hotels. Whether or not there is any fact in this, I know that as I go around Ontario I hear people who tell me: "You know that I belong to the Liberal Party, and I find that an inspector is constantly breathing down my throat." I dismiss that. I would like to dismiss that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But you do not.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I would like to, but the point is that we have heard time after time, by some strange coincidence which has nothing to do with the Conservative party, a Conservative is always elected. I have listened to this debate over the years. May I say, another area that I am concerned about is the wide disparity in penalties that are imposed on companies for breaches of The Liquor Licence Act of Ontario. I have a list of these here and I would just like to take a couple of them.

Last August, the Toronto police raided a Toronto hotel night club—I will not mention the name of it—and arrested a number of persons on charges of conspiracy and vagrancy, section C. Two months later there were a number of waiters appeared in court, the conspiracy charges were dropped, but the vagrancy charges were kept. The complete report, and I understand it always happens, the complete report was sent by the police to the liquor licence board. The licence board was aware that the magistrate in passing judgment said: "There is no doubt that this"—referring to this particular hotel—"was a den of prostitution." And he added later:

> There is no doubt that many of the accused had an arrangement with the girls to the knowledge of the girls. The girls would be served water when alcoholic beverages were ordered for them, and this took place quite frequently.

This is the end of the quote by the magistrate.

The proprietor of the hotel night club was asked to appear before the liquor licence board and the matter was remanded until June of this year. We are told it was because the owner indicated he may be selling the property.

Now, I would like to hear from the hon. Minister, as the hon. member for Bracondale had asked, I would like to get some clear knowledge of the ground rules in connection with the board when they are giving out reprimands or fines or whatever they are going to do to people who appear before them.

Members of the staff of the establishment have been charged with having made arrangements with the prostitutes to make a profit on drinking operations in this way, and I will just repeat it to show the approach

that had been taken, with which they have been charged. The girls would encounter a man in the bar, a complete stranger, and they would make arrangements to sit with him. And when the client ordered the girl a drink, she asked for a clear, but highly priced, drink such as champagne or vodka. Then the waiter would bring her a glass of water and he would charge the client $1 or $1.50, and the waiter and the prostitute would split the profits at the end of the evening.

Well, as I say, that charge of conspiracy was dismissed but this is what they were charging.

But the vagrancy C charge was upheld. As I understand it, these are very serious offences in the eyes of the licence board. Yet in spite of the fact that the board was fully aware of the activities taking place in this establishment, an establishment described by the magistrate as a den of prostitution, there was no action by the board.

Let me take some places where they have had action, and I am looking at the report by the liquor licence board of Ontario. Here is a place where they took action. I do not want to mention the place, I do not think it is necessary, but the board suspended the licence privileges of this establishment for a period of one week. Remember, the other place was described as a den of prostitution. This place gets its licence privileges taken away for a week and then it describes the reason. Because liquor had been served in the dining lounge premises without a meal.

I could go through a whole number of these but I think the hon. Minister may be aware—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: How many are there of that specific kind?

Mr. Thompson: Well, this is January 8, 1966.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the type that the hon. leader of the Opposition has just read: serving liquor without a meal.

Mr. Thompson: I have about four just in this file here. I do not know how many there are which are, as I say, described as permitting vagrancy C, who do not get anything, but it strikes me if there are four of them, even, which are serving drinks without a meal—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: No, but I will tell you what I am really curious about. This, after all, is a society where I would think if a man's livelihood is going to be penalized, as a free citizen he should be able to know why and there should be some ground rules in connection with the kind of penalty that he is going to receive.

I would think that some of these restaurant owners who have received a week or two weeks of having their licence privileges taken away from them, when they read this about this other situation of vagrancy C—and may I say I got this from a police report—I think it would be disheartening to the police as well, when they are trying to do a job, to see that in one case where it seemed to be a pretty serious offence that the liquor licence board seems to nod its head and ignore it, while in other cases where they served liquor without a meal they pounce right on them.

I would hate to suggest that there may be implications of politics attached—I do not know whether there are or not—but certainly in the licensing of the inspectors it is obvious that we should raise this question because of the passing strange coincidence that so many of the inspectors seem to have to have the qualification of being a Conservative. And I think frankly that the government—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What relationship is there between the two?

Mr. Thompson: I would say there is a blur constantly about the whole approach of the liquor licence board, there is a blur about use.

For example, in applying to get a liquor licence the hon. member for Bracondale has asked if an applicant, having followed all of those procedures laid down in the Act, could he then apply? Yet in a number of cases—and I have heard rumours about this payola and everything else—if you get a certain lawyer to help you to apply you seem to have better luck.

And I would think because of that kind of rumour going around the government would be particularly concerned to clear its decks on it. Similarly with respect to penalizing a person under the liquor licence board. I would think again that a government, even just on the matter of the rights of individuals, would want to see that there were clear ground rules by which a man would know why he is penalized. There would not be this disparity, where in one case for what appears to be a very serious offence in the

eyes of the liquor board nothing happens to the hotel owner, while in other cases they will get two weeks or even more than that, in the examples I could present.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is the hon. leader of the Opposition implying in the first instance that that case had been concluded in the eyes of the liquor licence board? Where nothing has yet happened, is the hon. leader of the Opposition suggesting that in the case where there are convictions in relationship to vagrancy C, that the matter had been concluded in the liquor licence board?

Mr. Thompson: No, but I am implying this, sir. First of all it has taken a long time to come to a decision on this, and it has been before the courts when there has been a vagrancy charge. Second, the owner has indicated from the record that we have, that he is probably selling his hotel, so surely it is the owner who has the responsibility in this and if you delay much longer without having some kind of a penalty, he will no longer own the hotel.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the board in its wisdom has had a great deal of experience in this. I do not have before me the statistics on the suspensions or the cancellations. Suffice it to say this, that the cancellation of a liquor licence is a very heavy penalty indeed. Contemplating a hotel in this city with the licences that go with it, deprived of those licences, I would not hazard a guess at what the difference in monetary value is. Suffice it to say it would be in the thousands of dollars.

I recall an instance a number of years ago about an establishment outside Hamilton where there was a partnership and one partner did something—I forget whether it was serving to a minor, some very serious offence—under which the board at that time had no discretion but at that time had to cancel. As a result, the board did cancel and that amounted to a penalty levied against a co-partner in the amount of, I think, just under $50,000.

Hon. members can imagine if a magistrate had ever imposed a penalty of $50,000 on a co-partner in this type of thing, that one's sense of fairness would lead one to believe that this was a very harsh penalty indeed. I point out this instance to the hon. leader of the Opposition. I know nothing of the particular case; I know nothing of the severity which would ensue upon the cancellation of a licence. If this was an operator who should not be in the business, then I think that the goal is to get him out of business and if that can be done without him suffering, it should be. As I say, I do not know what irreparable harm would be done to his family or him in this instance. If this Legislature sees fit, in its judgment and under the circumstances of this kind, that the board should fine a man $50,000 or $25,000, then it can do so.

In this instance, as I say, I know nothing of the facts. Perhaps at the next meeting whenever the board appears before the committee, it can be asked on what basis. My experience has been in reviewing from time to time the reports that come through, there is barely a pattern of a week's suspension or a two-weeks' suspension. I think the policy of the board is to make its point, that is to impose a penalty which will be felt by the proprietor in respect of his wrongdoing, but not something which will mortally wound a person. Indeed, the reason why we have provided for an appeal from cancellation, is that this Legislature has recognized that this is a very severe penalty indeed.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I have not brought up the suggestion that cancellation should take place. I notice that the liquor licence board seems to pass out suspensions in a number of other cases.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They have cancelled.

Mr. Thompson: They have cancellations, and I agree with you, and I am not sure if this warrants it. I am not the judge in this. I do think that it is curious that in this particular case, they have had no suspension for seven years of any kind. To read further, perhaps the hon. Minister has not got the facts here, but I would say that the concern that I am expressing is because it is hinted that you have this one particular hotel, as I understand it, the liquor licence board has known for two years about the situation there. They have never had a suspension in seven years, and my point is that I look at other hotels, public houses, taverns, which get a suspension for a couple of weeks, but somehow this particular hotel seems to ride on, even though it has committed an offence in permitting vagrancy, which apparently is looked upon with great apprehension by the board. While this owner is still there, they may not have a suspension. I am curious whether there are clear ground rules on the part of the board with respect to handing out either suspensions or cancellations. Is there a code by which the board operates in penalizing hotel owners?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is a matter of judgment and discretion which has been entrusted to the board by this Legislature.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, how many products are there on the board in a liquor store?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is a question that should be directed to the chairman of the board. I may say I think there are quite sufficient for the demands of the day.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, I did not hear the reply. Would the hon. Minister answer this question? To his knowledge, has $12,000 been the going price to get on the board in your operations there?

All right, I may follow it up this way then. Has there to your knowledge ever been a charge to get on the board in the liquor store?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Sargent: So this is the first time in history that this has ever happened in this government? We have a record, with all deference to Mr. Harry Price, who is mentioned as being bag man for the party, going back some 30 years ago. He was doing the same thing for the party and this is the second offence for Mr. Price in this regard.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, this is not before the House at this time, nor is it relevant.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is a matter of policy insofar as to how much do you charge to get on the board?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think it is very unfair of the hon. member. The hon. member has made a categorical statement, and I do not think that he is in full senses to realize the language that he has used.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister has not seen fit to take the government off the hook in this matter, and—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would read the statement I made in the House, and I rather doubt that he has, nonetheless, if he would, he would see listed there in great detail how these various brands of Melchers were listed. I stated at that time that I could find no evidence whatsoever that there was any impropriety, or that they had been listed in anything other than the normal course of events in the usual functioning and routine of the board.

Now, that statement is either in *Hansard,* or I imagine there are copies of it floating around.

Mr. Bryden: It was a complete evasion of the real issue.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the hon. member would care to read it.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates.

Mr. Bryden: No, Mr. Chairman, it certainly does not. I have a matter that I have been waiting patiently to raise, while other things were raised.

It really relates back to the subject-matter that my hon. leader was dealing with, namely, the employment policy in the LCBO and the LLBO. One thing I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, following up on what my hon. leader said, is that as long as the system is perpetuated in which the hon. Minister uses discretion in making appointments of regular staff—I am not now talking about top executive offices, such as deputy minister, but regular staff in the category of inspectors —there is bound to be a belief that political patronage is being exercised.

In the civil service of Ontario, we have, as far as I know, pretty well eliminated patronage through the civil service commission and The Department of the Civil Service. According to my observation, appointments are made according to certain principles and regulations and are on a merit basis. One does not necessarily always agree with the choices that are made, but one can agree that they are made in good faith and according to principles. This does not happen at all in the area of the LCBO or the LLBO. We still live in the Dark Ages, as far as the whole personnel situation in those two agencies is concerned.

As a matter of fact, it is very difficult to find out what their personnel policy is. I would like some day to hear a statement from the hon. Minister on that matter. As he pointed out, they are not part of the civil service. I think they should be, or alternatively, they should be under the same sort of regularized routine as the civil service is. This cuts into the whole problem of employee relations. What has happened here is that these two boards, the LCBO, which is the big employer, and the LLBO, a

smaller employer, are harbouring a company union and have been for years—a phony organization that purports to protect the interests of the employees in the organizations, and does no such thing.

I raised this in a preliminary way with the hon. Minister, by way of questions before the orders of the day, a week or two ago. His answers confirmed what I had reason to believe was the truth, namely, that the LCBO and LLBO employees association is essentially an association of store managers. It is dominated by store managers, and they are the people who sign the other employees up. The association has lost a large section of its membership over the past while, because it has not been doing a job for them. So now the store managers have been brought into play to browbeat the employees back into the organization, to make them join again, and sign a check-off authorization. This is what is happening right now.

The Minister says that the store managers are not part of the management group. I suggest to him that they are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if these gentlemen over here are not interested in the business of this House, they should withdraw rather than disrupt what is going on.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine has the floor, please.

Mr. Bryden: Carrying on like a bunch of donkeys for the last 15 minutes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there can be interruptions that are relevant and interruptions that are plain silly, and for outright silliness one can hardly surpass what one finds over here, as a general rule.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: These gentlemen to my left will take first prize in any contest for silliness; I have no doubt about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the store managers may not technically be regarded by the LCBO as being management personnel, but they are nevertheless representatives of management. They have at least an indirect disciplinary power, and an employee organization that has to depend on that type of personnel for its existence is an organization that has no legitimate basis of existence. I would doubt very much if it could be certified under The Labour Relations Act of this province. It is a store managers organization.

The employees it is supposed to be representing get no consideration at all from this organization and that is why so many of them have been leaving. But now they are being dragooned back in by the use of the store manager to exercise pressure on them, bearing in mind also that behind him is a disciplinary authority.

We have a most disgraceful situation in this province, Mr. Chairman, with respect to employees of so-called boards and commissions. Slowly it is being straightened out; it is a very slow—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the hon. member continue his remarks when we have reintroduced these estimates?

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to complete these estimates. We have completed the estimates as such, I understand, and we are now in the discussion. I would like to complete this tomorrow and then proceed with Bill 81 in committee of the whole House. The estimates to follow are of The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 106

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Fourth report, standing committee on legal bills and labour, Mr. Bales 3359

Crop insurance, bill to provide for, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3359

Statement re report on Metropolitan Toronto juvenile and family court, Mr. Wishart .. 3362

Estimates, Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, concluded 3367

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, in committee 3385

Recess, 6 o'clock 3399

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature; today we welcome, as guests, children from the following schools: In the west gallery, West Flamboro school board, Dundas, Ontario; and in the east gallery, John Lynch high school.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills), from the standing committee on legal bills and labour, presented the committee's fourth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill 95, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act;

Bill 96, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill 46, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act;

Bill 93, An Act to amend The Evidence Act;

Bill 98, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act;

Bill 100, An Act to establish and provide for the duties of a consumer protection bureau.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CROP INSURANCE

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for crop insurance.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, with the recognized importance of this bill to the agricultural community and, in fact, to the whole economy of the province, I wonder if I could crave the indulgence of the hon. members of the House, with your permission, sir, to make a statement on the introduction of this bill somewhat longer than usual; I feel that it is important at this time.

I would like to make an explanation with reference to the bill, An Act respecting crop insurance. Many of the members will recall that the select committee on crop insurance was appointed on April 12, 1960 and brought in their report on February 12, 1962. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that no action should be taken by the government of Ontario at that time to introduce crop insurance.

This conclusion was reached through interviews and meetings of the committee with interested farmers and farm organizations who indicated their desire to carry their own crop insurance. Few farmers had ever experienced total, or near total, crop loss, but that was before the severe drought of the past few years or the excessive rainfall of the late summer of 1965. Since the report of the select committee on crop insurance was presented, the farmers of Ontario have suffered adverse weather conditions in many areas—at times a lack of rain, and at other times too much moisture.

Particularly hard hit has been eastern and northeastern Ontario. However, problems have extended to northwestern Ontario as well, and last year there were pockets of weather damage in cash crop areas of western and central Ontario.

The government of Ontario has provided assistance during these periods in the form of transportation subsidies for hay, bank guarantees, co-operation with The Department of Energy and Resources Management, in the construction of farm ponds, and, during the past year, coupons for the purchase of livestock feed with extension of utilization of the coupons, the last one being to May 31 of this year. In addition, guaranteed interest-free bank loans to a maximum of $1,000 have been made available to farmers for the purchase of seed and fertilizer in the case of

those farmers who have suffered 25 per cent or more crop loss. All of these programmes have been very well received and have been of considerable help to the farmer-producer.

However, last year, when we approached the then federal Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Harry Hays, with a request for assistance and participation in a cost-sharing programme to alleviate the drought and adverse weather conditions, the hon. Mr. Hays was quite specific in pointing out that he did not favour this type of assistance for agriculture and obtained an undertaking from the provinces concerned — Quebec, British Columbia and Ontario—that they would give serious consideration to the feasibility of crop insurance for their province. We agreed to this. As well, I have had many farmers tell me that an adequate crop insurance programme would be much more acceptable to most farmers. I should also say, Mr. Speaker, that at the time of the conversation, I made it quite clear to the hon. Mr. Hays that the present federal Crop Insurance Act as it now stands is not suited to Ontario conditions. This was also agreed to by the other provinces concerned.

First of all, the percentage of loss coverage at 60 per cent was not sufficient and we requested that the federal Act be amended to provide up to 80 per cent of loss coverage. Neither does the present federal legislation provide for spot loss coverage on an individual crop, and it is felt that this is a necessary requirement of this province. Nor does the present federal Crop Insurance Act provide coverage for forage crops such as corn, hay and pasture. And because over 70 per cent of Ontario's agricultural revenue is derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products, we believe it is essential that crop insurance should be provided for such forage crops.

Mr. Hays agreed that these legislative changes would be brought in and it is my understanding that the Hon. Mr. Greene, the current Minister, is also agreeable to this. To date, to the best of my knowledge, no amendments have come forward, but I have every confidence that they will.

However, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention this in passing, because the bill which I have just introduced is drafted on the assumption that these necessary amendments will be made by the government of Canada. As I mentioned before, without these amendments, the legislation is of little use to Ontario farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members will appreciate that this Act is merely a foundation upon which we must build a comprehensive insurance programme. Experiences in other provinces have shown that an insurance programme cannot be started and brought into full force overnight. For example, the province of Saskatchewan in 1961 brought their programme into effect with 194 participants; they now have only 3,200. The province of Manitoba is still in the process of developing crop insurance although they started six years ago in 1960. The province of Alberta brought in legislation in February, 1964 and it took the summer and fall to develop the administration, with the programme starting in the spring of 1965. They approached this matter through the policy of test areas. Nova Scotia brought in legislation in 1963 but no programmes have been established as yet, to the best of my knowledge. Prince Edward Island's programme was also established in 1963 and covers only potatoes and grain.

I have specifically mentioned these other provinces for the purpose of pointing out that a province with the great diversification of agricultural crops that is found in Ontario, is faced with quite a momentous task in developing a crop insurance programme. For instance, administration and administrative procedures will have to be developed. Granaries will have to be established for the various crops and provision made for the speedy settlement of claims. The procurement of capable personnel is essential and is a major consideration.

None of these matters can be started until after this legislation receives the approval of this Legislature. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise this House of our plans as they now stand.

If this legislation receives the approval of this Legislature, we will move as quickly as possible to bring the plan into operation with the intention that it will be applicable to some crops at least in the spring of 1967.

Participation in the plan will be voluntary, but it will apply on a province-wide basis. Other provinces have followed the policy of using test areas and require a certain percentage of participation before a crop insurance plan is available to the farmers within a certain area.

Our studies have led us to conclude that when a crop insurance plan is developed and available for a particular farm crop, all the farmers producing that crop in Ontario, should be entitled to apply for the insurance.

The proposed programme will provide coverage up to 80 per cent of the normal production of a particular crop. A lower

percentage of coverage, at 60 or 70 per cent, would also be available if the farmer so desired.

It is the intention to establish yields on an individual farm basis, rather than to attempt to do so by preconceived areas such as townships or counties. Consequently, each farm unit will be insured at a level of coverage representative of the productivity of that unit. This will remove the criticism often directed at crop insurance programmes by the better producers who suggest that the average yield of an area is too low for setting the level of coverage for their own farm unit.

Under this proposed plan, each farmer will set his own production standards, based on his knowledge of the best performance of his farm. While this approach on the surface appears to offer some opportunity for misrepresentation, in practice this should not be a problem, because—as is the case under all insurance policies—any statement made by the insured which is not correct, within a normal margin of error, renders the policy null and void.

This approach appears to be necessary in Ontario because of the wide fluctuations in productivity even in small areas. In the long term averages, if counties were used to set levels of coverage, then the level would be too low for the better units, and too high for the others.

Protection is offered against such perils as drought, excessive rainfall, excessive moisture, flood, frost, hail, winter kill, wind, disease and other pests. If actual production for the above reasons falls below the insured percentage for the normal level, then the producer will be eligible for claim payments to the extent of the deficiency. Naturally, losses that are due to neglect, or failure to follow good farming practices—if the latter is shown to be deliberate, or because of neglect—are not covered, and would render the insurance void.

Premium rates for each crop to be insured will be determined from available statistics on actual yields by county. Our farm economics and statistics branch has already completed a sample survey of six counties, and a method has been developed to measure yield variability. Information from this survey is now being analyzed to determine the amount of actual losses on the farm units included in the survey, using the percentages of the average county yield for the various levels of coverage, that is, 80, 70 and 60 per cent. This procedure will be followed for all other crops. A farmer will not be compelled to insure all crops grown on his farm. He may decide to insure only one particular crop and this will be quite permissible under the proposed policy. I would like to explain, Mr. Speaker, that with reference to forage crops, this would include hay, pasture and corn used for fodder purposes. That would be considered one crop, a forage crop.

In the original application, which will be made for insurance by the farmer, all details of his farming operation will be required, as well as the estimates of his normal crop yield. It will be a requirement that the farmer report to the crop insurance commission as soon as he believes his production is going to fall below his level of coverage. Other losses, such as flooding, hail, disease or pests, will also be reported immediately the damage is evident. The adjuster must then examine the damaged crops and assess the extent of the loss. No indemnity will be paid at this time, but the results of the inspection will be recorded for the time of final settlement and appraisal. The final adjustment of the loss will be made at the end of the growing season, after harvest operations. All measurement of final harvesting results will be made by the adjuster in conjunction with the farmer.

Crop insurance under this legislation will be marketed through commissioned agents under contract with the crop insurance commission. They may be regular insurance agents, who are qualified to handle such insurance, or it may be necessary to retain other qualified persons to act as agents in certain areas. Insurance claims adjusters will be appointed. Commission fees to agents will be paid in a combination of flat service fees, plus a percentage of the total premiums.

The actual premium cost to the producer at the present moment, under current federal legislation will be reduced by a contribution from the government of Canada of 20 per cent of the total premium. We have been given to understand that it is the intention of the government of Canada to increase this premium support by another five per cent, to bring it to a total of 25 per cent.

It is the intention of the government of Ontario to further subsidize this premium rate by five per cent, bringing the total potential support to 30 per cent of the premium.

Administration expenses in all aspects, including agents' commissions and adjusters' fees, are shared on an equal 50 per cent basis by Ottawa and 50 per cent by the

province. A producer will not be asked to bear any administrative costs. The province of Ontario will guarantee the financial stability of the crop insurance fund by way of advances, when necessary, in years of heavy claims. These advances will be repaid from the fund when surpluses accumulate. The programme will be reinsured through an agreement with the government of Canada, as provided by The Canada Crop Insurance Act. This agreement may provide that Canada reimburse the province for up to 75 per cent of the amount by which claims exceed the total of (a) the premiums for one year; (b) the reserve in the fund if any; and (c) 2.5 per cent of the total liability of all the policies in force for one year. The insurance commission will pay a reinsurance premium to the government of Canada for this protection.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation makes provision for a crop insurance commission of Ontario. This crop insurance commission will be under the chairmanship of a senior civil servant and the present intention is to have the membership of the commission comprise civil servants and farmers.

Crop insurance is admittedly new to the province of Ontario, and, as indicated earlier in these remarks, did not appeal to the farmers of Ontario a few years ago. However, the Ontario federation of agriculture, after a thorough study of the subject, has recommended that crop insurance legislation be introduced. The Ontario farmers union has also recommended crop insurance legislation. We believe that the recent experiences of Ontario farmers with adverse weather have also rekindled the interest in this matter. Crop insurance can offer many advantages to the producer. First, it can ensure a satisfactory return of his investment in his crop, regardless of adverse weather conditions or other hazards. Second, it can enhance his credit position and, third, it can, if the farmer so wishes, remove the need for diversification as a hedge against crop failures or losses with one crop. This could encourage greater specialization.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time in explanation of this particular legislation, because I feel it is the most important piece of long-range agricultural legislation that has come forward this session.

It can provide for stability of income and of longer-range planning by the producers. I trust it will receive the support of all members of this House and become an effective weapon in the farmer's hands in his constant struggle with hazards beyond his control in crop production.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): May I ask my friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture if I heard correctly when he said that the benefits of this Act would not be applicable to the present crop year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, will this bill go before the agriculture committee?

Hon Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I should like to make a statement concerning a headline and an article which appeared on the front page of the *Globe and Mail* of today's date, the article continuing on page 2. The headline reads: "Ontario holds back two reports charging disturbed children neglected."

The article says that one of the reports was delivered to the Attorney General and the tenor of the article is that there has been suppression of information to which the House is entitled.

The report in question, Mr. Speaker, is the report on the organization and operation of the Metropolitan Toronto juvenile and family court. This report was ordered and this study was directed by the Attorney General and by the chairman of metropolitan Toronto last summer. It was simply a study report carried out by one official of my department, Mr. Pukacz, in conjunction with Mr. Noble of the metropolitan court, city of Toronto, a civic official and an official of my department, assisted by various court officials and others who are knowledgeable in the matter.

The report was directed for the purpose of ascertaining what action should be taken with respect to the problems of which we were aware in the court's organization and its operation.

I received the report on November 30, 1965. Since that time there have been negotiations almost continuously with the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto and with myself and my officials. As a result of this, a bill was prepared and introduced in this House on May 2, now Bill 107, The Juvenile and Family Courts Act, which provides for entering into an agreement to take over the administration and the responsibility for juvenile and family

courts with respect to Metropolitan Toronto. I think I may tell the House that the negotiations had proceeded to the extent where the proposal is that the province would take over the entire responsibility of that court and assume, in addition, full financial responsibility for the probation services and the family counselling services, which are somewhat the subject of this article.

Let me say this: There was no suppression of the report; it has been widely dispersed; I did not table it in the House; every hon. member of the government certainly had it, and it was made to myself and to the chairman of Metro Toronto. I am certain that many officials of the metropolitan juvenile and family court of the city of Toronto have it and used it, and it was quite available to anyone who wished to see it.

It was a working report for the benefit of my department and in order that I might get on with legislation; that work has been done. It was a report made by a civil servant and by civic servants to the heads of their departments and to the heads of their organizations to enable them to do things as recommended. The main recommendation of the report was that either Toronto or the provincial government assume the responsibility and those were alternative recommendations; one of them has been adopted and that is the responsibility of assumption by the province. That is what is contemplated by the bill to carry out the recommendations of the report.

The article says at one point that the Attorney General, naming myself, made a promise to a reporter three months ago that:

> —the report would eventually be tabled in the Legislature. Yesterday he said he had changed his mind and did not intend to release it.

That is not true. The discussion which I recall with the reporter was to when the report would be tabled. My answer was that I would give consideration to tabling it on either first reading or second reading of the bill, which was being drafted.

As I say, it is a report to a Minister by his own servants and it is a report to the chairman of Metro Toronto. The recommendation has been carried out in the legislation, and I decided not to table it. But I want to make it clear that I did not promise to do so.

The hon. member for Bracondale asked me the same question some weeks ago: In fact, he has on the order and notice paper—Notice No. 13—a request for the tabling of this report. I gave him to understand that I would consider tabling it. This was some weeks ago, but I have not done so.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Why not?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not answering "why not?" I think the reasons are apparent. I am simply saying that the article is misleading in this respect.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The hon. Attorney General dispensed it to everyone except the members of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member has the bill which arises from the recommendations—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Very good; I am simply correcting the statement in the newspaper.

The report has not been suppresed; it is not hidden; it has been worked upon and legislation has been produced from it.

The rest of the article has to do with some other report of another department of the government, and with that I am not concerned at the moment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am concerned with correcting a misleading statement in this newspaper. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is too much to hope that one can ever catch up with such a misleading statement, but at least I think I should put the record straight.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: What about the others, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Minister has made a statement on this particular report and it is not debatable; it is a ministerial statement before the orders of the day. If any member has a question to ask the Minister and he wishes to answer it, I do not mind one or two questions, but it is not normal procedure to question statements before the orders of the day; I wish the members would remember this.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. If members wish to ask a question, they may

do so if the Minister cares to answer it. The member may address his question to the Minister if he is willing to accept his question.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is fair enough; will the hon. Minister answer a question?

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the question to the Minister who apparently is kind enough to answer it. While I appreciate his rising to correct the impression he indicated since, in fact, the report has been widely dispersed to a variety of civil servants and civic officials and has been seen by members of his government—to use his own words—should it not also be the privilege of the members of this House prior to the debate on the bill so that we know the working background?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that question. When a Minister, as I see it, requests one of his staff for a report on various internal arrangements—pieces of administration, operation of some agency or something with which he has to do—I think that the Minister is entitled to know when there is some comment or criticism. There are some things with which I perhaps do not agree and some things with which, perhaps, I would go beyond the report. These are for my education, for my information—

Mr. MacDonald: What about our education?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You will be educated.

Mr. MacDonald: With whatever the hon. Minister wants to reveal.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If the hon. member will just listen? I think the Minister is entitled to have his civil servants report to him and give him various ranges of information and advice with which he may or may not agree. From that, as I have pointed out, I think the Minister is entitled to retain that information and to use it; this has always been clear. If this were a report to the Legislature, there would be no question, but from this report I have brought forward legislation. I will welcome the widest debate on the legislation which will arise from the recommendations in this report.

I am not going to stand here and take the position that when I say to one of my staff "Get me some information," I do not say that it is to be secreted or suppressed. I say "Get the information which you can tell to me." I have a right to have that information; every Minister has the right to work with it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It should not, for many good and sufficient reasons, in every case be made public. This, I think you must accept. I said it was not suppressed and it has not been suppressed. It is widely dispersed, but surely you can understand—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of this House can understand that this is a working report, asked for by the Minister, made to the Minister, and another gentleman, the chairman of Metro Toronto, from which we have negotiated, from which we have worked? We now produce, to the House, legislation which you may debate.

Mr. S. Lewis: You are suppressing it, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is not suppression; I have not yet decided to table it in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member now have a question that he wishes to ask the Minister? He may do so.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on both a point of personal privilege and a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of personal privilege.

Mr. Ben: My name is used, and incorrect information is given with reference to—

Mr. Speaker: The member, then, has a point of order.

Mr. Ben: I have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: You may state where the Minister is out of order.

Mr. Ben: First of all, the hon. Minister did not point out that my notice of motion was for return of two documents, two reports, one made to the Minister's predecessor twice removed, and one made to the Minister. The information that the Minister gives—that his officials worked on it—I submit is not correct. The report I asked for is one which the Metro council submitted to the hon. Minister's department upon the

request of council, while I was on that council. This has nothing to do with the Minister's officials doing any investigation.

Two separate reports. Now, those reports have been in the hon. Minister's department a long time. Furthermore, I suggest that when I asked the Minister privately for those reports, he said that he would not table them until he introduced the legislation and I was quite agreeable to that, because I deemed that to be his prerogative, but the Minister also stated to me that when the legislation was introduced, the reports would be made available to me. I discussed it with the Minister subsequently, at the elevator, and he showed me a caption on a file indicating that this was legislation coming down—and it has since come down. But there was a definite promise on the part of the hon. Attorney General that these reports, after he introduced his legislation, would be made available to members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Does the Minister wish to speak to the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I just wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would like it to be noted that the hon. member for Bracondale said the report would be made available to him, not tabled, and our discussion was at the elevator in the lobby.

Mr. Speaker: The members have spoken to this point of order; there will be no repetition.

The member for Parkdale has a question before the orders of the day.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health, who is not here, but he can take it as notice.

Would the Minister inform the House whether he intends to table in the House the report made to him by an interdepartmental committee representing The Departments of Health, Education, Welfare and Reform Institutions, on the subject of emotionally disturbed children?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, with your permission, sir.

Yesterday during my absence from the House for a few moments, a question was raised which might suggest that there was some impropriety by my actions in having an extraction of *Hansard* distributed with my picture on the cover.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to make it quite clear that this was arranged privately between myself and the Ryerson Press, was paid for by me, and the extracts are so explained on the cover. It states: "Extracts from the official report of debates" for that date.

There was also some implication that there may have been some interjections in this which were not included. Mr. Speaker, that is not so. There were no interjections made which have been excluded from this. I have checked it with the original *Hansard*. As a matter of fact, the copy which I had printed, starts out by going into exact detail from *Hansard*, of the resolution which was moved by the hon. member for Downsview. It was seconded by the hon. member for Forest Hill, and then followed my comments on it.

No interjections were made, therefore no interjections were left out.

There was also a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that this may have been a precedent. This is no precedent at all. I got the idea, as a matter of fact, from my predecessor who was in this House for 12 years, and who had a copy of *Hansard* printed with his picture five times the size of the one I use. He sent out such a *Hansard*, I think, on more than one occasion. As a matter of fact, not only did it include his speech in the House, but it included a Yiddish translation of it, and I think, Mr. Speaker, any privilege which is granted to a communist member of this Legislature should be granted to any other member.

Mr. MacDonald: What relevancy has that?

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, have I the right to say anything in reply to the hon. Minister?

Mr. Speaker: I think that since the Minister has raised the question, perhaps I might allow the member to say a word in reply.

Mr. Oliver: That is fine. What I objected to yesterday, of course, Mr. Speaker, had a number of angles. One was the picture itself.

Mr. Speaker, this is discriminatory to say the least. Not all of us have the photogenic qualities of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. Therefore on the front page of *Hansard* at least, all should be equal, and when my hon. friend exercises the prerogative that he did and has his picture on it, he assumes a position that is perhaps denied us insofar as quality is concerned, at any rate.

But the really serious objection, of course, is that this purports to be an official *Hansard*. That is the point that bothered me. You have on here the crest of the province of Ontario. "Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature." Across the bottom, you have "Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow" —with whom you are acquainted, I think— "Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC, The Queen's Printer, Toronto. Price per session, $3.00."

Now, what I am suggesting to the House, and what I suggested yesterday—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member left out a line.

Mr. Oliver: No, I am coming to that. I did not undertake to read the whole thing. I did not undertake that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Oliver: What I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, is that to all intents and purposes this is an official copy of *Hansard*, with the name of the Speaker, with the name of the Clerk, with the crest of the province, and everything contained thereon.

Now, then, when you go to comparison, when you go to the House of Commons— and I have here a speech by a gentleman who is known to some of the members across the way, the Rt. Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker, the leader of the Opposition in the federal House. Now, here you have the House of Commons debates, speech of the Rt. Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker, delivered in the House of Commons on January 20. Nothing about the Speaker, no crest of the federal government, nothing about the Clerk, just the speech of Mr. Diefenbaker. And across the bottom it says, "Not printed at public expense." In this article here, on which my hon. friend has his speech, it is not said that it is not printed at public expense. I think my hon. friend paid for the printing of this, but to all intents and purposes this is an official document of the province of Ontario and to all intents and purposes printed at public expense. And it has the hon. Minister's picture on it.

I suggest to the House, as I said yesterday, that this is going quite a long way in abusing the privileges of the House and I do not think it should be repeated.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member left out the most important part in reading the front page. It also states, "Extracts from the official report of debates for Friday, January 28, 1966." Now, insofar as the other matters are concerned, about the Speaker's name and price per session $3, appearing on the cover, I had nothing to do with this. I asked Ryerson Press to print this for me, to put on "Extracts from the official report," and my picture, stating the subject on which I was speaking. On the other matter, I presume the printer felt this would go into it anyway. If I had been asked about it I am sure I would have thought it was not necessary, if I had thought about it at all. But I think it is futile anyway, I think it is unimportant.

Mr. Oliver: If it is so unimportant, why does the hon. Minister think they go to the trouble in the federal House of making the distinction and not having the crest and not having the name of the Speaker and not having it purport to be an official report of the House of Commons? How does the Minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is the dean of this House and has been here for many years, I wonder why the question was not raised and such careful scrutiny given to the actions of my predecessor, who got away with murder in this House for 12 years?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think perhaps the matter should be closed at this time, but I would like to point out that the Speaker's office had nothing to do with the reproduction of the excerpts from the official copy of *Hansard*. It is the privilege of each and every member, if they wish, to have speeches printed by any printing company, if they give their speech to them. If they want to give it to Ryerson Press, they deal specifically with them and they pay for what they want done. I would suggest, however, that speeches reproduced do not bear the resemblance of the official report of the *Hansard* proceedings of the House.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that, the hon. Minister not being here yesterday, I did not mention his name when I brought this matter up and, not being in the House when the previous member had used the same form, I did not know about it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 24th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

(*continued*)

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Woodbine will permit me, during the course of the remarks yesterday, the hon. leader of the Opposition made reference to some matters which were current before the liquor licence board of Ontario. I was unfamiliar with the facts of the particular cases and as yet I have not had the possibility of reviewing with the chairman of the liquor licence board all of the details of these cases.

However, the hon. leader of the Opposition will remember that during the course of his remarks, sir, I did make an interjection. I said: "Is the hon. leader of the Opposition implying in the first instance that the case has been concluded in the eyes of the liquor licence board?" He said no, but the fact that the matter was not concluded did not deter him from making certain implications which, of course, have been picked up by the newspapers. I think the proper course would have been if he had said the matter had not been concluded, to wait until the matter had been concluded, and then made a comment on it.

I was in touch with the chairman of the liquor licence board and am advised that the matter first came before the liquor licence board on April 21, which is only two weeks ago, and that the matter was adjourned until June 23. I express the opinion that it is common courtesy when such a matter, if it is not sub judice, at least is before a quasi-judicial body, in instances like this, the matter would be better left until a decision had been made. Then, of course, comment could be made at that time.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question in regard to this vote.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is no vote before the House.

Mr. Sargent: In regard to this department and the LCBO, last night I asked the Minister if, to his knowledge, there had ever been an amount of $12,000 paid to get a product on the board. He stated that not to his knowledge had this ever happened before.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not say that at all, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, the proper position I should have taken was not to answer a question of that nature.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you have the unhappy situation where you have to answer the question. This is a matter of $123 million of profit to the people of this province, Mr. Chairman. If this Minister can tolerate moneys paid to the amount of possibly $12,000 for a product when there are 300 products on the board, we are talking about a lot of big money.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have to say that I made a complete statement to this House. I referred to it last night.

Now, sir, if the hon. member wants a categorical denial of the allegation he is making, I think it is on the record of the House. If he wants to just go on making allegations time after time, I do not suppose there is any way he can be stopped. But I would point out to him that both formally in a statement which is before the House and when he raised the matter last night, I referred him to that statement, and I told him that I myself have investigated and laid before the House the complete story of how these particular products got to be listed by the liquor control board. There is no indication whatsoever that there was any money paid or that there was any wrongdoing in connection with those listings. I cannot make it any clearer than that.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the hon. Prime Minister. But I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister would like us to believe that statement? I would like to ask the Minister again, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member that he has to accept the Minister's statement in connection with this.

Mr. Sargent: All right. I would ask him if he stands by that statement—that never to his knowledge has this happened before. Does he stand by that statement?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is putting in the word "before"; I never uttered that word, and I stand behind the statement I made last night. The answer that is in *Hansard* is the answer that I made.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I was the one who made the statement before. I asked the hon. Minister, and he said not to his

knowledge. If the hon. Minister stands by that statement, I would like to ask his predecessor—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will answer that question. I have never before, after, since or at any time; never in the course of my whole life.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I told the House last night that some 30 years ago, Mr. Harry Price had been—but I will read this to the House to clarify the situation. This is from the Toronto *Telegram,* March 25, 1966:

> For the second time in his career, Harry Isaac Price has become the centre of a liquor hassle in the Ontario Legislature. Yesterday Kenneth Bryden, NDP, Woodbine, read two letters into the record in which Mr. Price was prominently mentioned in exchanges between officials of the Melchers Distilleries, and in 1935—

he is referring to Mr. Price:

> —was sharply rapped by a Conservative government-appointed commission into liquor sales of foreign distilleries. Commissioner Duncan C. Ross said Mr. Price, a Tory MPP, was an agent for a foreign whisky firm and that the arrangements had been made with a view that he would have influence as an MPP with the liquor control board and its officials.

This is 30 years ago.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Who was the Prime Minister at that time?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): George Henry!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I go on with the report—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

May I ask the members to stay with the questions in connection with the policy of the department, please?

Mr. Sargent: We could wait all day if they want to talk away.

> Commissioner Ross had been investigating charges of liquor tollgating in Ontario, a system whereby it was alleged that the LCB would not buy from foreign distilleries unless they had agents in Ontario. Now these agents would then receive commissions on LCB purchases, it was alleged.

This article goes on to pay tribute to Mr. Price for his contribution to the community and it lauds him at some length, and his fund-raising for the party, and so on. But the point is, this matter comes before us. It is accepted across the province; I have heard many times of the sums you have to pay to get on the board. Mr. Chairman, it is a shocking thing when the Prime Minister of this province tries to squelch a situation whereby $12,000 is alleged to have been paid to the party for services rendered to get a product on the board. In Quebec a Royal commission was set up to inquire into the charge that Yvon Dupuis had been offered a bribe of $10,000, and there was a full hearing of this commission; but here in this province, we have a situation involving some $12,000. Where the money has gone, we do not know, but when we ask a Minister of the Crown and his department, if this has ever happened before—and we know of a precedent established 30 years ago—the Minister says that this is an awful, dirty thing to ask the government. He stands by his statement that this never happened before to his knowledge and I suggest to him that he is stretching the truth very much.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege—30 years ago, or 1935 was it—

An hon. member: You had just turned fifty.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the only public office I held—and I must say I was in public life—was that of Hamilton municipal boy councillor. You will forgive me if I was more concerned with what was going on in Hamilton at the age of 15 than I was with what was going on here.

Mr. MacDonald: It is no point of privilege, it is irrelevant.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the point we are trying to make is that I feel as an ordinary citizen that the government is using this great profit-making machine to help their friends out in this province. I tried to illustrate in the House last night that a licence was granted to Talisman Inn, Euphrasia township, a ski resort, when a few weeks previously they had been turned down in a vote.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that Talisman is owned by a man named Alec Graydon. He is the principal stockholder in this company from London, and is closely allied, I understand, with Labatts.

Now, I understand that he is also a very good friend of the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): As most people in this province are.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that, but I understand that most people in this province do not invite the hon. Prime Minister to visit them frequently at their skiing lodge, and most people do not serve liquor illegally before the licence is granted.

Now, this is the situation we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, and this government can smugly hide their right to use this great profit-making machine as a fund-raising campaign for the party. We will never know how many millions of dollars have been put into your coffers, your election fund, through this media, and I take great exception to the hon. Minister's trying to pull the veil over this and saying not to his knowledge.

I would like to ask the former Minister, the present Minister of Reform Institutions, if he had any knowledge.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to direct his questions to the Minister who is responsible for that department.

Mr. Sargent: Through the chair then, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions?

I ask if he has any knowledge of this ever happening before—$12,000, any amount of money, being paid to get on the board?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister made it quite clear, and I am sure it is clear to anyone with any intelligence, that it would have been entirely unnecessary for anyone to offer any inducements, because for the first time in history, I opened up the lists completely. Everyone who had become an applicant to get listed on the board, was listed in one fell swoop—and I think the figure was pretty close to 200 in spite of the fact that we knew there were going to be many complications arising from such a completely open policy. There was no need for anyone to attempt to use influence, or use influence to get on to the list, because everybody who wanted to get on got on to the board.

I think that is simple enough even for the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: His question is, did they all pay it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that was not his question, if he wants to ask that, I will answer that one for him.

Mr. Sargent: You make it pretty easy. I know I do not have too much intelligence along these lines, but I would like to tell the House, Mr. Chairman, that widespread across Ontario is the feeling that this is being hushed up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are spreading that kind of a rumour. That is exactly what I was trying to stop by opening it up.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it was because of these rumours spread by this sort of talk that I opened the list to everyone.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, through you, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions—he took a trip to Italy—the Minister of Reform Institutions as the Minister in charge of the—I am out of order, I guess, asking this question—but he took along a friend, it is a pretty long story.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member try to contain himself and restrict his questions to policy matters, please?

Mr. Sargent: Well, we are talking big policy here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: What policy?

Mr. Sargent: Insofar as the right to use a public body to raise financial funds for a party is concerned.

This House has a lot ahead of it, but this, is very important, and I will not go into the full length of this text, but the story of the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think that when we were discussing whether these matters were going to be opened up, I took the position that under the rules of the House, once the estimates were through, that was the end of the discussion that should take place at this time.

An hon. member: That gets you off the hook.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is ample opportunity. The dean of the House knows that there is ample opportunity for the hon. member to say whatever he wishes at another time. Certainly the hon. member for Woodbine, I will say this, knew the rules of the House and knew when to make the statement that he did, and I am suggesting that that is exactly the vehicle through which this member should have made any statement along these lines. I think what the hon. member is doing, if he keeps abusing and stretching what you and I agreed was the ground rule, will prove the end of this kind of discussion during the course of the estimates, not only of this department—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has threatened the House that if we continue to question and embarrass him he will cut off the vote.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I will really have to say that we are going far beyond the agreement we made for this matter to be discussed, in order that the affairs of the liquor control board and the liquor licence board could be discussed. If the hon. member persists in this line of questioning—and this is no threat whatsoever—it is just that we are not following the procedure that we had undertaken to follow. If this is the case—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I will follow the procedure then, but I would like to end by saying this: I want to say very sincerely that the people of Ontario are very leery about your decision not to have an inquiry.

An hon. member: What does the hon. member know about the people of Ontario?

Mr. Sargent: I would like to suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he owes it to the people of Ontario to set up a commission into the whole affair. He talks about $133 million profit each year. The area for this thing to happen is wide open and to protect himself, if he is politically knowledgeable, he would hold an inquiry to clean up the whole mess and to give the people a clean view of the whole thing. But the Prime Minister is hushing it up and saying that we cannot discuss this; and the Minister says that he will close off the debate.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not say any such thing. Let us stick to the rules of the House, that is all—the rules. The dean of the House should know the rules.

An hon. member: He does, too.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, and he knows that I am upholding them.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like, in all fairness, to ask the hon. Prime Minister to reopen this and have a commission look into it and see all those things under the rocks that we do not know about.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I should say that I am not going to discuss the matter that the—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just before you get into this, Mr. Chairman, may I have a moment, please? The hon. member for Grey North has left a very nasty insinuation about a trip that I took to Talisman.

Mr. Sargent: I did not say that the hon. Prime Minister did; I said that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions did.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member said that I visited Talisman!

Mr. Sargent: Oh, yes, I did.

An hon. member: Yes, you did.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, I cannot let this pass. I suppose it is one of the prices of public life that statements like this can be made on the floor of this House with such an obvious insinuation. Of course I know Mr. Graydon; I suppose I know—I hope I know—80 per cent or 90 per cent of the people in London. At least, I won every poll in the last election, so they must know me. It is automatic that I would know people from my own riding.

My visits to Talisman have been two in number; I visited there a year ago and I took my two children there for three or four days' skiing at New Year's, and I visited there this past New Year's, but I did not stay at Talisman inn. I stayed in the home of a friend of mine—another friend who happens to come from London, because I know somebody else in London. He has built a chalet for winter skiing adjacent to Talisman and I stayed in his chalet. I did not stay at Talisman, but I did—if you can draw any insinuation from this—eat one or two meals in the Talisman hotel, in their public dining room. The hon. member could have had this information had he asked me per-

sonally. However, he would prefer to bring it up in this way, hoping that there would be some public insinuation drawn that I somehow was bound up in this licence to which he referred because I took my children there for two weekends to ski.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine had the floor; is he prepared to yield to you?

Mr. Oliver: I have conversed with the hon. member for Woodbine, and graciously—

Mr. Bryden: Technically I have yielded it all along, Mr. Chairman and I am happy to yield it to the hon. member for Grey South.

Mr. Oliver: That situation has been examined and we are in agreement.

The hon. member for Grey North, very properly, I thought, brought up the question of the Talisman ski resort, which happens to be in my riding. We were very proud, of course, to have the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information and other dignitaries visit that riding.

I am not rising at this time to suggest that there should be a ban put upon their re-entry to that area, but what I am suggesting is that there is something of a crazy quilt pattern about the liquor laws of this province. In this township, the township of Euphrasia in which the Talisman ski resort is situated, they had a vote, township-wide, as to whether this Talisman ski resort should have a licence or not. The township voted overwhelmingly against the proposal that a licence be issued to the Talisman club.

What happened was that in spite of the overwhelming majority—a no vote—against a licence to this particular establishment, within a matter of weeks, as the hon. Provincial Secretary said last night, a club licence was issued to the Talisman organization and they have been carrying on ever since.

What in the name of heaven was the use of having a township-wide vote to decide whether a licence was to be issued or not? When the vote said no, then they walked right in within weeks and gave them everything that the township voted against.

Now, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is as crazy as crazy can be. For my part, I think that the Talisman should have a licence—honestly, I do. I think the vote across the township was perhaps wrong, but what I am saying to the hon. Prime Minister—and I think he will agree with this—is what more right has the Talisman to have a club licence than the ones in the riding of my friend, the hon. member for Grey North? And in other parts of this province? What more right has the Talisman to have a licence than absolutely good hotels in my riding to have a licence? What right, I say? Absolutely none.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: I say seriously to the hon. Prime Minister, and I think he agrees with it to a degree at least, that we have got to the place in our liquor legislation in this province where we might as well do away with local option entirely and base the giving of licences to proper establishments upon the needs that exist in that locality and upon an assessment by the proper authorities as to whether that need actually exists or not. Until we do that, I think we are as crazy as can be, and this situation points that up.

The people said no; the liquor board said yes. Now, if it can be done in that area, it can be done anywhere throughout the province, and if it can be done in that area in spite of a no vote, what is the use of having the vote all?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I know that the hon. Provincial Secretary will speak to us in more detail, because he has more knowledge of it than I. But we, as a matter of government policy some years ago, brought in revisions to The Liquor Control Act which permitted the licensing of clubs in what are commonly known as dry areas. Let me point out, as we debated in those days, when the policy was changed and this policy was brought in, there is quite a difference between a club licence where a person has to be a member of a club, and one in a public premises such as a public house on the corner. For all I know, the people in that township do not really want a pub in one of the villages of the area, but they may have no objection to a club licence. This is true in regard to curling clubs and in regard to golf clubs. That is why the policy was changed. We left the basic right of local option for local people to decide whether or not they wanted public outlets, but we did make it possible for private clubs where people were members to have club privileges, which involves the serving of liquor.

These privileges are restricted, of course, but I am only repeating what I said in the House at that time; we had a situation in

the province where we had various citizens who were being forced by the law to break the law if they had a glass of beer or a drink after a golf game, or before a dance in one of the golf and country clubs or curling clubs across the province. So we faced this problem and changed the policy of the government. I do not see that because a club licence is granted in a dry area you should immediately say that the people of that area have not the right to decide whether or not they want licensed hotels. There is a great difference, and I draw the distinction between a club licence and a public licence.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? If what he says is accurate—and there is some substance to it, of course—why would the township of Euphrasia be asked to vote as to whether these people should have a licence or not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They were not asked to vote as to whether Talisman should have a licence. They were asked to vote, as I understand the procedure of the liquor licence board—I do not know who organized it—but they would vote on whether they wanted a public house, whether they wanted a dining lounge, whether they wanted a lounge licence. This is the vote that would go to the people of that township as it goes to any municipality.

Mr. Oliver: And they said they did not want any of these.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They said they did not want any of these things, and they have not got any; there are no public houses in the township of Euphrasia.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, let us call a spade a spade. Let us admit that where it is impossible to get, under the normal procedure, the regular type of licensing, many organizations turn themselves into so-called private clubs. There is a difference between most private clubs and Talisman. Talisman is in the business of making a profit; most private clubs are organized for the benefit of their members, where they want to play golf, swim, or go curling or do what they want; there is no intention at all of making a profit. I do not think the Albany club is interested in paying dividends to its members, and I am sure that the Talisman club is interested in making money.

This is the object. The government is allowing that this so-called club label with registers, membership cards and so on, is a device to circumvent the liquor laws of the province of Ontario. That is the point the hon. member for Grey South makes and it is a very valid point. There is no parallel at all between the profit-making organization and what went on in Euphrasia township. The hon. member for Grey South tells me that no one else in Euphrasia township was interested in having a liquor licence, other than Talisman. Talisman is one of the biggest, if not the biggest and best ski resort in the province of Ontario and they would improve their profit-making approach if they had a liquor licence. There is nothing wrong with that; what is wrong is the phonyness with which this government approaches this whole project.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not agree.

Mr. Singer: First, they ordered a vote through their arm, the liquor control board, and when that did not work, somebody must have whispered in somebody's ear "Why do you not become a private club and we will give it to you under another little approach that is hidden?"

Mr. Chairman, let us bring some sense and some honesty into our liquor laws and let our laws say what they mean. If the government is going to ignore local option, then let them take local option off the books. If they are going to enforce it, let them not then circumvent it in the way they did in this situation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, a glaring part of this whole matter is that the hon. Prime Minister very suavely and smoothly glosses this whole thing over, he stickhandles his way out of it by saying that there are ways out for a club licence. Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Prime Minister, there are many, many clubs better than Talisman, millions of dollars invested in that area, in my riding, that cannot get a licence. They want the same rights as Talisman, but you will not give it to them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Have they applied?

Mr. Sargent: They have applied. They have applications in but they cannot get any action at all. All we want is equity. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister, in support of the hon. member for Grey South, why do you not be fair? The great

peninsula up there, the great holiday area that it is, the Bruce peninsula—millions of Americans go through there and we cannot give them the things they are used to. Why do you not be a man and say this thing is phony; why do you not be honest and say this thing is all wrong, and give our people the things they should have, and be honest about it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member appeared before the committee. I do not even know whether the liquor licence board has been there but I wonder if the hon. member appeared before that board. It seems pretty impossible to come in here and ask me, or ask the hon. Provincial Secretary—

Mr. Sargent: You set the policy, sir.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —specifically, what has happened to one or two, three or four applications that appear before the liquor licence board.

Mr. MacDonald: We have done it every year for years.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The chairman of that board was before the committee. I wonder if the hon. member appeared and asked about these areas about which he is now asking us?

Mr. Sargent: We will bring you a thousand members down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: When we appear before the committee on commissions, the chairman inevitably says, as my good friend from Parry Sound said yesterday: Policy comes from the government. What we are talking about are not regulations, we are talking about policy. And policy is decided by the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues. You can talk as long as you want to the chairmen of these boards about policy, and they will say, "We cannot do anything about policy." There is no point in going after the hon. member for Grey North and saying, "Did you appear before the committee on commissions?"

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Because you know he did not.

Mr. Singer: Because the policy is made by you and if it is bad, it is your fault.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We are not talking about policy. He raises the question of certain individual establishments in his riding. The place to ask the questions about the individual establishments in his riding, I submit, is before the committee on government commissions, where the chairman of this board would appear. I merely ask my friend if he did appear before that committee and ask about these individual establishments in his riding.

Mr. Oliver: Surely, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister is not serious in what he says to the House now. He says to the hon. member for Grey North, "If some of your people are being discriminated against, why did they not come down to the committee and make their application?" You are just saying exactly that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. I am talking about him, the member, not these people whoever—

Mr. Oliver: You are saying that if some organization, some establishment in the riding of Grey North thinks they are being discriminated against, then either they or he, the member for Grey North, should appear before this committee and say, "We have been harmed." That is exactly what you said. I say to you, Mr. Premier, that the time has come in this province for you to write the liquor laws of this province so clearly and so plainly that "he who runs may read" and that nobody need be in any doubt; everybody will be able to understand the provisions of the law.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: It is a silly thing for you to say, "Come down and see if we can help you." It should be written plainly so that everyone will know what the law means.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I could not possibly leave this. Mr. Chairman, I realize I am dealing with a man of many years' experience in debate and I have watched the twist he has made in this and I think it is very neat but I cannot allow it to pass unchallenged.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: My point was very simply this: That the hon. member for Grey North, instead of coming in here and asking me or the Provincial Secretary what happened to a certain establishment in his riding—instead of coming into this House and asking across the floor—I would say, if he wants an answer to that question, he has an opportunity to go before the committee

of this Legislature on government commissions and ask the chairman himself, the man charged with this. I simply asked him whether he did in fact do this, and I have yet to get an answer to this question.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I think I should remind the members of the House of the decision made last night when we were discussing this item. As a matter of fact I have a copy right here in front of me where I said: "This is not the chair's ruling." I would have ruled against it because there is nothing about the LCBO in these votes. But the Minister decided that he would answer any questions on policy and this is his prerogative. However, you cannot expect the Minister to deal with detailed applications. I would ask members to stay with policy matters.

Mr. MacDonald: I have another matter on policy. I am glad to accept the challenge of the Prime Minister of presenting to the committee detailed instances, in order to get the answer of the LLBO.

Let me relate to him a detailed instance which I took to the committee; and what happened. Last year I raised the case of a man in the Lakehead, in Port Arthur, who had sought a licence—

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): And you were proved wrong.

Mr. MacDonald: Not at all; this is the whole point. Mr. Chairman, the interjection of my friend is rather interesting, let it sit on the record. Now, let us listen to the rest of the story. The man involved said that between December 15, the time that he had been assured that he would get a licence—and he had been assured by the local member, who happens to be a member of the Cabinet—and January 10 when he got a letter from the board saying he was not going to get the licence, he was visited by a representative of the local Conservative association executive, saying that he would need to contribute $1,000. He made this statement publicly. Indeed, when I raised the matter in the committee, only at that stage did the chairman of the liquor licensing board say that the reason why they had not given him the licence was because this man allegedly had been engaged in bootlegging.

The man involved immediately said, "I challenge the board to have another hearing. If they will tell me who squealed with regard to my alleged bootlegging, I will tell them who approached me and asked for $1,000 on behalf of the Conservative association if I wanted to get a licence."

So I said to the chairman of the liquor licensing board, "In face of that kind of rather serious accusation, why did you not have any hearing?" And I reminded him that a year or so ago out in the area of Halton some such accusation had been made and quickly there had been another hearing to allay the rumours that there had been this kind of influence used.

But no hearing was held. Indeed, the other interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, was this—one of the newspaper men went to Judge Robb and asked him why a hearing was not held and Judge Robb said that affidavits had been secured from all members of the executive of the Progressive-Conservative association, but that nobody had approached this man. And the newspaper man said to him, "Who secured the affidavits?" and at that point Judge Robb became silent and said he had no more comment.

Now, I ask the Minister, who secured the affidavits from members of the Progressive-Conservative association that there had been no approaches made to this man with regard to the allegation that he had been asked for $1,000?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Does the hon. member mean me?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Mr. Chairman, he happens to be the Minister who is in charge of this. I ask, who secured the affidavits? On behalf of whom did they secure these affidavits from the members of the Progressive-Conservative association in Port Arthur—swearing that not one of them had approached this man and solicited $1,000 to get the licence?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am unaware of the specific individuals involved but I believe it was local people up at the head of the lakes.

Mr. MacDonald: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the place to leave it. If there has been a flat assertion—and I am not defending this man at all—I know nothing about it except that I raised the case last year, as members of the Opposition year in and year out are raising cases of people who think they are discriminated against when they approach the liquor licensing board. He said—not I—that he has been approached for $1,000 by somebody in the Progressive-Conservative association. He made the accusation. Indeed, he challenged the liquor licensing board to say from where

they got the evidence that he had been bootlegging.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, if the liquor licensing board has nothing to hide, in defence of its own integrity, there should have been another public hearing in that instance as there was in the instance of Halton, just so that it can be resolved. If you have nothing to hide, do not attempt to hide it. It may be an Irishism, but it is appropriate. If you have nothing to hide in the Melchers deal or in this, do not attempt to hide it. Have an investigation.

I submit to the hon. Minister that he cannot now get up and evade the issue by saying the approach was made up there to get the members of the local Progressive-Conservative association to provide affidavits. That is not good enough. Indeed, it is rather astounding that the chairman of the liquor licensing board should have revealed publicly that he did not proceed with the matter any further because he did not think there was any necessity of proceeding any further. And why? Because somebody—who? —and I ask again—the public is interested to know. Somebody went around and solicited from every member in the Progressive-Conservative association in the riding of Port Arthur affidavits that they had not approached him.

I submit the hon. Minister cannot sit in his seat and just evade this whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Back to this incident, Mr. Chairman—and I recall it in the newspapers—did the hon. member raise this with the judge? As I understand it, he—

Mr. MacDonald: I raised it with the judge last year and I raised it with the judge again this year.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He made an investigation himself which he, of course—

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Prime Minister is referring to the wrong investigation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, this is as I understood it. I cannot recall the details at the moment, but I believe it was at that time that he raised the point of the second hearing that the board should hold.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Prime Minister, I submit, should not perhaps intervene in this because he says he does not know the details, and I say he does not know the details. I raised it because the Prime Minister challenged members of the Opposition, if they have specific cases, to take them to the place where they can get the details. I did it last year; I got nowhere. I came back this year and I said to the chairman when he came before the standing committee on government commissions, "When you were challenged by the man to whom you denied a licence with the fact that he had been approached and asked for $1,000 and particularly after you had smeared his reputation by saying that he did not get the licence because he was guilty of bootlegging, why did you not hold another hearing?" I got no satisfactory answer because if there is one suave individual in dealing with questions, it is Judge Robb. I give him full credit, he is in a class by himself.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Also honest.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not questioning his honesty.

An hon. member: Oh, yes!

Mr. MacDonald: But it was some newspaperman who went to Judge Robb and it was Judge Robb who gave the explanation—presumably that the reason why they did not proceed further was that unknown people got affidavits from the Progressive-Conservative association that they had not done it. Now, this is a neat little family affair: to keep it contained. I repeat, if you have nothing to hide, do not attempt to hide it. And if you are hiding it, do not get up and polish your little halo and say that all is fine in the Tory family, because it is not.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, this takes the discussion back to the point I tried to make last night when I asked the hon. Minister why he did not introduce a system into the granting of licences where there would be certain prerequisites as, for instance, in the application for building permits in the city of Toronto or any other municipality. The requirements are precisely and concisely set out and any citizen complying with those requirements must be issued a permit. If he is not issued a permit, he has the right to go to a court of law and compel the municipality to issue a permit. Here you do not even have any clear rules. You want to have control of it so you can manoeuvre it whichever way you please and then you object to insinuations being cast here.

There is not even any recourse to a court of appeal or any court at all and you wonder why we get up here and accuse you of not

granting licences without any prejudice whatsoever to the applicant or to his political affiliation. All you have to do is set out the requirements clearly, unambiguously and unequivocally and you will not have people casting aspersions on you. At the present time you are inviting them, because frankly you will not clear up the situation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, let me say one last word. Silence is golden on some occasions but silence is very eloquent when all spokesmen for a government sit in their seats and will not pursue this any further. Because in facing the challenge of the hon. Prime Minister, I have brought the details to him and I submit he simply cannot let the matter rest there. That board must go further and get to the bottom of this.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I explained that I have not the details of it. The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. Sargent: I would just like to finalize what I have to say in this regard. The hon. Prime Minister said that I should go before the committee to get my decisions on these matters. Now, I do not think I should have to. My motivation here today has been that this whole business is a great area for corruption. Going back, a former Prime Minister of this province said that there was a profit of $3 million made from distilleries to get their wares on the board. This is a matter of record of a former Prime Minister. Things must have changed, Mr. Chairman. Distilleries cannot be paying to get on the board because we have the statement of two hon. Ministers here that they know nothing about these things happening.

But it did happen, $3 million was being paid by distilleries for this service. This is a great area for funds, which is not being used. I would like to say that the files in the press gallery are the largest there, I think, on this whole matter of the LCBO, the Grossman case, the Melchers case. Surely the hon. Prime Minister has enough regard for the people of this province that he will, as the hon. leader of the NDP said, call for an investigation and let the people know the truth, that he has nothing to hide. He owes it to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Provincial Secretary a question. It seemed to me that he indicated it was the local people who got these affidavits from the Progressive-Conservative association at Port Arthur. Just as a matter of interest, could someone explain to us how one goes about getting affidavits from all of the members of the Port Arthur Conservative association? I think it would be a matter of great academic interest.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I made no such statement.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member for Woodbine has been very patient, he has yielded the floor.

Mr. Bryden: I have been not only patient but fascinated, Mr. Chairman.

During the course of the discussion that has taken place for the last hour or so, the hon. member for Grey North made reference to a certain matter in which I have expressed some interest in the past in this House. I want to state, Mr. Chairman, that I am not going to discuss that matter at this time, but in view of my previous association with it, I think it is rather important that I should explain why I am not going to discuss it.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Considered as read.

Mr. Bryden: I am not going to be sucked into the hon. Prime Minister's diversionary effort. Some time ago he made a statement before the orders of the day which purported to answer certain questions I raised. This statement has been referred to a number of times during the present discussion. His statement, of course, did not answer the questions I raised. It answered certain other questions which he apparently decided he was able to answer. He did not answer the questions I raised.

The questions I raised related to the fund-raising activities of the Progressive-Conservative Party of Ontario. I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I have not lost interest in the matter that I had discussed on a previous occasion, but clearly the fund-raising activities of the Progressive-Conservative Party of Ontario, although a matter of extreme public importance, do not relate to the vote, if I may call it that, that is now before us. That is the only reason I am not following up on the remarks that my friend from Grey North made a little while ago, and I want to make it clear that that is the only reason. I will be following up on the matter at appropriate times and places in the future.

At six o'clock last night, Mr. Chairman, I was in the course of discussing another matter, not quite so exciting and romantic

as the one that has just been under discussion, but nevertheless one that, in my opinion, is of great importance.

I was talking about employer-employee relations within the establishment of the LCBO and the LLBO. I stated before six o'clock arrived that the government is harbouring a company union within these two organizations. It is indeed harbouring company unions in a number of other organizations as well, but these two are the only ones that are before us at the present time.

The so-called LCBO and LLBO employees association would not stand up for five seconds under the terms of The Labour Relations Act of this province. The government of Ontario has in force legislation that imposes certain standards — appropriate standards, in my opinion—on the activities of private employers. Yet it refuses to accept its own laws with regard to its own operations. The Labour Relations Act, of course, does not apply to the government of Ontario or any of its agencies, we have later discovered. Whether or not the Act technically applies is not the point I am interested in. I think the principle should apply and I do not think the government should be harbouring company unions.

This organization is run by and for the benefit of store managers, who are people actually acting on behalf of top management. It is a management outfit, ostensibly for the protection of the employees, to whom it offers no protection of any significance at all. The evidence of this is plain, Mr. Chairman; it has been suffering a serious loss of membership because it does not do a job for the employees. They are not interested in it, so what happens? All the store managers are whipped into action to drive the employees into the association, to use—I will not use the word force, because it is more subtle than that—their positions, as the representatives of authority and of discipline within the organization, to, shall we say in quotation marks, "persuade" the employees to join the organization again, this phony company union, and to sign check-off authorizations for it. I think—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member permit a question? In the event that there was a union of the kind that the hon. member is referring to, are you suggesting that store managers should be excluded from such a union?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am going to discuss the problem; I may cover some phases of what the hon. Minister was talking about, but I would suggest that this matter is one that could very properly go before the labour relations board of Ontario for determination as to what is the appropriate bargaining organization for this group of employees. You see, this group, in common with a substantial number of public servants of the province, people in other agencies, are really left in limbo. They have no basis on which they can legitimately form their own organization for their own protection. They are not civil servants in the technical sense of the word. They do not come within the terms of The Public Service Act insofar as those terms relate to the civil service. They do not come under the jurisdiction of the civil service commission. This is the exclusion on one hand.

Of course, the effect of this is that they do not get the benefits of civil servants, benefits which the civil servants have been able to acquire, after much struggle, through their organization, the civil service association. That association is not permitted to represent them. They cannot use the grievance procedure that operates within the civil service. They are excluded from many benefits which civil servants, in the strict sense of the term, have managed to acquire for themselves after many years of struggle. These people cannot get them.

The exclusion from the civil service has the effect that they cannot get any advantages that civil servants do not have. This is always brought down on their heads. If they are looking for some improvement in their conditions which civil servants do not enjoy, it is always said that they cannot get better conditions than civil servants. But when they try to get some of the privileges the civil servants have, they cannot get those, either. In other words, the civil service commission in this instance is used simply as an instrument of oppression to keep the employees down, to prevent them from getting reasonable terms or even bargaining for reasonable terms.

These people have no opportunity to bargain at all. There are phony procedures within the organization. You could find duplicates for them in hundreds of cases in the history of company unionism—an employee representation council sort of setup, a grievance procedure that never operates, a representation dominated by store managers. If an employee has a grievance, it is in most instances a grievance against the store manager. He finds when he appears that the store managers are not there as the management

representatives, they are there as his representatives. This is what is palmed off as employee representation.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a problem that is peculiar to the LCBO and the LLBO. It is a problem that was battled out in the water resources commission. My understanding is that the situation is now fairly well in hand there. The civil service association has finally been recognized as representing the people in the water resources commission and they are building a constructive relationship there. But there was the same situation in the water resources commission, though it is gradually being rectified. The same sort of situation arose in the Niagara parks commission only a few months ago. The chairman of that commission, a former Minister of Labour of this province no less, said he was not going to bargain with representatives of the employees of the parks commission. I understand that he is gradually being brought to heel and that situation is being straightened out.

We still have a very serious situation in terms of employee relationships in the workmen's compensation board, Ontario. This is not the time to discuss it—I presume there will be an appropriate occasion to discuss it before the House winds up its work for the year, and I will certainly plan to discuss it then.

We have in principle exactly the same company-union setup in the WCB as we have in the LCBO and the LLBO.

I will now speak specifically of the LCBO and LLBO employees, though what I say is equally applicable to the workmen's compensation board. On the one hand these people are not merely excluded from the provisions relating to civil servants—they are not under the civil service commission—but on the other hand they cannot get the rights that employees of a private employer enjoy. They cannot get effective representation through the civil service association, which is the recognized bargaining agency of government employees, they cannot get that, and on the other hand they cannot go to a trade union in the regular trade union movement. And why? Because of a neat little Act, a very short little Act, that the government slipped through a number of years ago. I can say in my own defence that I was not in the House when they slipped it through, so I do not have to take any responsibility. But I am sure that even if I had been in the House I would not have seen what the government was up to.

The Act I am referring to is The Crown Agency Act. It was put through this House, I think, in the session of 1958 or 1959. At the time it was introduced, the then Attorney General, who is now the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, gave the customary explanation on first reading. He stated that the purpose of this Act was to enable various agencies such as the LCBO, the workmen's compensation board, the water resources commission, the Niagara parks commission and so on, to get exemptions from federal sales tax on the same basis as the government itself could get the exemptions. In other words, they decided that if they passed this Act they could have these Crown agencies, so-called, treated in the same category as the government itself and thus exempt from federal taxation.

This was the sole explanation given by the Attorney General of the day. At the time, Mr. Harry Nixon, who was then the member for Brant, asked a few questions along that same line which were answered and that was the end of it; the bill went through all stages without opposition.

I discovered a year or so ago in the public accounts committee that, in fact, these Crown agencies have not got the exemption from federal taxation that the government hoped they would secure as a result of The Crown Agency Act. The Act has been a dead letter as far as its stated purpose is concerned. But it was hardly on the statute books than it was used as a device to prevent the employees of Crown agencies to organize in trade unions. I think the specific case related to the workmen's compensation board, Ontario. An application was made to the labour relations board and immediately the Attorney General's department was down there to argue. And the labour relations board, I take it, had no alternative but to accept the arguments because they were interpreting the law and I have no doubt this was a correct interpretation of the law. But the argument put forward by the Attorney General's department and accepted by the labour relations board was that because of The Crown Agency Act, The Labour Relations Act of Ontario did not apply to these people. They, therefore, could not claim any benefits under that Act, they could not organize in trade unions, they could not use the machinery of the Act to build up an effective bargaining relationship with their employers.

So this is what The Crown Agency Act was used for. And this is what it is being used for right now. We have groups of

employees, substantial groups of employees, two of which are employed by the LCBO and the LLBO, who are denied the most elementary rights that under the law of this province inhere in all other citizens. They are excluded on both sides. On the one side they cannot use the machinery of the civil service commission; it is useless for the civil service association to bargain for them. On the other hand, they cannot use the machinery available to employees in private industry and they cannot effectively form trade unions for their own protection. Here they sit at the mercy of a phony organization, a management-sponsored organization, which uses the secondary level of supervision as the agency through which it inflicts its will on these people. They cannot get reasonable satisfaction in the disposition of their grievances; they cannot get any satisfaction at all. They cannot bargain in any effective way about their wages or any of the terms and conditions of employment. They are in a state of peonage, completely dependent on what the management in its arbitrary judgment may decide is good for them.

I find it a most incredible state of affairs, Mr. Chairman, that in this day and age any government in a free, democratic society would not only permit such a situation to continue but would flatly refuse to take the action that is necessary to correct it. I do not care which way they solve the problem, they can do it either way. They can do it the way the water resources commission finally did it, and that was to accept the civil service association as the bargaining agency for these people. At least, give them a chance to show whether or not they would prefer the civil service association to the phony company union they have. Set up some sort of machinery whereby their preferences could be determined. Do it that way, let the civil service association take care of their problems in the same way as it handles the problems of civil servants strictly so-called. Alternatively, repeal this ridiculous Crown Agency Act. It is not ridiculous, actually, it is an oppressive Crown Agency Act. Let the employees organize through the regular trade union movement.

This, I may say, is a principle that should apply both to the LCBO-LLBO setup and to the workmen's compensation board. However, Mr. Chairman, I will not pursue the matter at this time with regard to The Workmen's Compensation Act. I merely want to bring it before the government in its implications for the liquor licence board and the liquor control board of Ontario.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I have two matters of government policy that I would like to raise with the hon. Minister.

I raised them during the hearing of the standing committee on government commissions when the liquor licence board appeared before that committee. In the instance of discrimination, I raised it also during the estimates of the hon. Minister of Labour and also when the Ontario human rights commission was before the standing committee on government commissions.

In both instances, I did not receive any satisfactory statement as to what the policy of the government was or, indeed, whether they would consider changing the policy of the liquor licence board.

The first matter deals with the penchant which the board has for suspending licences for a period of time rather than imposing fines on the licensee. The result of a suspension is that not only does the licensee suffer the pecuniary penalty of not being able to do business for a week or two weeks or three weeks, but all his employees in the establishment suffer a penalty which cannot be recouped to them. I am speaking now of the waiters and the barmen who are employees in licensed establishments. They do not receive any adequate remuneration. The range of their income is in the neighbourhood of $60 to $70 a week. To have a loss of this amount for two or three weeks when a licence is suspended, is a serious fine and penalty imposed on them, when the board could, by imposing a substantial fine or penalty on the licensee—rather than suspending the licence—enable these men to continue their employment and receive their weekly earnings.

I am not so naive, Mr. Chairman, as to think that there are not, in some establishments, collusive practices between the licensee and his employees, or various methods by which the offence for which the suspension is levied, is in part, in some instances, attributable to the action of the employees taken in concert with the licensee. But I would ask the hon. Minister to consider seriously taking up with the chairman of the liquor licence board, the proposition that a pecuniary penalty and a substantial penalty for infractions of the liquor laws, would become a penalty upon the owner and licensee of the establishment and would not necessarily mean that his employees in that establishment would also suffer a penalty when they may, or may not—and in most instances

it is likely that they would not—be contributing to the offence which led to the suspension.

The second matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would like the hon. Minister to comment on—and to state whether or not the government will take it as a matter of policy for the liquor licence board—is the question of discrimination in eating and drinking establishments. I refer in this instance, to the report which was prepared at the instance of the Ontario human rights commission by Dr. Helling, on the position of negroes, Chinese and Italians in the social structure of Windsor, Ontario, and specifically to a recommendation which he made in that report. This is the matter I raised when the Ontario human rights commission was before the standing committee. I raised it during the estimates of The Department of Labour and I raised it before the liquor licence board, and the recommendation that Dr. Helling made is—and he makes this flat statement:

> —food services and drinking places, especially, seem to practice discrimination—

and he goes on to recommend that:

> —the power of the provincial government in the granting or withholding of licences, especially in dispensing of alcoholic beverages, should be used for the enforcement of human rights legislation. Individuals or groups who avail themselves of privileges granted by the province should use the privileges in a non-discriminatory manner. The Ontario liquor control commission should emphasize to their licensees that the observance of human rights legislation is an integral part of general observance of law and order.

My question on other occasions, and my question to the hon. Minister now, is will the liquor licence board, either as a condition printed on the licence or on each occasion when the annual licence is renewed for each establishment, send with that an accompanying letter pointing out that if there is any evidence of discrimination in the establishment to which the licence has been granted that it will mean an automatic suspension or cancellation of the permit, so that we can use the privilege by the grant of a licence to these establishments as a method of making certain that the kind of unique discrimination which we all know, but find so difficult to pin down and which occurs in the province of Ontario can in some way be reduced and, as would be our hope, eventually eliminated?

It would seem to me that by the use of this method it would be possible to correct the attitude of a large number of licensees and would lead to a general change in attitude on the part of certain licensees in the way in which they conduct their establishments, and to make certain that the kind of interest to which we pay lip service in human rights would be a part and parcel of this important privilege which only the government can dispense.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I came late to that particular meeting of government commissions from Cabinet, so that I was not present during all of the discussion. About the comments of the hon. member in the latter part respecting the Helling report: I do not know what the chairman's reply in respect of this was, but my own position would be, and I interpret government policy to be, that any instance of discrimination in respect of an establishment which came under the provisions of any statute over which this government has control would be very severely dealt with.

I cannot take a strong enough position in this regard. I have asked for a copy of the Helling report and I do not know whether he referred to any specific instance.

Interestingly enough, I have never heard of any specific licensed premises that had been brought before the human rights commission in recent times. It is pretty hard to recall everything. I take a particular interest in this, but you can take it from me that any such behaviour on the part of any licensed establishment would be severely dealt with.

It is interesting to note that when you examine those who are licensees in the annual report of the liquor control board of Ontario, the licensees cover the very broad range of backgrounds that we have been discussing here during the course of the past two days. I guess there are as great a variety of licensees in this province as exists in any other jurisdiction, in fact, probably to a greater extent.

As I say, the government is on record with respect to rights legislation that is offended against or contravened by somebody who receives privileges under other legislation: it would, I think, make a very severe situation.

In respect of the suspension powers and the cancellation powers of the liquor licence board, I have been aware of what can happen. I went to great lengths in the course of a general explanation when the hon. leader

of the Opposition brought up some point yesterday that even in respect of the proprietor, the board tries to make a suspension that hurts without being hurtful. A cancellation is a matter to which a very serious penalty—

Mr. MacDonald: That hurts the innocent employees—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Take when there is a legal strike of a premises. Innocent people are very often caught up in it. It is one of the problems that we face when an instance takes place, when a father's driver's licence is taken away, his children suffer by reason of the fact that he might lose his employment. They are broad ramifications.

Under the Act as it presently stands, and we reviewed it very carefully, the board has no power to impose a money penalty. I do not know of any board, and we have a number of them, that has that power. I do not know whether we amended the liquor control board to give them that alternative power or not, because they can take the products off the shelf, which also can be a very severe penalty because when the products are taken off the shelf then, of course, the production of the company goes down and the employees, in very large number, might suffer.

To give a board a power of imposing money penalties opens up a whole new range of what the powers of administrative boards should have, because they are basically licensing boards. The liquor licence board is a licensing board. In reference to liquor licences, you grant them, refuse them, suspend them or cancel them, all within the jurisdiction of the board.

I realize the fact that whenever a premises is suspended—and a cancellation is even worse—that people are very often thrown out of employment completely, or for an extensive period of time. But this, as I say, enters into the broader picture of administrative boards generally.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not need to dwell very long on it.

On the question of the discrimination provisions, I agree with the hon. Minister that the licensees cover a broad grouping of people from various walks of life, various races and creeds and colours in the province. That was not my point, nor was my point the fact that where there has been a proven breach of the human rights code and a discrimination has, in fact, been found, the province would not have to take that into consideration in dealing with the licensee. My point is that in that area of discrimination, we all know that it is difficult, if not almost impossible, to prove conclusively discrimination.

What I am asking is simply that the liquor licence board, when it grants its licences and when it issues its renewals, would bring forceably to the attention of each licensee in the province, by an effective statement, the provision of the human rights code—to the policy of the government to eliminate discrimination on race, creed and colour and to point out to the licensee the grave danger and jeopardy in which his licence will be placed if there is evidence of discrimination in his establishment.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I know that the liquor licence board, as a matter of record, sends out a copy of The Liquor Licence Act and regulations to every licensee, that he be familiar with what is done, and it may be that the hon. Minister of Labour might see fit to have his commission provide the board with a sufficient number of copies of the relevant documents. They can be sent out at the same time, which would be a very routine way of accomplishing what the hon. member is suggesting.

Perhaps that may be an effective method. In fact, my own experience is that in a great many of our licensed establishments—I have been on the premises and seen in and about the premises the proclamations that are provided by the human rights commission. Now I know that this is not across the board.

Mr. MacDonald: But, Mr. Chairman, proclamations can hang on the wall and their spirit can be violated.

I just rise to cite one instance that will always stick in my mind. It documents the general thesis that my hon. friend from Riverdale has been advancing.

Some years ago I happened to be attending a CCF national convention in Regina and it was being held in the main hotel in Regina—I have forgotten the name of it at the moment.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): The Saskatchewan!

Mr. MacDonald: The Saskatchewan hotel. I think you are right there. There happened to be in attendance at the same time a group of co-operators from the United States who were up visiting the co-op movement in Saskatchewan and they dropped in at our convention. While they were in the hotel, they

attempted to go into one of the taverns to have a drink, like anybody else and were turned back, because some of them were negroes. Now, the word went around the convention like wildfire. One of the people attending happened to be the Treasurer of the province, under whose jurisdiction comes the granting of licences.

He approached the authorities, and I do not think with any threats; he just reminded them of what the law was, because at that time a bill of rights, enshrining this principle was part of the law of the province of Ontario, and I can assure you the discrimination ended very quickly.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacDonald: Did I say Ontario? I will correct it for *Hansard,* for the benefit of posterity.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, may I just touch on some of the circumstances in my riding? I suppose every riding has its own individual set of circumstances that govern this problem.

The liquor licensing of establishments, both dining rooms and hotels, Mr. Chairman, has been a problem for many, many years, I know to me as a member, and I suppose many hon. members have had the same problem. New establishments go up, within a very short period of time and before the rest of the building is finished, the bar, or the outlet where they can sell beer and whisky is in business. They have their licence even before they have completed the construction.

There have been many who applied for many years, and because of reasons only known to the liquor licensing board, they did not get their licences. They have come to me on occasion and have asked me for letters of recommendation. If I saw fit, I would naturally give them a letter saying that they ran a good establishment, and it was a credit to the city, and they ought to have a licence, in my opinion.

On occasion they would come to me and want to know why they did not get their licences, because they have an establishment, and have met most of the requirements, they believe, that the liquor licensing board asked for. From year to year they would be refused, they would have their hearings and they would get a letter to the effect that "We have heard"—whatever the routine is; most of you know better than I do. I do not indulge too much in that particular product, but I can look at my citizens in that riding, or the people that I represent, and I find that there is an injustice from time to time, when an individual, a small businessman, has to apply annually for his licence and finds himself in the position where his lawyer, in many cases, could not get the licence for him, for many and varied reasons.

My reason for bringing this to the attention of the House is that it would appear to me that there is something lacking in the way these licences are issued. I would think that if an establishment did not meet the requirements, as far as the amount of floor space is concerned, or an entrance in the wrong place, that they could be told immediately in their first application, that "This is what is wrong; you ought to adjust this, and we will be glad to look at your application as soon as that is done." In some cases, as we get a report on the new licences that are issued to establishments, they tell them, "When you do certain things and meet these requirements, we will issue a licence to you."

The thing that impressed me often was, the bigger establishments, the newer establishments, were companies owned by influential men who maybe know the right people in the right places. This is the only thing I can attribute it to. They seem to get their licences as soon as the doors are opened, while the small businessman doing a good job, needing that extra money to meet his mortgage, to meet his obligations, finds himself annually reapplying and being refused.

I would think that they could simplify that. If it were my business, I imagine, again, only looking at it from the outside, I could sit with these people, discuss their problem with them, tell them that their chances of getting their licences are good or they are refused and they will never get them. But they keep them, let us say for want of a better expression, dangling, from year to year, and not getting the necessary permit to assist them financially to carry on.

I tell this to you after hearing the hon. Prime Minister say, "Why did you not appear before the commission, or the committee on commissions, to discuss this problem?" as the hon. member for Grey South was asked to do. I do not think a member of the Legislature should have to appear before any board to represent his constituents, to try to persuade them to give them a licence.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This is to find out what the circumstances are, that is all, Mr. Chair-

man. I have investigated, I do not know how many, things that have been brought to me, individual cases, and I find in most instances, whether it be the workmen's compensation board, the liquor licence board, or whatever it is, that there is always a mass of detail that you do not ordinarily get. I am sure the hon. member could get this too, if he were to ask these boards.

Mr. Bukator: That answers one of the questions, except that I know the Badminton club in the city of Niagara Falls tried for many years to get a licence. Finally they came to me and said, "Would you assist us at an appointed time to go and speak to the proper authority?" I only outlined to them what I knew of the club, and it was not too long after that they received their permit.

I feel that a politician is often accused of playing favourites when he goes to a commission with the people of his riding, to get someone a licence. They usually say the politician takes something under the table. We have all been accused of it in this particular business. It is not a new one for me, I have been at it for 20 years, municipally and provincially, but I would think—and I am sure he is a fine gentleman and as honest a man as I have ever met—that Judge Robb would be glad to have the representative of any riding come in with his constituents and talk over the problem. But I think that applicants need not go the second mile, if they were immediately told what was wrong with their application.

I have never been approached by the liquor licence board in connection with any licences that have been issued. They have never called me, or written me a letter saying certain people were applying and asking what I thought of them. And yet it has happened with some hon. members. Maybe their name was put on as recommendation.

I want to try to impress the people in authority who have the say about liquor laws that there must be an easier way. People should not have to wait three, four and five years while others get them immediately. This is the only point I am trying to make, Mr. Minister. You might have had the same problems in your riding, I do not know, but I would think if they get it in the third year or fifth year they could just as well have got it in the first year and made their financial problem that much easier and put themselves in a position where they could hire more people, they could build a better establishment and they could establish themselves in a much better way to do business in that community.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps we are drawing to a close in these discussions. There is a basic principle which is involved in relationship to licensing. We do have a system of control in the province. There is not a liquor store in every community that would like to have one. The number of communities across this province that would like to have a liquor control board store far exceeds the number there are. And the liquor control board must, in its wisdom, pick and choose, which it does. It is given discretion. So it is with all licensing bodies. So it is with the liquor licence board of Ontario. The board is following a system of control. It cannot possibly—and I do not know whether the member for Niagara Falls or the member for Bracondale is recommending this, that everybody who wants to have a licence should get one. If you have had any contact with those in the catering business—I know of no restaurant that would refuse or would not wish to have a licence, so a very heavy burden falls upon the liquor licence board. It must rationalize and say this man will be licensed and this man will not. It is the same as the taxi-cab problems of this municipality and others. The number of people who would like to have taxi-cab licences far exceeds the number who are licensed. So it is with any type of licensing body where the number of licences are restricted or limited.

In respect of the position of the big or small, influential or non-influential, as a citizen of Toronto—and I think all of us have seen it visually—you only have to walk around and compare the list of those who are licensed today in comparison with those licensed ten years ago, or even half a dozen years ago, and the changes that have taken place over that period of time. There are a far greater number of licences.

I know that the city of Niagara Falls, is, of course, a great tourist area, and that there are a great many visitors. There would be, in the course of the judgment of the liquor licence board, the number of outlets—that meet the standards—that the board might feel should be licensed in that particular area. I think if the hon. member were to visit every restaurant in his riding and let it be known that he was a member of the Legislature, this would be perhaps something that he would hear from every restaurateur. As I say, I do not envy the position of the chairman or the board in having to make these decisions

where they have to choose. The chairman, time and time again, has uttered the fact that discretionary powers are very difficult to carry out. A Minister who has discretionary powers is in a very difficult position—indeed, rather than wanting discretionary powers, most men in authority will try to avoid them. When you have no discretionary powers it is a case of punching holes in a card, feeding it to a machine and having the answer come out the end, for example, like our point system. If you get to 15 points, that is it—there is no discretion whether it is or is not.

In respect of licensing powers, we have trusted to the good judgment and the discretion of the board. If you had contact on a province-wide basis over a period of years, you will see that although sometimes we think there is no rhyme or reason to what they do, there invariably is when you take all of their actions into account. I do not know of any specific instances that the hon. member is referring to; I am talking about the overall picture.

Mr. Bukator: Since you linked my name with the hon. member for Bracondale and you said you did not know whether I was suggesting that you open the door and give everybody who applies a licence, I would like to put that portion of the record straight. I would not be in favour of that. I cannot speak for the hon. member for Bracondale, but I say to you, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, that an individual applied five years ago, and for five consecutive years applied running the same establishment with no apparent physical change in that establishment. The bar was set up, the tables were there, but because of reasons that I do not know, they got their licence this year and did not get it five years ago. That particular establishment has been deprived of the privilege that they were entitled to for five years. I say to you that there are applications before this particular board from the city that I represent that have been there for some years that annually they have refused. Maybe two years from now they will give it to them. It is my opinion that that establishment ought to have it now. Some 10 or 11 million people come into that city who look for this privilege. So, to make the record straight on that, I only ask the question of the Minister as to why five years, four, three or two? Why did that citizen become good enough in the fifth year to get it and not five years ago?

So now I will take this from the hon. Prime Minister himself. I will make it my business as the representative of those people to go down to the board and discuss all of these applications and find out for myself why. If, as you put it, Mr. Minister, you would say that this one ought to get it and this one ought not to get a licence, I would agree with you. You have to have the courage of your convictions to say this man is not entitled to it because of the reasons they have found; and that one ought to have it and he ought to have it today.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you this in all sincerity, many people have been deprived and not privileged to operate and make money where they ought to have done for the past few years. The only reason I draw this to your attention is because I think there are many members in this House who have had identical problems with the people they represent. If this obstacle in some way can be taken out of the way, you would be helping the people you ought to as a member of the Cabinet. That is what I did.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, for the hon. members; if the board were to grant in one year all of the licences that people felt they were entitled to, you would, to use an expression that has been used, flood this province with licences. You will see that in the city of Toronto the number of establishments have not all sprung up in the year. They have been licensed over a period of years and have been absorbed into the community. I am fully sympathetic with the position of this gentleman, but at the same time he is not the only one in the province; there were others who had to wait. I have said to people that patience is sometimes a virtue because when you get the answer no, it is a pretty irrevocable type of thing. But, as I say, the board in its judgment is —and it is this Legislature through the Act which entrusts this board with this power—doing a good job. In the overall picture, when you look over the whole of the province, the big urbanized areas, the small communities, they have done a pretty fair job in my opinion.

Mr. Bukator: One other point, before I quit. The Minister himself interjected this and I did not. He made reference to the fact that there are many small municipalities that look for liquor outlets to take care of the people in that community. I represent a village that has some 3,400 persons in it, and they have a brewers' warehouse. We have many tourists through that small village because they come from Buffalo through the village to the Falls.

Many of them stay at our tourist establishments there. They cannot purchase a bottle of liquor in that village. There has been application made through the proper channels to try to persuade the authorities to put in a liquor store in connection with this village. Now, if any particular village is entitled to one—I might feel a little one-sided in my thinking because I have only lived there some 50 years—the village of Chippawa ought to have a liquor store in connection with the brewers' warehouse that was established there some three or four years ago. While they are doing business on the one side they might as well do it on the other, instead of having to drive five miles to the city of Niagara Falls to buy liquor.

I do not know who I approach on this one, but if someone would give me some direction—you see, I come from a small town and I do not know my way about the big city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Perhaps I can strike a sympathetic chord in the hon. member's heart. There is only one riding in the province of Ontario that does not have a liquor store—

Mr. Bukator: That must be Chippawa.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and that is the riding of Bellwoods. We do not have a liquor store in the riding of Bellwoods and I have to go more than five miles if I have occasion to avail myself of the services.

Mr. Bukator: Then while they are in the process—

Mr. Singer: That is not five miles, do not be silly; it is five blocks.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will speak for my riding, the hon. member can speak for his.

Mr. Singer: We also know the city of Toronto at least as well as the hon. Minister does.

Mr. Bukator: When and if the hon. Minister can persuade the proper authorities to get a licence in his riding so that he will not have to go the five miles, I wish he would apply for two so that I would get one in my village also.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the hon. Minister before the estimates are concluded?

Today, there came to my hand a document, through the courtesy of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs; a very nice document, it opens and you put it on your table. It is very nice. Now, when we come to the estimate book which has been supplied to this House during the time I have been here, we find that it is a very difficult book to handle. It will not stay open, you have to turn it this way, and then when you want to look at an estimate you turn it over. I am wondering if the Minister would not look into this matter of printing and see if some device might be worked out so that the estimates could go down on the desk and could stay there without having to be turned over each time. Perhaps this would not suit the hard usage that it gets from some hon. members but certainly human ingenuity should be able to work out some device whereby this book could be improved.

I ask the Chairman if he would convey that to the hon. Minister and ask if something could be done.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the Minister that he also include on the table the number of *Hansard* that we happen to be talking to? In other words, I think today's *Hansard* is No. 106 or so. Because when you make notes, you like to know when a certain item will be in *Hansard*. The next *Hansard* will be 107 tonight.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order; committee of the whole House.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves that the reprinted Bill 81 be the bill considered by the committee.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Hon. members will notice that the

difference between the two printings is that the reprinted bill states "reprinted for consideration by the committee of the whole House."

Motion agreed to.

House in committee on Bill 81, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we could deal with this bill clause by clause, and I would be prepared to do my very best to answer questions that any of the hon. members may have with respect to any of the clauses. I would warn you that when considering these amendments, you have to bear in mind that chapter 260 or Bill 80, The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, is the one that is referred to. And you have to have two Acts before you. There were some sections in the first Bill 81, the one that received second reading, that have been deleted, and I will bring these to your attention as we go through clause by clause.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may give just a brief word of explanation as far as our group is concerned on this bill.

On second reading, we expressed some basic differences in principle with regard to this bill. They could be summed up on the one hand that we felt we should move towards complete amalgamation and that the half-measure in our view of the number of boroughs was not achieving this. On the other hand, it was not achieving another very necessary objective and that is of a standardization of services that was possible through amalgamation, but at the same time decentralization into small communities for administrative purposes, so that you would keep some closer contact between the people in the big metropolitan area and their local government.

We have expressed our objections on this point of view on second reading on the principle. We reiterate them just briefly and in this capsule form. For better or for worse, we are stuck with what we think is inferior legislation and we will have certain amendments at various times but our amendments will be within the framework of the bill that has been passed on principle and given second reading. Perhaps I am emphasizing the obvious, but I just wanted to put it on the record here that because we accept a great deal here does not mean that we agree with it. We feel that this is the only constructive way that you can work at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those comments.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on section No. 2, subsections 2 and 3 of section 4 seem to me to be somewhat inconsistent. I did have occasion to look into this a short time earlier today and it would seem to me that the bill would gain in value if section 3 was deleted, leaving only subsection 2 and deleting any reference to subsection 3. The purpose of all this, Mr. Chairman, is to make sure that a reasonable number of voting hours are left available for the voters in Metropolitan Toronto. If the committee is prepared to accept the amendment that I suggest, then only section 2, subsection 2, will be the applicable section which will make sure voting will take place in Metropolitan Toronto on the first Monday in December, between the hours of 10 o'clock in the morning and 8 o'clock in the evening, or a period of ten hours, and that will be it.

Section 3 has some history that goes back to 1961, no one is quite sure why that is there. But if section 3 was being administered by an arbitrary council the voting theoretically could be from 8 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the afternoon, which really does not make much sense. I think that we would achieve the purpose that is necessary in having a guaranteed voting period. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 4 of section 2 be amended by deleting from subsection 2 thereof the words "subject to subsection 3" in the first line and then by deleting the whole of subsection 3. Are you with me, Mr. Charman?

Mr. Chairman: Has the member a written amendment?

Mr. Singer: Yes. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer moves that section 2 of Bill 81 be amended by deleting from section 4, subsection 2, the words "subject to subsection 3" in the first line and by deleting the whole of subsection 3 of section 4.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the hon. member brought this matter to my attention. Personally, I have no objections to this amendment; I think it is desirable, except that we must bear in mind that for the election to take place in 1969 in the six municipalities composing Metropolitan Toronto, the metropolitan corporation will have no authority to make any changes. This would mean that the first election, or the next election, in the metropolitan municipalities will be held on the first Monday in December, and the polls would be open from 10 o'clock in the morning, until 8 o'clock in the evening.

Subsection 3, which we have in the bill now, is the same section as appears in The Municipal Act, and it is rather a strange statement to make, but I really do not know why the metropolitan Act was amended in 1961-62 to bring it in line with The Municipal Act. However, I think that under these circumstances, it might be wise to accept the amendment suggested by the hon. member and definitely state that the next election will be the first Monday in December, within these certain hours. Therefore, neither the metropolitan corporation nor any of its constituent municipalities now, will have any jurisdiction insofar as this matter is concerned, and I would ask the House to support this amendment.

An hon. member: It is a rare day.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, it is not a rare day, it is just that a great spirit of co-operation seems to exude here today.

Take off the words, "subject to subsection 3"; in the first "the day" the "t" will be a capital letter, and then you delete subsection 3 and 4 will become 3.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed, say "nay."

The amendment is carried.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, the next section, 4, will be renumbered 3, and that deals with the date for the calling of the nomination meetings; subsection 5 will become 4, and that has to do with the term of office of the members of the council and local boards shall be for a three-year term; subsection 6 will become 5 and that deals with the metropolitan separate school board, and subsection 7, which deals with the extension of the franchise, will become subsection 6.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3:

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement. I ask the indulgence of the House; this may take longer than until 5 o'clock. If we were to postpone the private members' hour, we could make it up sometime later. I ask this as an indulgence for myself, because I doubt if I can be back here—

Mr. MacDonald: Why not at 8 o'clock?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We could do that very easily; my problem is that I have an engagement this evening and I doubt that I can be back here to continue this statement at 8 o'clock.

Mr. MacDonald: Just to show our co-operation in this, we will be very willing to set it for 8 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Thank you; this is one of the easy ones to co-operate with.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to review the background of the position of metropolitan chairman. The Ontario municipal board—to go back to those days—in its report dated January 20, 1953 recommended that the members of the metropolitan council should be divided equally between the city and all the suburban municipalities as a group, with an independent chairman as head of the council, to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. The original Metro Act provided for a council of 25 members, with 12 from the city of Toronto and 12 from the other area municipalities.

In the case of the suburbs, the locally elected mayor or reeve was made a member of the metropolitan council, ex officio. In the case of the city, its metropolitan membership was composed of the mayor, the two controllers receiving the highest number of votes in the last previous election, and the aldermen from each of the nine wards who led the polls in their own ward.

The Act provided that in addition to these 24 members, there should be a chairman who was to be head of the metropolitan council and the chief executive officer of the metropolitan corporation.

This brief description of the dual nature of this important position is significant in the light of actual experience in the operation of the metropolitan two-tier federated system during the past 13 years.

During that period there have been periodic examinations, discussions and proposals with respect to this particular office. Many representations have been made, both within

and without the House which have brought into question the desirability of retaining the present provisions of the Act with respect to the metropolitan chairman.

The metropolitan commission of inquiry, after extensive public hearings and consideration of numerous briefs, dealt at some length with the suggestion that the metropolitan chairman should be directly elected, and in their final, unanimous report, they recommended that no change be made in the existing legislation, providing for the appointment of the chairman by the members of the metropolitan council and that the person appointed could be one of such members, or any other person.

The special position of the chairman of metropolitan council was discussed at some length in the report of the Royal commission on Metropolitan Toronto. Dr. Goldenberg also recommended no change in the provisions of the Metro Act governing the election of the chairman of the metropolitan council, and he went on to recommend that when the mayor of one of the proposed four cities was elected chairman, his office as mayor of such city could become vacant.

A number of representations has been made to the government on this question since the publication of Dr. Goldenberg's report and, as I have previously stated, all such submissions were very carefully studied and considered before I announced, on January 10 last, the decision of the government that the provisions of the Metropolitan Toronto Act with respect to the appointment of the chairman, would remain unchanged.

The establishment of a two-tier system of metropolitan government, based on the principle of federation, was unprecedented on this continent and our experience at that time has provided ample proof of the value of the original concept. The importance of obtaining strong and competent leadership for this new and untried municipal organization was recognized from the very beginning in the carefully considered provisions respecting the appointment of the head of the council and its chief executive officer.

Although it may be true that the legislation can never ensure the emergence or selection of the type of leader required by any municipal organization, it can at least attempt to provide what might be called a suitable climate for such a selection. It should never be forgotten that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is a federation of local self-governing municipalities for certain specified purposes, and that the governing body, with the exception of the chairman, is composed entirely of the elected members of local councils.

These men, entrusted with the duty of selecting the chairman will, in most cases, have had extensive experience in the administration of their own municipalities and may be expected to be in the best position to judge qualifications of prospective appointees to the chairman's office. Such a person may, or may not be, at the time, a member of a local council.

The first chairman of the metropolitan council, Mr. Frederick G. Gardiner, QC, was not, when appointed to office by the Lieutenant-Governor in council in 1953, at that time a member of any local council, nor was he such a member when he was elected to that office by the metropolitan council for the years 1955 and 1961, inclusive, when he voluntarily retired. We are all familiar, of course, with the great progress that was made by the metropolitan corporation during his term of office. Under his dynamic leadership, the metropolitan corporation in eight short years accomplished what was considered by many to be impossible, and both the government of the province, and the people of Metropolitan Toronto whom he served with such distinction during that difficult period, were singularly fortunate in securing his services.

While frankly admitting that the ability to attract such an outstanding man to the position was or could be considered to have been a stroke of good fortune, it is important to remember that even such a man as Mr. Gardiner could not have continued in office beyond 1954 if the legislation had required the chairman to be appointed from among the members of the metropolitan council. In practice, this would mean that the local election would become a stepping-stone to the higher office and such a person, on becoming the metropolitan chairman, would certainly have to resign from his local office in order to devote his entire time and energies to the service of the metropolitan area as a whole. This is what happened, in fact, in 1962 when the present chairman of the metropolitan council was appointed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? In 1962, when Mr. Allen took over through Mr. Gardiner's resignation, he first resigned his position on the board of control—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I think it was the other way around. In any event, I feel at this point if—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just listen to what I have to say and perhaps it will clear the matter in your mind.

On that occasion I understand that the choice had narrowed down to two candidates —the present candidate and one other—both of whom were members of the metropolitan council and both were required in response to a unanimous request from the members of the council to give assurance that, if appointed, either one would immediately resign from his local office. I think that this assurance was given and then, when elected, he resigned while the other one, of course, gave the same assurance but did not resign because he did not have to as metropolitan chairman.

I think my facts are correct.

Mr. Singer: My memory says "no" but I would not be positive.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: None of us is infallible. I could be wrong. I do not think the point is really too significant. The real point involved is that the council itself asked for this assurance before they would consider these men as possible chairman; I think that is really the significant point.

At that time the statute permitted the metropolitan chairman to retain both offices, but after eight years of experience it had become obvious to members of the metropolitan council not only that the metropolitan chairman must devote his full time and attention to that position, but that he must, regardless of any other qualifications, be completely impartial and have no formal association with or special responsibility for any of the federated local units. Dr. Goldenberg in his report recommended an amendment to the Metro Act to provide that on the appointment of the head of one of the local councils as chairman of the metropolitan council, his office should become vacant. In the case of a member of a local council other than the head, he would have given such member the right to decide whether he was in a position to retain both positions.

After giving this proposal full consideration we have decided that the same principle should apply in both cases and that the principle of impartiality is so important that a member of the council of any area municipality, on becoming chairman, shall automatically vacate his seat on the local council. In other words, in our view, the two positions, by their very nature, are incompatible and there should be no distinction between mayors, controllers or councillors in this respect.

Having indicated briefly the reasons why the government concluded that the metropolitan council should not be limited to its own members in appointing the chairman of the metropolitan council, it seems desirable to indicate the reasons for the government's decision that the metropolitan chairman should not be elected at large throughout the metropolitan area. I have no doubt that most, if not all, of the advocates of an overall election are sincere in their objections to what they conceive to be a departure from what is called the democratic process in the present arrangements. However, I would remind such persons that the practical application of democratic principles in the great democracies of the western world is by no means uniform, especially in the field of local government.

In England, for example, the head of a local council whether he be the chairman of a county council or the mayor of a county, or metropolitan borough council, is never chosen directly by the electors. He is appointed by the members of the council and may be either a member of the council or any person qualified for election as such member. It is significant to note that after an exhaustive examination and inquiry into the government of Greater London, the Royal commission headed by Sir Edwin Herbert, in its report of October 1960 made no suggestion for any change in this system with respect to either the metropolitan boroughs or the reorganized Greater London council.

In our view the real question at the present time is whether at this stage in the development of the government of Metropolitan Toronto, and in view of the special and unique features of that government, there would be a better chance of securing the best possible person for this position by means of an overall election in an area comprising at the present time some 250 square miles with a population approaching two million.

Although, even in our largest cities, mayors are chosen in this way, it is in our view a mistake to consider the position of the metropolitan chairman as equivalent to the head of even a very large single municipality. On the contrary, he has been since the formation of Metropolitan Toronto and will still be the head of a federation of local self-governing municipalities—an office which, in many ways, is just as unique as the

municipal organization which he heads. The complexity and magnitude of its operations have grown immensely during the past 13 years.

The first budget of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, which was adopted for the year 1954, called for a gross current expenditure of about $56.25 million. The budget recently adopted for the year 1966, estimated a gross expenditure at $280 million of which some $70 million will be provided by provincial grants and subsidies, another $40 million from available local revenues and the balance of nearly $170 million from metropolitan levies for general and educational purposes.

Important new responsibilities will be assumed by the metropolitan corporation if the legislation now before you is adopted. The advantages of having the chief executive officer of such a large organization chosen by the elected members of the metropolitan council, in our view, greatly outweigh other considerations, at least at this stage in the evolution of Metro. As I have stated on previous occasions in this House, and as has been found in the able and comprehensive report of the Royal commission, Metro Toronto on the whole has been an outstanding success. The thing that is of concern really is: Can we at this stage of development of this metropolitan government take the risk of making a substantial change in the fundamental design of the operating mechanism, which has accomplished so much in so short a time?

Mr. Chairman, I add one other statement which I wish to make. I would like to say simply, we do not consider that the functions and the method of selection of the chief executive officer as we have decided here is fixed for evermore. It is the intent of the government that the form and the function of the metropolitan organization should be reviewed periodically, in light of its experience with the additional responsibilities and powers that will be given to it by this Bill 81.

It seems logical to us that such review should take place after the first three years of operation, as was done when the first Metropolitan Toronto bill was introduced, and when we might consider that the transitional period has come to an end, with, as I say, the additional powers and responsibilities contained in this bill. This would bring us to 1970, after the election which will take place in December of 1969. There are various ideas that have been advanced that might be considered at that time, which would lead perhaps to a solution of this very difficult problem.

It has been suggested, and I think the idea merits some consideration, that as Metro develops, it may be necessary to separate these two functions that are presently embodied in the one individual, the chairman of the metropolitan council. Here he serves two purposes: He is first, the chief administrative officer of the organization, and secondly, he is the presiding officer over the metropolitan council itself, and the executive committee of that council.

I would think that it would be folly to consider splitting these two functions at this precise point in time in the history of Metropolitan Toronto, but I do not discard forever the idea that this might be a logical step in the future development of the administration, so that there would be an administrative officer appointed who would in fact be a senior civil servant. Then the position of the actual leader of the government, in the sense that he is the presiding officer of the council and so on, might be chosen in some other way.

But I suggest to you that at least for the first three years of this period of time we should stay with this arrangement which has functioned so well in the past, particularly when we are launching Metro into a new period in its development when there are going to be some changes that will be required.

Now, that is only one of the possibilities that are open and I mention it only as an example of some matters that undoubtedly will be considered in the next three years and undoubtedly will be studied at the time when the review that I mentioned will be made. There will be other ideas advanced no doubt, but it seems to us in the government that at the present moment, and with the matters that face the Metro council in these next three years, we should leave this situation as it is and as I have outlined.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I wonder if when we deal with this section 3, since there are really in fact ten subsections to section 5 which is the section of the Act being amended, we should not deal with them in order and call them one at a time. I know there are amendments to more than one of these subsections so it would be my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that as we proceed in this we start with section 1, as at the bottom of page 2, and then follow them through. I think we would make more sense in that.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add, if I might, my support to this proposition. I was going to raise it in another context later.

Later we come, for example, to part 7 covering education and there are literally 18 pages. It is a reproduction of the whole original education portion of the bill and I would think that if we are going to deal with it (a) in an orderly manner, and (b) be able to deal with various points in it; we must in some way get over the normal rule of the House that if you vote on one amendment the whole section has to carry. I think the orderly way to achieve this would be to take it section by section—the original sections.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not think we would assume that an amendment to a subsection that might be defeated would mean that the whole section, and all the other subsections—

Mr. MacDonald: That is the rule.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I realize that; but in dealing with this, this is a day for co-operaton. We would be quite willing—as long as we do not establish any precedents. I suppose we all take that as read.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact I suspect this is one day when you will need co-operation to be able to get it by your own backbenchers; so I think you are soliciting with some malice aforethought.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We were getting on quite nicely until you made your remarks.

But we would agree with the procedure that you mentioned.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, with reference to section 3: In the report which has been submitted by the hon. Prime Minister of this province he stated that the purpose of this bill, or the principle behind it, was to give proportional representation. During the debate on the first reading of this bill the hon. member for Scarborough North stated that this was proportional representation, and at that time I asked him whether he thought that Scarborough was getting proportional representation.

I would point out that on the basis of the division, or representation, indicated in section 3, with Toronto receiving 12 members, Etobicoke 4, York 3, North York 6, East York 2, Scarborough 5; and based on the population figures given in the hon. Prime Minister's statement, Toronto would have one representative—perhaps I should start at the bottom!

East York would have one representative for every 45,000 people. York would have one representative—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member goes too far, may I interrupt?

We considered the head of a council was out of that computation at which you are trying to arrive. The head of the council automatically goes to the metropolitan council, and then the representation is based on—

Mr. Ben: Am I to understand then, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister's statements imply that on and after January 1, 1967, the area municipalities are entitled to the following membership on the metropolitan council?

The borough of East York, a total of three members, one being—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is not what I said.

Mr. Ben: Well, then—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The borough of East York would have two members, the head of the government and one more.

Mr. Ben: Then it is the head plus one member. Then Etobicoke would have the mayor or reeve, plus three members.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Right!

Mr. Ben: Well, I am basing my calculations on those figures then, Mr. Chairman.

Therefore, East York would have one representative for every 45,000 people. Mind you, the Act states that East York is deemed to have a population, for the purposes of this bill, of 100,000 souls, but in fact it does not It only has 90,700. So they would have one representative for every 45,350 souls.

York would have one representative for every 46,230.

Scarborough would have one representative for every 50,660.

Toronto would have one representative for every 56,800.

North York, one representative for every 56,900 and Etobicoke, one representative for every 59,750.

The difference between East York, which has the highest or best representation, and Etobicoke which has the lowest representation, is 14,400 souls.

In other words, one vote in East York is worth one-and-a-third votes in Etobicoke. Now, that may seem small to some of the members here, but I would point out that the municipality or borough of East York and the borough of York, which has one member for every 45,350 and one representative for every 46,230, respectively, are landlocked. These are the boroughs which are least likely to grow in population. I would suggest that Toronto, perhaps, would fall into that category also.

On the other hand, Scarborough, Etobicoke and North York are the growing municipalities and they have room for expansion. Figures show that the population of Metro Toronto increases at the rate of 50,000 per year, so that by the date of the next distribution the population of Metropolitan Toronto will have increased by at least 350,000.

The bulk of that growth is going to be in the communities or boroughs of Scarborough, Etobicoke and North York. If the difference at the present time in the representation is almost 14,500, one can venture to guess that by the date of the next distribution it is quite conceivable that these three outside and growing boroughs will have twice as many persons per elected official than they have now. Twice is a slight exaggeration, it would be close to twice that much, but I am trying to emphasize my point.

If we are trying to achieve proportional representation, we should at this time at least try to take into account part of that expected growth in the population of this area.

I would venture to offer a suggestion at this time. It would involve adding three new members to Metro council by giving Etobicoke an additional member, North York an additional member and the city of Toronto an additional member.

If this were done the representation ratios would be as follows: York and East York would still have the same number per representative of 46,230 and 45,350, but Etobicoke would now have one representative per 47,800, North York would have one representative for every 48,800 and Toronto would have one representative for every 52,400. I would point out that Toronto would still be in the least enviable position.

But the point is that the difference now would be just about 6,000 votes. It would give those growing municipalities some room for expansion and there would be some semblance of proportional representation in the future. I could say that if Toronto were given two additional members, they would have one representative for every 48,600, which would still bring it closer to proportional representation.

But I believe it would have another effect. At the present time, under the scheme proposed by the government, there would be a council composed of 32 members plus the chairman. One of the objections to an appointed chairman has been that in the event of ties under the existing setup, there have been too many occasions for tie-breaking votes by the chairman. Under my proposed scheme, there would be less chance, all members being present, of there being a tie and the chairman having the tie-breaking vote. With 32 members and everyone present, the law of averages indicates that there could be an even division, 16 and 16. With 35 members under my proposed scheme, plus the chairman, there cannot be a division with all members present because the bylaws of Metro council prohibit a person abstaining from voting.

An hon. member: He could just walk out.

Mr. Ben: He could walk out, but then there is an odd number, I say, on the law of averages with everyone there. So it has those two effects. Because the government seems pretty well set in its determination to permit the chairman to be appointed from other than the elected officials, and the chances of a tie being less, and the fact that here we would have more of a proportional representation system, I move, Mr. Chairman, that section 3 of Bill 81 be amended by changing the figures in section 5(1) in the following manner: After "the borough of Etobicoke" 4 be changed to 5, after "the borough of North York" 6 be changed to 7 and after "the city of Toronto" 12 be changed to 13.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, speaking to this portion of the bill and the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Bracondale, this bill has been drawn up to the best of the ability of people who produced it, who have given consideration for at least three years before there was a review.

I would say to the hon. member for Bracondale once again: He mentioned certain municipalities and I think, if I read between the lines, the main idea is to get more representation on metropolitan council for Toronto.

Some hon. members: No, no.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I think so. Now, just let me finish.

Mr. Singer: How does the hon. member read between the lines—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: If the hon. member will follow me for a moment, I will try to remember comments my hon. friend made. Specifically, the township or the new borough of York are now going extensively into high density where the population will increase; so it may in Toronto. But I would think at this time until this bill comes into effect that we should have a look at it for, say, two years, and see then where the faults, if any, are, before we try to change any part of this particular section of the bill, relative to representation.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Humber not only reads between the lines in a most peculiar way, he is really putting before us the proposition that we in this Legislature should treat ourselves as rubber stamps. He may wish to look upon himself as a rubber stamp, but I do not think the rest of us should. What he is saying in effect is that some eminent and intelligent people have studied this matter for three years, this is the formula they have come up with and we, as mere elected representatives of the people, should accept their superior wisdom.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I never suggested that.

Mr. Bryden: Well, what other interpretation could be put on his remarks? It certainly is not a position that I am willing to accept. Basically, the problem we are up against here is that you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. The whole conception is wrong and it does not matter how you juggle the figures, you are not going to get a satisfactory solution. I would say, however, that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bracondale does improve upon the proposal that is now before us. It would get a somewhat more accurate balance on the basis of present population and that is really all that we can go on.

We may have ideas, we may have fairly reasonable projections as to population trends in the whole of the area and in various parts of it, but we do not know for sure. I do not agree with the hon. member for Bracondale that because certain of the municipalities are landlocked they will not necessarily grow in population. There is a very obvious trend right now towards growing upward. They have used all the lateral space available to them, but now they are trying to get as far up into the clouds as they can in order to accommodate more population. The hon. member for Humber is right enough when he says that this question of representation will have to be reviewed later, but I do not see that that is any reason why we should not now get as accurate a representation of the population as it is possible to get.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: We have an accurate representation.

Mr. Bryden: It is not as accurate as is possible. I did not work out the arithmetic but as far as I could gather from listening to the discussion, the proposal of the hon. member for Bracondale would give a more accurate representation than the proposal in the bill. Notwithstanding the eminent credentials of the gentlemen who worked out the formula in the bill, it just happens that somebody has done a little better job. I am sure they would not be offended by it; I am sure they would be prepared to recognize that it is always possible to improve on their work. Therefore, I think we should accept this formula.

The hon. member for Humber is entirely wrong when he suggests that somehow or other the effect of the amendment would be to give Toronto greater representation. I am no mathematician, but I know enough about arithmetic to know that if you give Toronto one more member and the rest of the municipalities two more members, you are reducing, not increasing, Toronto's proportionate position on the board. Toronto, at the present time, under the formula before us, has somewhat more than a third of the members on the council.

In the increase proposed by the hon. member for Bracondale, it will get one-third of the increase, so its proportionate position will decline slightly. Therefore there is nothing in the suggestion that this is a way of getting more people from Toronto on the board. The one additional Toronto member will be balanced by two from other municipalities—Etobicoke and North York and neither of those municipalities, according to my observation, has shown an overwhelming disposition to go along with what Toronto proposes. I do not think we have to worry about that. I think we should accept the amendment as a reasonable one that will give us somewhat more accurate representation than the formula now proposed.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I have before me a copy of the official plan of Metropolitan Toronto as it now exists in the hands of metropolitan council and the figures that are given for development of the various areas are these: that the city of Toronto will eventually have about 780,000 people, that is including the new additions under the new Metro bill, and North York will have about 657,000 at that time.

The proposal that has been put forward by the hon. member for Bracondale would not only give balance at the present time, but would also look forward to the future and would give better balance, although not in any kind of perfect proportions, in the few years ahead when the development that the metropolitan plan sees will have been accomplished, so that it just seems to me to be a matter of sheer common sense. We could argue here all day about figures and try to get exact balances which would change overnight, but from the figures that are now given as present populations and from the projected figures when these areas are developed as they will be within the next decade, it seems that the amendment offered is a rational one and one which we should support.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the government is striving, I think, in bringing before us Bill 81, for a better bill and I would think that they are striving as well for a bill that is more democratically inspired than the last one; this is an improvement.

The suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Bracondale seems to fit completely within the broad principles stated by the government. What my friend the hon. member for Bracondale is suggesting, very simply, is that the representation on the metropolitan council be brought closer into line of representation by population—a simple, democratic principle which I am sure the hon. member for Humber agrees with.

I am sure he would like people to have representation in accordance with population. The system suggested in the amendment brings it much closer than the system that is in Bill 81. Mr. Chairman, what reasonable objection can anyone have?

The hon. member for Humber, I guess, is a suspicious man. He was looking for some sort of a hidden gimmick in this, and his first reaction was—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: What does the hon. member think about it?

Mr. Singer: I am telling the hon. member; I think it is good and I think with his vast experience, the hon. member for Humber should be anxious and eager to support it. I am certain that if he stands up and says: "I support it," there is a really good chance that this amendment will carry. I think he should carefully consider it.

Mr. Bryden: There is a plot to get North York more representation; that is what it is.

Mr. Singer: That may well be; it is very subtle, but this is what is going to happen.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to have this Bill 81 passed—and we are; there are a lot of you over there who seem determined that it is going to go through in this way—then let us make it as perfect an instrument as we can when it leaves this House. Let us have it as close to representation by population as we can figure out at this time.

The amendment suggested by my colleague, the hon. member for Bracondale makes eminent sense in this direction. I cannot understand why it should not be accepted by the government. There is no balance that is going to be destroyed; in fact, it keeps a balance. It makes the metropolitan council more representative and more equally representative.

The object, Mr. Chairman, of our redistribution of the ridings in the province of Ontario was to achieve something close to representation by population; I think we failed in that. Surely one of the objects in this bill should be the same sort of achievement?

Therefore, for all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge upon all hon. members of the committee that this amendment be supported.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Downsview, I can agree partially that he is dealing with today's data on population; that is true, but in any progressive legislation you try to look ahead of tomorrow. Let me suggest to you that after many hours, weeks and months of trying to set up a formula for a kickoff, for a start on this new Bill 81, if we were to accept today a new balance of power, a new representation, I ask the hon. member for Bracondale how is he going to select 13 members from the Toronto city council?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I might say that I resent the implications of

the hon. member for Humber. I am not offended by them, but I do resent them for the simple reason, as I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that a more equitable redistribution would have been to give Toronto an additional member which would have given it a representation of one member for every 48,600 votes. This would have been in line with the representation which I am suggesting for Etobicoke, North York and East York. I appreciate that every time somebody suggests giving Toronto something, everybody rises against it and says that there is some ulterior motive, so I try to compromise.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): That comes from your side of the House.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps the hon. Minister should listen.

I am trying to suggest something that would not only be equitable, but would be acceptable to this government. Now, the hon. member says: "How can you work this out with 13 members?" There are a number of solutions—for instance, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has already agreed that the status quo, as far as the city's representation on Metro council is concerned, shall be maintained. That is, they shall have nine senior aldermen plus the mayor, plus the two controllers who receive the highest number of votes.

It would be very simple to say that the representation from the city of Toronto shall consist of the mayor and three controllers who received the highest number of votes, plus the nine senior aldermen. If you want to be absolutely equitable and give Toronto still another seat so that it shall have 14, then you could have the nine senior aldermen plus the whole board of control. I am not suggesting you go that far, because I think it is impossible. I am trying to suggest something that perhaps the government will accept because it is, as was stated by the hon. member for Woodbine and the hon. member for York South, at least a progressive step. It is an improvement on what you have.

Mr. MacDonald: Acceptable to all reasonable people.

Mr. Ben: Those would have been my words had I uttered them first.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Everyone on this side is unreasonable and on that side, reasonable.

Mr. Ben: So there is nothing complicated about it. You put through this amendment and there is just a simple amendment in the amendment that has already been proposed by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, where that big black hand points—

An hon. member: Now we know who Black Hand is.

Mr. Ben: And you have something that at least quietens them down at the city council for a while. At least it will put one controller out of the argument.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about the other boroughs?

Mr. Ben: The other boroughs have proper representation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I want the hon. member for Bracondale to know that I was born, raised and educated in Toronto. It was just by chance I moved to the suburbs, so basically I appreciate the heart of Metropolitan Toronto, which is the city of Toronto. I do not want him to get the wrong idea, but can he tell me any advantage in what we are going to do, by advancing in numbers?

For instance, let me be rather small and specific. What good is that 13th member on the city of Toronto council representing the city of Toronto to Metro, providing we raise the other equal? What are you gaining by it?

Mr. MacDonald: Can you not recognize the principle involved?

Mr. Ben: May I ask the hon. member how much it cost and why did this House authorize redistribution?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): That is a very good question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the House that up until now the Minister has accepted all amendments proposed. I would suggest that he keep his record intact, especially in view of the reasonableness of this amendment.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I do not come from Toronto, but I would just like to say a word here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: A place more important than Toronto in some people's opinion. The Representation Act, or Bill 92, has been mentioned here and the fact that the bill has been presented and it is not representation by population as much as this bill we are now discussing. Actually, I would have to disagree, Mr. Chairman, because the government, as I understand it, in their explanatory notes divided our ridings into rural, rural-urban and urban ridings. If you look over the population of all of the proposed rural ridings under the new Representation Act, you will find that within a 1,000 votes, 1,000 people, one riding is the same as the other. When you examine the rural-urban ridings you will find that within 1,000 or 2,000 votes they are identical. In the city of Toronto for their urban ridings here, they are almost identical, in many instances they are only two or three hundred votes out. Therefore it is not fair to say that, according to the Act dealing with redistribution, you have not followed the principle of one member for so many thousands of votes. But in this particular bill, as the hon. member for Bracondale has pointed out, the city of Toronto should have another member or even two members, and Etobicoke and one of the Yorks another member each. If under the redistribution bill, the government have accepted the fact of representation by population, depending on the type of riding that it is, then I think under this bill you should apply the same reasoning.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pass some comments, if you do not mind. In arriving at this matter of representation by the borough municipalities in the city on the metropolitan council, we were using the 1964 population figures which were the basis on which the 1965 unconditional grants were paid to Metro. It is just an impossibility to arrive at the representation of one municipality on the basis of 44,000 and then to apply a figure of 48,800 to some other municipality. We had to take a figure that was within a very broad range and that was the factor that we used.

We arrived at this representation, and rather fortunately, it ended that the city of Toronto would maintain its same numerical strength on the metropolitan council and then this plan, with a representation of 32 members from among the elected members of the individual councils, provided the representation throughout.

As the hon. Prime Minister has said on earlier occasions these are matters for review in due course of time but I do not think we can anticipate the population growth in the six municipalities for some years ahead. Certainly the municipalities are not all going to grow in the same proportion. I think we will have to use the 1964 population figures and leave this representation as it is in Bill 81. I am sorry to break my—

Mr. Bryden: So soon?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes, break my record so soon, but I hope that I will be able to be of better service to you on some other points. I would ask the members to vote against this amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Presupposing that you cannot find other figures than the 1964 figures, can you in all honesty state to this House that even based on the 1964 figures, this is a fair distribution?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I can so state; you asked me a question, I give you an answer.

Mr. Ben: I am afraid that from henceforth I shall have to disregard that halo I see over your head all the time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Ben moves that section 3 of Bill 81 be amended by changing the figures in section 3, subsection 1, in the following manner:

After the borough of Etobicoke, 4 be changed to 5.

After the borough of North York, 6 be changed to 7.

And after the city of Toronto, 12 be changed to 13.

All in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

All opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the amendment will please rise.

As many as are opposed to the amendment, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 24, the "nays" are 42.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost, and that subsection 1 of the new pro-

posed section 5 stand as part of the bill. Carried.

Subsection 2 of section 5 agreed to.

Subsections 3 and 4 agreed to.

On subsection 5:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on subsection 5, I think that there is a very important principle of which we all in this Legislature should be fully aware, and that is the principle of accountability to the people of the province, to the people of Metropolitan Toronto.

We on this side believe that the people have wisdom; we believe, that over the centuries, one of the great prides which we have in our country is the fact that the people will choose representatives who are responsible to the people. I think every school child in this country reads about representation, our method of voting, our democratic rights.

We believe that when you come to the chairman of the council of Metropolitan Toronto, here is a man with a uniquely powerful political position, and yet it is suggested by the government on the other side, that he should not be accountable to the people.

He holds one of the top positions, governing one of the most important geographical units of Canada. He spends more than do seven provinces. The only exceptions are Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. This man should be accountable to the people of Metro.

We know that in the past when Metro was formed, Mr. Gardiner was appointed, and certainly I would like to say that during that period, I think we all had the utmost respect for the job that he did as an architect of Metro. And similarly with Mr. Allen. Mr. Allen has shown himself to be a wise mediator, but he himself admits that the day would come surely, when his position should warrant, and I quote the words that he spoke: "—should warrant that there is strong merit in the election proposal." In other words, that he should be answerable to the people.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: When was that?

Mr. Singer: It just happens we have a news clipping here.

Mr. Thompson: It is quoted in the *Telegram*, Toronto, Wednesday, May 4, 1966.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: And he wants the chairman to be elected?

Mr. Thompson: Well, I just simply quote that.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for Humber is a little slow today.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: No, I am—

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, the hon. Prime Minister has talked about a transition period and suggests that they would have a look at the appointment or the election of a chairman in about 1970, I think, if I caught his words correctly. I am concerned that with the government there is always the excuse of a transition period. They have been going through transition periods and surely, at this time, this would be the opportunity to make the system fully democratic, concerning this man, this most powerful person in this metropolitan area.

The hon. Prime Minister has mentioned that in London—may I say we had the honour of meeting the Lord Mayor of Belfast just recently. He mentioned that in London, and in other municipalities of the old country, the mayor, the head of the municipality, is appointed. I think I am correct in your remarks, sir.

Now, I do not know if in theory he could be appointed, but certainly in practice, the Lord Mayor of Belfast, whom I met just last week, the Lord Mayor of London, and mayors of most of the major cities in the old country, are elected from within their councils.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): He is not the chairman, either.

Mr. Singer: No, he is an alderman.

Mr. Thompson: He is an alderman when he is elected from among the aldermen.

Mr. Dunlop: There is no analogy between the Lord Mayor of London and the Greater London council.

Mr. Thompson: But I would say this, that really it is the principle which we are advocating. It is just the principle which is applied in this Legislature, and that is that anyone with a major responsibility over the affairs of the people, has got to be answerable to the people.

There are some who would say that the Metro chairman should be accountable to the whole of the Metro area and I think that their reason again is on the basis of being democratic, of recognizing that the chairman must be accountable to all the people. On the other hand, when that is examined by others

that have been in the Metro field, they are concerned that with such a broad area—over 240 square miles—it is very difficult because of expenses, because of the matter of getting to meetings all over the area, for a chairman to campaign for election unless he has a great deal of wealth, and has the support of the publisher of one of the papers; at least one he would have to have.

On the other hand, the people who say he should run across the whole of Metro point to such places as New York, and show the vitality and interest of someone like Lindsay, in running. Yet there is an admission by Lindsay that he has spent $2 million, as the cost of his election.

In this proposed bill, it is a federated system we have in Metro, and we believe that it is still essential that Metro's chairman should be directly accountable to people in Metro, just as the Prime Minister of this province has to go back and face the electorate in his constituency. The Prime Minister has stated that there may come a time when there may be someone like a deputy minister to the chairman, as there is a deputy minister to most of the Cabinet Ministers. We say, why wait for that? Why not have the administrative staff to help the metropolitan chairman, so that he can still be answerable to the people, as well as carry on directing the affairs of Metro?

Sir, it is because of this, because of this very basic principle of being answerable to the people, that I would move that section 3 be amended by deleting from subsection 5 the words "or any other person," in the fifth line thereof.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. leader of the Opposition would answer a few questions on this particular point?

May I say that I for one agree in principle with a great deal of what he says, regarding the election of such a powerful administrative and political figure and the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto. But it is the mechanics of the thing that cause a great deal of serious and sincere doubt in the minds of many of us.

For instance, if the mayor of the city of Toronto should be chosen by the members of the metropolitan council as the person to be the chairman of metropolitan council, surely the job is such a great one that you would not expect the mayor of the city of Toronto to fulfil both positions. Therefore, right after an election the mayor of the city of Toronto would have to resign to take on the chairman's job. Would this mean that the runner-up for the mayor's job would then take over the job? Would this mean that the board of control and the council of the city of Toronto would choose the new mayor? These are some of the difficulties in regard to that position contained in the amendment of my hon. friend; actually, I suppose in practice it would mean that the position of the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto would be forever denied to the man who would be the mayor of the city of Toronto.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Let me finish this out. If you have explanations, this is what I am asking for. If, for instance, the head of any of the local municipalities, was chosen by that Metro council—let us get away from the city of Toronto if it raises the ire or the hackles of the hon. member sitting on the immediate right of the hon. member for Dovercourt—would this then mean the head of that local municipality would have to resign that position? I am indicating to you that I think in actual practice this suggested system would deny the head of any municipality the position of chairman of Metro council for the simple reason that this would have to be an issue in that election campaign. If there were two people running for the mayor of the city of Toronto, for instance, I am sure somewhere along the line in that campaign a question would be asked of each of them: "If you are elected mayor, can you tell us whether you will stand as chairman of Metro Toronto?" And I would say that it would be a very rash individual who would say: "Yes, I will stand."

An hon. member: He would say; "No, I will not."

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I am not so sure he would say, "No, I will not" under those circumstances. In other words he would deny himself. It may well be then that one of the heads of those municipalities would be the man best fitted for the job, it may well be, but this may also cause complications and denials later on.

These are the difficulties, and some of the practical difficulties, that I think, in trying to convince the hon. members on this side of the House in any event, if not in his own party—

Mr. Bryden: They were all convinced at the time of second reading.

An hon. member: They changed their minds.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: These are some of the questions and explanations I think are required.

Now, sir, if the hon. member can provide us with them, certainly I have an open mind on this question. It is a very great difficulty. The principle is inescapable, I think, that somewhere, somehow, somewhere along the line the chairman of Metro council is going to have to be elected.

Mr. Bryden: It will never be possible under your system.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: It is the procedure and the mechanics of how this is going to be done that have worried me and I think have worried other hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the committee of the whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): It has been decided between the Whips that the private members' hour will go on from 8 until 9, Mr. Speaker, and we will resume debate on this bill at 9 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 107

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 12, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 12, 1966

On notice of motion No. 24, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Thompson, Mrs. Pritchard, Mr. Gisborn 3403

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, in committee 3411

Motion to adjourn, Mr Robarts, agreed to 3432

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 24, by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence.

Resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should erect in Ottawa a building to accommodate, when appropriate, its various services to the Ottawa valley and eastern Ontario region, and that such building in both form and site be in keeping with the prestige of this province.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution standing in my name, seconded by Mr. Harris.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that briefly, the hon. members of this House have heard the wording of the resolution which is the gist and basic idea behind what might be called the "Ottawa speech."

I understand that over the years in which members have stood here on behalf of Ottawa, not only has the hon. member for Ottawa East recently spoken on this, but last year I spoke on the question; the year before I touched on it; the present hon. Minister of Transport has spoken on it on several occasions; the hon. member for Carleton, I understand, has spoken on it, and I believe that you, Mr. Speaker, as a private member, also have spoken on what I have described as the basic "Ottawa speech."

Despite this fact, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking tonight, primarily, because of the rather fantastic exchange that took place in the House a few weeks ago, despite the fact that there have been perhaps a dozen speeches over as many years relating to this resolution, the following exchange took place in this House between the hon. member for Ottawa East, where he said:

> Would it not be possible to have those facilities located in a central area where people would know where to go instead of having to go to 16 different locations?

To which the hon. Minister of Public Works replied:

> So to answer the hon. member's question simply, we have not considered it at this point.

With that exchange on the record very recently and with the history of a dozen years of speeches on the subject behind it, one has the alternative of either despair or anger with this answer. I will not make any observation as to how long it will take us to have tulips on the front lawn of the Legislature, but I am forced to speak tonight, basically, because of the feeling that some of us have in the back benches and that is, perhaps—and I think the Opposition may experience this too—that if we keep pushing at the boulder no matter how mighty it may be, there may be a time at which that last shove will actually start it rolling down the other side of the hill, and this might be—I do not know—the last shove that will topple it over the brink of the hill and we shall see some action by The Department of Public Works.

Before I get to the gist of my remarks, I would say that there are two misapprehensions which have come to me from other hon. members of the House which should be dealt with.

First, this motion does not suggest that the Legislature of Ontario be moved to the city of Ottawa. This type of proposition was raised some time ago, as I understand it, by the hon. member for Simcoe East who suggested that we might all pick up and move to Barrie. Under the present conditions and with the rather spectacular performance of the Commons in Ottawa, as someone coming from that area, I am not quite sure whether it would be good for my people to be host to two Legislatures in the same city. Therefore this resolution is not directed at that point, nor is it directed to a point that has been raised, I think, by other members that the Ontario government be decentralized and its departments shipped off to different corners of the province.

What I am suggesting is really very much the opposite, that we look to a question of collection and concentration of the government's activities in the Ottawa area. As was mentioned, there are some 16 addresses one may go to to receive contact with the Ontario government, in 14 leased premises, and 10 owned premises dealing with about a dozen different departments.

I think it is not unfair to say that in the Ottawa area of eastern Ontario, that the liquor control board of Ontario is the only emanation of this province that is properly housed, properly organized and looks as though it knows what it is doing. As for the ordinary operation of government, I point to the obvious—what is to me obvious—as being the inefficiency, the lack of economy and lack of public service which is connected with our present situation in Ottawa and, as I have mentioned in this House before, I do believe also, that particularly in the capacity of being the national capital of Canada, there should be some reason for having an outward and visible sign of the province of Ontario at that particular location.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is now with some regret, in looking at the words of that particular motion, I notice the word "Ottawa" used on several occasions and the words "in keeping with the prestige of the province." I regret those words, Mr. Speaker, because I do not mean this particular resolution to be either parochial or prideful. Although I am parochial about Ottawa and proud of Ottawa, and parochial about Ontario and proud of Ontario, it would be a misconstruction of the purpose of this particular resolution if it were construed as being "parochial" or "prideful."

What I suggest, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): The hon. member will have this speech reprinted.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, it will be printed in any case, we can be sure, in *Hansard*.

What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that although this may sound parochial as a resolution, I would like to make my remarks on a higher ground—or move to somewhat higher ground—and speak of it in the context of regionalism.

The word "regional" or "regionalism" is an "in" word these days. We have discussions of regional government, regional development, regional education, regional community colleges, regional jails, regional welfare, regional highway need studies, regional hospital boards and plenty of regional conferences. I regret that the resolution refers only to the Ottawa region, because I do believe that what this resolution comprises could relate to any, or many, of the regions that exist in the province of Ontario, and I do believe that there are many such areas across the province.

Mr. Speaker, these are days of big government and there is no question of it; the public demands big government; the public demands that the government teach it and train it; the public demands that government protect its health, its sick and its aged, its retarded; that the government give it housing and the government ensure in some way or another, some form of minimum income. In a democracy, if the people want this, this is how their money is to be spent, but apart from the duty on government to do this service, or to commit this service to the public, which votes for and supports the government, I suggest something further: that the government not only be efficient but that the government must be seen to be efficient or we will lose the basic support that in a democracy is the foundation of the government as the servant of, and not the master of, the people.

I suggest that because we are in a democracy it is the bounden duty of the government not to look scruffy, not to appear scruffy or second-rate to the citizens who support it with their ample tax dollars. I think that if the government of Ontario, apart from questions of party, looks scruffy, looks inefficient, the people will believe that it is inefficient.

I might say, as an example of the kind of experience that brings me to my feet, that when I was a new member—and this, sir, has been the experience, I am sure, of many hon. members in this House—shortly after election I received that continuing line of requests for help that direct themselves to The Department of Public Welfare. As an ingénue in this field I tried to sit down and read the statutes, regulations, orders, rulings and different legal and legislative matters related to the welfare problems of the people who came to me. And it seemed to me, sir, that I was facing an absolute jungle when I approached The Department of Public Welfare.

At that point—and many of us I presume have been through this—I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of speaking to the Deputy Minister of The Department of

Public Welfare. And that particular civil servant said to me essentially, "Do not worry about all these details, do not worry about these particular problems of interpretation of our statutes, when you come into my office"—and he meant this whether it be by telephone, letter or personally—"simply say that you have somebody in your riding who needs help, give me their name and address and we will see if we can help."

I may say, as a member dealing with this department, that suddenly what was on the one hand absolute chaos and a jungle of legislation, became in the hands of this particular civil servant a welfare programme which was highly sophisticated, very comprehensive, and very flexible.

I would suggest also that in The Department of Education—how many hon. members are there in this House who can tell what students who talk to them are entitled to by the way of loans, bursaries, scholarships, grants, which courses they should take, at which time, in which institutions, in which places? We simply cannot possibly be up on all those things from time to time. Which member of this House a year from now will be able to give reasonable advice to people who are having problems with OMSIP or with the OHSC? For instance, in relation to my riding, which is partially rural, I find it difficult to know what subsidies apply for drought, and which apply for too great a degree of rain or in which parts of my riding the drought subsidy applies and the rain subsidy does not apply.

I find that businessmen, for instance, do not know and are not easily informed of the different forms of assistance that are available from the provincial government. I suggest this will apply to Lands and Forests, Tourism, Transport and The Department of Health services.

So one of the things—I have mentioned that my resolution deals with regionalism—one of the things I also suggest it deals with, Mr. Speaker, is the question of an information office.

I have mentioned—and it may seem too practical and too simple—that it should be in a handsome building, a good-looking building and something of which we can be proud.

But beyond that, with an information centre I do believe that figuratively speaking it should have a doormat in front of it saying "Government of Ontario at your service."

I believe that people should be able to cross the threshold as one can cross the threshold of the Deputy Ministry of Public Welfare in this province, simply cross his threshold and say, "I need particular help for a person who is in my riding." You should be able to walk across this threshold of the Ontario regional central building in any particular area as a student, as an aged person, as a needy person, as a tourist, a hunter, a farmer or a businessman and say, "I would like a particular form of help"; and that someone would hand you on to someone who knew the details of that about which you were asking.

Now, today in the city of Ottawa, and perhaps this occurs in other parts of the province, there are times when you have to walk a quarter of a mile to go to the offices of The Department of Transport in Ontario, unless you want to park against the law.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: This may be changing.

With regard to The Department of Health, I would say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, may I describe the facts to the hon. members? Unless it changes soon, I could say that The Department of Health, with their very difficult job of raising bacteria, testing germs, is housed in an abandoned firehall in one of the dirtiest areas in Ottawa and subject to continual vandalism. In another department the elevator in the rickety old building in which it is situated is normally broken down. In another department one must drive four or five miles in order to get anywhere near where the office of the particular departmental officer is, and he is usually out on calls.

If this kind of thing is difficult for an MLA, Mr. Speaker, it must be absolutely impossible for the ordinary member of the public trying to deal with our government.

I look about at the accommodation that is available to big business, big business in this city, big business in any reasonable city. It is clean, smart, efficient, and it gives one a feeling of pride to look at a business office. They tend to spend a great deal of money to express this.

Small businesses today are not scruffy, they are smart looking. Lawyers' offices today, I may say, are no longer, generally speaking, certainly in the city and towns, holes in the wall covered with dust and abandoned files and dark walls. They are, generally speaking, becoming very smart. Doctors'

offices, factories—labour itself, I think the hon. members most concerned with labour can point to the fact that big labour is moving into big labour palaces.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that big government should, in an area such as Ottawa—and big government is in my area affecting people in a vast variety of ways—should move into some equivalent type of premises. To reverse the slogan, it is not only the question of being sharp, I believe that the government of Ontario, at least in my region and I am sure in the others, should look sharp. Now, Mr. Speaker, the government of the province of Ontario in the Ottawa area, the Ottawa valley in eastern Ontario, certainly does not look sharp.

For all these reasons—I have spoken earlier of efficiency, there is no question of efficiency. I have spoken of economy, we pay in rent something like $86,000 a year for holes in the wall in Ottawa. Not only from the point of view of regional thinking and regional attitudes, but also, as I finish, from the point of view of image itself to the public, I think the government of Ontario has reached the point where on all scores it cannot simply say, as the hon. Minister said the other day, to answer the hon. member's question simply, we have not considered it at this point.

I would request as part of the consideration of this resolution, that the hon. Minister or the government give an intelligible and intelligent answer to the simple question, why not?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would the Speaker give his opinion as to whether or not this resolution borders on the line of being out of order inasmuch as it directs the spending of government funds?

Mr. Speaker: I would not like to rule on that point of order just at the present time. If it is a point of order, I would say the resolution was accepted by the the Clerk at the table and was placed on the order paper. I am content with it if it has been placed there. I do not feel like ruling that it is out of order.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that part of my argument is that this is a saving of government funds?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like an Opposition argument.

In considering what I might say on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I consulted with my hon. colleagues from Hamilton because I thought this would be a good example of another city in the province where we might discover what the exact situation is. But I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the report they gave me was considerable fulfilment of that scruffy image that the hon. member for Russell related to you with regard to the situation in Ottawa.

For example, in the city of Hamilton the agricultural representative for this government is at 1100 Main street west, the inspection service of The Department of Agriculture is at 150 Main street west. The Attorney General's department's legal offices is at the first division court at 20 King street east and the ninth division court at 63 John street east. There is a probationary service for adults at 146 Rebecca street. There is a fire marshal's office, the district office, at 20 Ellsworth drive. The provincial police are at 1160 North Shore east, in Burlington. The Labour department has an apprenticeship branch, and I understand it is in the Sottish rites building. It is one of the masonic orders, and it is behind a rather forbidding set of iron gates on the front of the building at 361 King street west. It is not uncommon to know of people going out to try to find this office and they cannot find it.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is wrong, it is on King street. It is the Grand Lodge offices and not the Scottish Rites cathedral.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was on one of the different rites, but within the same order apparently.

The Public Welfare office is to be found in the automobile club building, regional office, at 627 Main street east. The Public Works office is on Mount Hamilton. The Reform Institutions pro and rehab is on Wellington street north. Registration and examination branch, credit union section, is at 143 Main street east. The retail sales tax branch district sales tax office is at 361 King street west.

Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously when I relate this as a situation in Hamilton which apparently duplicates the situation in Ottawa, there is no need to argue further on the basic validity of the case for consolidating offices of the various departments of this government in one building for the convenience of intercommunication between the various departments at the governmental level; and also of course, for the convenience of the public

who do not have to chase for miles from one corner to another of a sprawling city, in order to find some government office where they can do business.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, for precisely the same reason that this government at Queen's Park is now consolidating its buildings instead of following the tendency to scatter them all over the metropolitan area, I think that we should have some consolidation of offices in various cities across the province.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, raises the question, which cities, which urban centres across the province should be picked? I would concede in advance that Ottawa is likely to be one of them, but there are two things about this resolution that disturb me very much. One is, as the hon. member himself has said, this is "old hat," every Ottawa member for some years now has talked about this. I did not realize that the hon. member was quite so desperate in trying to find a vehicle to build his political fortunes, as he seeks a new riding after distribution, that he had to ride this old hobby horse; because you, among others, Mr. Speaker, as representative from the Ottawa area, have discussed this many times.

More important, Mr. Speaker, is its parochialism. I was interested in the sober second thoughts that the hon. member apparently had after he had got the resolution in its present wording on the paper. He realized himself that it was very parochial, and so he was rather defensive. I would have hoped that any member of the stature of the hon. member who has introduced a resolution like this, would have acknowledged that what is good for Ottawa, is good for all other areas in the province, and that this would have been his first thought, as he placed the resolution on the order paper in this House. If he had done it that way, it is conceivable that we would not have had so much laughter—and I could not quite make up my mind as to whether the Conservative members in the House were laughing at him, or with him.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): We were laughing at the hon. member who is now speaking.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps the difficulty that the hon. member had, as he contemplated the proposition of regionalism and he took refuge in a vague and general approach to regionalism, is that it is difficult to know exactly what this government's concept of regionalism is.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Oh, now this is the vehicle for the hon. member's speech.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe. Right. This is the vehicle for my speech.

Mr. McKeough: It has taken five minutes to get to this.

Mr. MacDonald: I am glad to see that the hon. member has caught on. He is not asleep, like some other hon. members in the House, anyway.

This government has given some indication of its regional development plans across the province of Ontario, but it has given so little thought to them, that one does not know exactly what is the pattern and what are now referred to as the regional "capitals" in each of the areas.

At the risk of provoking some caustic comments from the other side of the House, I want once again to draw attention to the kind of rational, reasoned, thoughtful approach to regional development which has emerged belatedly—but I predict it is going to get ahead of this government—in our sister province.

They have only in recent years, started to give some consideration to regionalism. They had a pilot project in the Gaspé area. When they considered the proposition of how that could be applied all across the province, Mr. Speaker, they mapped out the province in terms of ten different regions, and when they announced those regions—I have a copy of the press release here, with a map that indicates the boundaries of the regions. Indeed there is an accompanying press release which gives the breakdown of what municipalities go into each region. Sometimes they have divided municipalities because they are coming up with a rational, modern division for economic purposes, not one that just happens to follow historic boundaries that have now become outdated. But these ten economic regions—and in seven of them, when they announced their approach, Mr. Speaker, they announced the regional capital. Indeed, they also announced 25 subregions and 16 intermediate regions and they designated growth centres around which economic development could take place.

They admitted quite frankly that in three of the regional development areas there were no obvious growth centres, so they have got to have the concentration of economic and other social sciences for a study

of this area, to find out how you can engender and inspire economic development.

Mr. Speaker, if we had that kind of an approach to regionalism, my friend would have had no difficulty. He would have known in most instances which city is going to become the regional capital, which city is going to be the spot in which each one of these government departments, in accordance with the generally announced policy, will be decentralizing its administration, so that we can do something to rescue ourselves from the administrative chaos, both at Queen's Park and out in the various areas across the province.

There are obvious advantages to doing this, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to list three or four of them.

First, in doing it in this way, there will be a uniformity of systems in the administrative regions, and this in itself would facilitate decentralization.

Second, there would be a better service to the public. It would bring the government closer to the people, and it would dispel something of the image that you find too prevalent in many parts of the province of Ontario, that Toronto is at a great distance, and indeed, they often substitute the name "hogtown" for Toronto.

Third, it facilitates co-ordinating and planning. There can be local co-operation between the various decentralized provincial departments, instead of communications all tending to come from the region into Queen's Park, then over to another department, and from that department back to the regional office, which may be five or six miles away from the other regional office in the city, so that you might as well be in a different country, instead of having close co-ordination of activities.

Finally, there is an accessibility of services, both public and private, and that becomes an incentive to regional industrial development. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the regionalization of administrative structures constitutes an essential phase in itself, of industrial development at a regional level—not only industrial development, but other economic development.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, as I listened to the hon. member, that his speech was so bewildering in many aspects of it, that it reminded me of a chat that he apparently had with Scott Young a few weeks ago. I would like to have listened in on that chat originally, because it was, as Mr. Young recorded it, most bewildering. I want to quote just two comments. The theme of the chat in that instance, was "a philosophy on fund-raising for political parties" and the hon. member is credited with saying that the only thing that a man is buying when he contributes to a campaign fund is a telephone, and Scott Young says:

> I looked rather puzzled in my naive malicious and stupid way so he explained.

And he quotes again the hon. member:

> I mean, they bought an open line.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, apart from its vicousness and its nastiness, it is not completely out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps what the member is now quoting is irrelevant to the subject-matter of the resolution.

Mr. MacDonald: It is one paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and I will tie it in with the Ottawa building sought on this resolution. I have a suggestion for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: As long as you do not pursue the article too far because it looks irrelevant to me at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: I have no doubt that it is embarrassing but the hon. gentleman was hitting out in many directions, including at his own government, and now apparently he cannot take it. To continue—

> I mean they bought an open—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, on what ground could this possibly be relevant?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member will learn its relevance if he will just sit down. I let him give his speech; he should not get so excited.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not excited at all. I just think the hon. member is being nasty for nastiness sake.

Mr. Speaker: The member will show the relevance.

Mr. MacDonald: I have one further paragraph.

> I mean they bought an open line. If I get a telephone call from somebody I know contributes $500 to my campaign, well, I am going to answer the call and certainly I am going to listen. If I get a call from somebody who did not give me a dime, I might let it wait for a week and, in some cases, I might never answer it.

That is the end of the reference there, Mr. Speaker, except I want to show you how I

think it should be tied in with this composite building.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in this building we should have a number of offices for the local members because I think it would be convenient that they, too, should be close to the government offices, and in it there should be telephones. The one telephone will be the direct line from the $500 contributors and on the other one we will have the blinking light that will go on in perpetuity for those who have not contributed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. White: The hon. member has a direct line from Charlie Millard.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say of the hon. member for Russell that I frankly had listened always very attentively to what he said because I see him, in a way, as a Jeremiah. By that I mean he is wailing for the children of Israel to take an accounting of themselves. It seems to me they have not always listened. As I watched him, I thought of him there in the loneliness of the wilderness surrounded by all those vacant faces. The leader of the New Democratic Party said that they were laughing: I thought they were crying in their misery. He pointed out the scruffy aspect of the government and a number of other adjectives that even I would refrain from saying about this government, but I thought them apt anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Perhaps the leader of the Opposition could get to the resolution before the House.

Mr. Thompson: I was referring to the very able way in which he was speaking, Mr. Speaker, on the resolution.

I think, sir, that the point that interests me was that the hon. member was suggesting a building; he was saying that this would centralize the services in Ottawa. The leader of the New Democratic Party had pointed out how people had to go here, there and everywhere in Hamilton, and certainly you could do this. You can go through in any of the cities to see the variety of addresses and realize the carefree abandon with which this government has offices here, there and everywhere. But I think it is only indicative of the complete lack of co-ordination on the part of the government. A building may help and I realize that what the hon. member for Russell is saying to the government is: "Wake up, start giving efficient service, start giving economic service, start giving able service." He says: "If we get a building, perhaps that will draw us together."

I suggest before the building, comes the spirit on the part of the Cabinet and leadership on the part of the Prime Minister of this province to take a co-ordinated approach to economic development. I know we have hammered this. I see a smile on the member's face, because I think in a way what he wanted to spark, as Jeremiah, was to get another voice crying for him, and I am intending to do that. I know he agrees with me when we are saying to the government: "Take a co-ordinated approach to economic development." It is ludicrous to see the hon. Prime Minister of this province stand up and give us the fanciful phrases—design for development, or whatever it was—hand us out a little booklet carefully prepared by PR men and I know they are certainly getting lots of work to do for the government—and then right after it we talk of estimates. We find that the hon. Minister of Education has his designated region; we find that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has his designated region; we find that the hon. Minister of Public Works—the very man you are wanting to establish a central office—is excluded from the regional development—the design for development, in the words of the hon. Prime Minister himself.

But first, sir, is the need for the leader of the Conservative government to give a recognition to regional development. Not in fancy phrases or in a book, "Design for Development," but in leadership, co-ordinating all the departments. Where does he go in this? The first thing is that he has to say that these are the areas, and these are going to be the regions. I would hope that he could point out ten areas. You see, I think the reason why the member had to refer to Ottawa alone and had to make that apology was the fact that he does not know any regions. There are no regions designated. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has his region, so if you are suggesting a central building to house the administration for Reform Institutions, it would differ from one of the other departments and so on. So being a rather suave diplomat, he decided he would just concentrate on Ottawa because he realized that they are abject in their poverty of policy concerning other regions. You could not go any further.

But this is obviously the first thing—first of all by the hon. Prime Minister of the province himself to head an economic development group. Secondly, we are going to

decide that these are the regions, and then to say, we will put a Public Works building, a central building, in the centre of each region. I may say, having travelled around the province, that I am fully aware that there is a resentment on the part of the people of Ontario at the lack of efficiency on the part of this government, and that there are people who feel they cannot get services unless they come down to the bureaucracy of Toronto. I think of such things as a mayor of a city which has a representative sitting across from me here, who has complained to me that in connection with assaying he has to come all the way down to Toronto and then back again up to the far north. In mining, he said: "Why could we not have some kind of decentralized office in the north?" And this complaint goes through the whole area. Kenora is 115 miles away from Winnipeg, yet from Toronto to Kenora is over 1,100 miles. They feel that services are not provided for them.

When I was in Kenora the last time, I had a number of requests from people there saying that they have to write to Toronto sometimes in order to get their voice heard. They will take the train and it takes them a day and a half or so to get to Toronto. As you know, Mr. Speaker, when people come to make representation to a Cabinet Minister, there has often been the situation that they cannot see a Cabinet Minister; that is why they are resorting to picketing. So you see there is resentment, and in order to help the government we should have the decentralized approach outside Toronto. There has been great fanfare about an extension to Queen's Park—this big extension here—and yet we realize that Public Works putting up projects at the proper time and in proper areas can give a stimulation to a riding and to an area. The problem is that there has been a concentration in Toronto, both on building and in services. One of my colleagues brought up the point, for example, of the medical insurance programme which the government has. Surely this could have been in some other area than Toronto? And I agree with him. There seems to be a steady attraction to concentrate in Toronto. But I would say, sir, that we would agree with the principle which I hope is behind this bill. I hope that the hon. member for Russell is really more broadminded with respect to regional development and co-ordinated services, that he was thinking of Ottawa. But the reason that he could not extend his vision to the whole of the province was because he had been stunted in being able to locate other regions, because as yet the hon. Prime Minister of the province and the Cabinet have not located regions.

I, sir, say to him, he has done a service as a Jeremiah, because he has wailed out and eventually his voice will be heard.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution from the hon. member for Russell, I would first of all try to throw a little light on the confusion that exists in the minds of the two hon. members preceding me.

What they are talking about here basically in the resolution is the means by which a building would incorporate the services that this goverment has given in Ontario. I endorse everything the hon. member for Russell says about the fact that we need to co-ordinate, for efficiency and service, all the different departments that are spread. I am grateful to the hon. member for York South, for he saved me the trouble of enumerating the various departments in Hamilton that are spread around, and also that he talked in terms, although I did not regard it as relevant to the recommendation, that we should have a capital city in each regional development, when we have regional development, that Hamilton, of course, would be the capital city of the region.

I feel that in my city of Hamilton, where we are now doing extensive urban renewal, and a big civic square development, it would enhance the status of the government, and the government of Ontario should have status because it is the largest and the best government in Canada. A new building incorporating the services—I counted 20 that are spread around in Hamilton. I quite appreciate that Transport and Highways must have its departments in the areas around.

An hon. member: Like Burlington!

Mrs. Pritchard: In centres like Burlington, the hon. member says. That was the place I had in mind, but I am thinking in terms of convenience and service to the public. In nearly three years of being in this House, I would hate to enumerate the number of calls I have had for services, and have had to hunt through the telephone book myself, to direct the people as to where they go. I think it is only practical that something like this should be done, and I am sure a building, the Ontario building of Hamilton, in the new civic square would greatly enhance everything.

Everything that can be said in support of this resolution has been said by the hon.

member for Russell. I would just like to add my voice and stick to the point of the resolution. I think it is an excellent idea, and I hope we get some support for it from this House.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution—of course, now that we have a clearer idea of the intent of the resolution, there is no doubt that we can support the need for consolidation of government services in Ontario. As has been said, the ultimate desirability would be that when we have developed our regional development areas and picked the spot, we should consolidate them in the manner appropriate to the province.

The final words of the hon. member for Hamilton Centre in appealing for support to the resolution, makes me wonder if we did right when we established the procedure of having an hour twice a week to deal with what we call private members' business.

I have some feeling that it is becoming somewhat of a farce in the House. Prior to having a fixed agreement in dealing with private members' bills—which I feel in the past have been presented to the House, put on the order paper, with a great deal of sincerity in the wish of the member to have dealt with by the House in a serious manner, in favour of some public betterment in the province and that we could gain opinion of the government and the Opposition as to their disposition of their particular problem.

Now, we find that the hon. government members have submitted more resolutions and bills in this session, than I ever remember before, simply because the procedure that we have adopted is to have an hour to speak it out, and it never then comes to any disposition.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are going to remind me that I am dealing now with procedure rather than with the resolution, but I think this had to be said, because I feel that the resolution had a certain amount of political connotations from the hon. member for Russell. It is very nice to be able to put a resolution of this type on the order paper, have it talked out and then tell one's constituents: "Well, I was in favour of this, but there was no way to bring it to fruition."

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Tell them also that the government was against it.

Mr. Gisborn: I am not sure whether they were or not. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the resolution, certainly the consolidation of the government services in the different areas would be beneficial to the people in their particular communities. Certainly those provincial services listed in the Hamilton phone book list only streets, they have left off some of the addresses in some of the locations, and some of the streets where we have government offices listed. I could not tell you how to find that street myself, after living in the city all my life.

For example, we have Department of Public Works, which is listed in the phone book as Mount Hamilton. Now, it gives no address and has a phone number, of course, but Mount Hamilton in my opinion is all of the city of Hamilton about the brow. This was always what we called Mount Hamilton, and if a person wanted to find the address or the location of that particular office, I have not the least idea how he would do it, rather than call maybe one of the other offices and ask someone if they knew just exactly where this service was.

So I would certainly support the proposition put forward by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party that when we establish our regional areas, then the principle in the resolution deserves a lot of merit that we establish the appropriate centralized service for the area mentioned.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to item 6, on the agreement, I move that this item be discharged.

Mr. Speaker: It being concluded, this order is discharged from the order paper.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order; House in committee on Bill 81, an Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I had been asked a question by the hon. member for St. George and I would really answer it in this way: I think first of all he himself almost answered it as he kept talking. I appreciate that he is perhaps in somewhat of a difficult situation, I understand he was an advocate for amalgamation and now he is perhaps trying to think of other difficulties attached to propositions or proposals by the Opposition. But I would say that the hon. Prime Minister also answered this for him. The Prime Minister explained that in about three years he could

see a division between the administration and the political sides of government, and I think that the hon. Prime Minister in his own role in this House answers this question.

The hon. Prime Minister has a deputy. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, some people could say, "Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, how can he look after the affairs of Timmins?" I am sure he would answer that he can look after them very well. Some of us might feel that perhaps he is looking after them too well, that we hope people will question that. But he has two roles. I think most would agree that he has a very responsible role as Minister of Municipal Affairs, where he is looking at a number of problems throughout the province, a number of municipalities throughout the province and he is looking at the question of regionalism in a whole number of areas.

But he also represents Timmins. And the thing that we delight in, which is so important, is that where there is someone with a responsible position in government, whether it is the chairman of Metro or whether it is the Prime Minister of this province or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, at some point he has to return to a constituency, to the people, and he has to face the people. If they feel he has not given a satisfactory accounting of himself, they will throw him out. And this to us is a basic principle, that a man who is chairman over Metro, with such a responsible job, with such influence, we do not believe that he should not be accountable to a group of people.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): They would throw him out as councillor of ward 2 in North York!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. member missed the answer, he was late. Does he want it again? The answer was given before he came in.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, that is a very interesting theory the hon. leader of the Opposition has presented. There is only one important fact which he has overlooked. When the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs goes back to his riding in the next election, no one else in the meantime has taken over his seat. This is very important. This is one of the frailties in the suggestion that the problem of a metropolitan chairman being a member of the elected council vacating his seat in the local council, is in the same position as the hon. Prime Minister as has been mentioned previously.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment, let me present the case, if I may. If an alderman or a councillor or a reeve of a local municipality is elected as metropolitan chairman, his seat becomes vacant—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course it becomes vacant. Is the hon. member suggesting it be left vacant or he holds both seats? That is ridiculous.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister does not understand.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, we understand. You either rule that his seat shall remain vacant in the local council or that he holds them both. Well now, as the hon. member has pointed out, to suggest that a chairman of the metropolitan council can be both a mayor of a borough of the city of Toronto and be metropolitan chairman at the same time is too much to expect of any man.

Mr. Singer: Not if you adopt the hon. Prime Minister's suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Prime Minister never suggested anything like the member suggests at this particular time. The member is talking about the future, we are talking about this bill at this particular time and we have to do something about it now.

Mr. Singer: Why not make it democratic now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in addition to the fact that his seat would be filled by somebody else in the meantime, he is going to be faced with the problem of having to compete possibly with another member of the metropolitan council in the upcoming election and the problem of all the infighting that is going to go on between the metropolitan chairman and the other person on Metro or in the local council who has taken his place in the local council in the meantime. This would not be conducive to a good chairmanship on the part of the person who is taking that position.

As a matter of fact, I could go back and point out to the hon. member for Downsview who keeps saying "no," when he appeared before the commission of inquiry, which was appointed and of which I had the honour to be a member, I think in 1957 or 1958 he appeared before the commission, and very strongly urged the retention of the

present system of the election of the metropolitan chairman.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting out into left field in this question. As in Bill 80, Bill 81 provides that the members of the metropolitan council may elect one of their own members or if in their wisdom they find someone more qualified, they may go outside. Now, I want to say to you about representation of the people: Every member of that metropolitan council represents the whole of metropolitan council; they are the voice of the people, they have the alternative. If they find the man who is adequate for the job within their ranks they will elect him, but we, so far, I hope, will continue to give them the privilege, if they find a man outside who, in their opinion, as of the people, is more qualified to chair the metropolitan council, they should be privileged to do so.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, the process of rationalization that we are hearing from the other side of the House now is quite interesting to listen to.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Who says it is rationalization?

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the interjection by the hon. member for St. George is correct, the bill we are discussing is not rational and that is his dilemma. The member rose and, in effect, said the principle of what was being advocated from this side of the House is indisputable. He concurred with it completely.

But now as a political face-saving device, he is beginning to become preoccupied with the political difficulties of putting it into effect. Just let me, in a brief word, say that there is no resolution of these difficulties within the framework of the bill presented.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I agree with that.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. In other words, to get up and say, for example, that maybe two or three years from now you will consider getting on to a democratic basis and making the chief executive of the metropolitan area responsible to the people. You cannot consider it then, because you will be faced with the dilemma then that you are faced with now, it is inherent in the kind of half-baked compromise structure that you have come up with in this bill. If you had come up with basically the kind of structure that we have been advocating on this side of the House and which I think the hon. member in his heart agreed with, then your dilemma would have been resolved.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: If this is half-baked, then the hon. member's is fully baked.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, that is right, it is well considered and well baked and ready for consumption at both ends, both in terms of amalgamation to meet the needs of the whole city and in terms of decentralized administration to make it possible for the government to be close to the people. The hon. member is right, it is wholly considered, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. MacDonald: However, Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the first case of rationalization we got and that was the statement of the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon. As we approached section 3 of the bill, he made a lengthy statement but all of it was addressed to subsection 5 with reference to the chairman.

Let me say this, Mr. Chairman, that it may have been valid to have had an appointed chairman in the formative years of Metro. I say it may have been valid. I will acknowledge that this is a principle that we have applied in other places in the development of government, in certain areas of northern Ontario. For example, in an improvement district where you are beginning to establish the nucleus of a local government, you start with an improvement district and after it gets established to a certain degree, you will move on to a duly elected basis in accordance with the normal municipal setup.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very dangerous proposition that this abrogation of democracy should be carried on for any longer. Indeed, I go back and say it may have been valid in the first instance. As far as I will go, is that it may have been valid. The proposition that you are going to abrogate this basic democratic principle, for the choice of a man who is going to be representing, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has pointed out, a quarter of the people of the province of Ontario—a group of people that is larger than the majority of the provinces in the whole of this country—I think is offensive to those who profess to believe in democracy.

Indeed, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the kind of arguments that we heard on the other side are a Tory concept of democracy that was very prevalent 100 years ago. I would have hoped that having moved into the second half of the 20th century, we would have passed the stage where you would have been expressing fears about the proposition of the kind of man you might get as your leader, that if you did not have complete control of the situation, you might get a demagogue. I suppose as most Conservatives look at Ottawa these days, this is the kind of philosophy that comes back to them and they wonder, if they had a chance to appoint their leader again, they would not escape this kind of consequence, but I think we have gone as long as we should in terms of abrogating this basic principle of democracy.

The hon. Prime Minister advanced a couple of other arguments, Mr. Chairman. He said; "Let us put it off for three years." Now, surely this is most unconvincing. If we have moved for a 10, or 11, or a 12-year period in establishing a metropolitan form of government, and we are now presumably establishing a pattern for the foreseeable future, surely I do not need to remind anybody in this House of the kind of dislocation and controversy—in fact, the near-chaos—that has been created because of the uncertainties of this kind of shift. Why should you invite the proposition that two or three years from now you will reconsider many of these basic points? I think quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, that it is a delusion. You have no intention of doing this, and no likelihood of doing it. Indeed, if you get an appointed chairman as part of the new structure, certain inertias will settle into the picture and come into play; the prospect that it will be reconsidered two or three years from now, I venture to predict at the present time, will be nil.

The other argument that the hon. Prime Minister advocated was let us not take the risk of this kind of a fundamental change. You know, Mr. Chairman, it is almost laughable that from that side of the House we should have the argument that this is a progressive bill which is really grappling with the problems of this area. In that context, when you talk about the fulfillment of a basic principle of the election in accordance with the democratic process of the chief executive of Metropolitan Toronto, the hon. Prime Minister should counter with the argument: "Let us not take the risk of a fundamental change," and add the specious argument that we have had accomplishments in Metro over the past ten years. Presumably those accomplishments are because we have had an appointed chairman, and therefore we should go on without change.

Mr. Chairman, we in this party simply do not accept it, and what is more important, I am convinced that in their first choice, a majority of the hon. members from the metropolitan area sitting in this House do not believe in it. Indeed, if one were to go back to *Hansard* and list those who got up and raised their voice in terms of (a) amalgamation and (b) of the proposition that we should have an elected chairman for the metropolitan area, it included not only many of the so-called backbenchers, it reached right into the Cabinet. So what we have had here is a decision that has been made by those who are determined to shape it in this form at the present time, and it has been imposed. To quote one hon. member who came out of that caucus where the imposition took place: "Well, at least we went down with our flags flying; we fought a good fight right to the end."

It is not good enough, in terms of meeting the needs of the people. I do not know who that person was; it was quoted as one of those who had been leading the battle. Conceivably it was the hon. member for St. George.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think we must recognize that whether we like it or not, we are going to have an appointed chairman.

An hon. member: Oh, I don't know.

Mr. Sargent: I think there are enough numbers there to guarantee this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: I think, Mr. Chairman, the motivation for the government having stated their position insofar as having an appointed chairman, was to have the most able person possible to head up a Metro form of government. Somewhere along the line I think this bill will come into effect. Three years hence, 1969, we will have the first nomination. I think that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and his advisers in the presentation of this bill have come up with a pretty good framework to handle this trail-breaking piece of legislation. But I would like to caution them along this line of thinking, qualifying the need to have the

best person possible to head up this Metro form of government. I would think that we must ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, and you probably have thought of this somewhere along the line, that each contender for Metro council, and this may complicate the whole matter, should call his shots, as it were, and should run on that basis, not elected by accident. This is not a popularity contest, but rather one of ability. I think that these people who would aspire to being on the Metro council, in running for election, must state their qualifications and be able to handle this job. Somewhere along the line, I think the hon. Minister must view this as being an alternative, if we are going to have the democratic process, Mr. Chairman, where we have an elected chairman—and that is what the people want. But on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I think that the government is trying to get the most able man they can to head up this department. I think there would be, somewhere along the line, a compromise in the framework of this bill. I do not see, in reading the bill, that you would have two segments running in each of the six boroughs—people running for Metro, and people running for the individual councils. In this way, you could get the top people to call their shots, as it were, as being part and parcel of this Metro government that would handle, possibly, two million people. I think that somewhere along the line you must think in this way to answer both segments, and the demand for democratic process and for able people.

Mr. Chairman, again I say that you have, I think, a trail-breaking piece of legislation here and the framework is good. But you must adhere to the rights of people to have elected persons, and a compromise in having people call their shots in what they are running for.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I think it is pretty obvious that the government has painted itself into a corner on this question. That in itself is probably not an occasion for comment, because this is a position in which the government is finding itself with increasing frequency at the present time. The unfortunate thing, however, is that it has also painted democracy into a corner. It is denying, in the proposal it has before us, what I think is a fundamental democratic principle. I never did agree with the appointment of the Metro chairman and I think that the proposition becomes less and less tenable as we go along. We have been going along now for well over a decade with an appointed chairman, and I think it is time we started on the path of democracy as far as the chief magistrate of this huge municipality is concerned.

I have listened with interest to the explanations given as to why the Metro chairman cannot be elected, starting with the statement read by the hon. Prime Minister earlier in the day.

The plain implication of every explanation we have heard yet, Mr. Chairman, is that we will never have an elected Metro chairman in this area—not as long as the present government is in power persisting with the present pattern of legislation. All of the objections to the election of the chairman that were raised will be equally applicable in 1970 or 1975 or 1980 if we continue with the same structure of government. It is futile for government supporters to get up and say this is an interim measure and the situation will change. There is no reason to believe that the situation will change at all unless the law is changed, or unless the structure of goverment is changed. As my hon. leader pointed out, we have made a proposal from this side that would permit the election of the chairman and meet all of the objections that have been raised. However, that pattern—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the hon. member? There is a constant reference to the election of a chairman. I think, so that the public will not be confused, it would be just as well if it were understood. Is the hon. member talking about area-wide election or of the appointment of a member of the metropolitan council who happens to be one of the elected representatives?

Mr. Bryden: I am speaking to this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I have already stated that I am against the concept of area-wide election; I just do not think it is practical. So when I use the term "elected chairman" I mean a chairman chosen from among the elected members of the metropolitan council. I appreciate the hon. Minister calling this point to my attention so that I can make myself clear on it.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): The hon. member is against democracy in its fullest concept.

Mr. Bryden: That is not democracy at all, that is not democracy in accordance with our traditions at all.

I am in favour of the democratic method as we are accustomed to it. I am not going to

say anything derogatory about our neighbours to the south. They have their system of government which involves a massive, plebiscite type of elections. These are things that they understand, but I do not think we have ever been able to make that type of system work. I am talking about democracy in terms of our traditions.

In our traditions, the normal method is that candidates for public office run for constituencies and that one of the people elected from the constituencies becomes the chief officer of the legislative body. That is our tradition, that is what we have proposed as the method for this area. That method would eliminate all of the objections that have been put forward by the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, the hon. member for St. George and others.

However, that is out of the window. Now we have to deal with this unsatisfactory type of structure that is before us. There is no doubt that if it is provided in the law, as it should be in my opinion, that in this new structure the chairman is to be elected from among the elected members of the council, certain difficulties will arise.

The hon. member for St. George called attention to the difficulties, but we will always have those difficulties. I think that the choice we are facing now is quite a simple one. Because of the difficulty, are we going to throw the democratic principle out the window? Or are we going to accept the democratic principle and try to find a solution to the difficulties?

The difficulties will not be insuperable. They are there, there is no use pretending they do not exist, but in my opinion the proposition that should take precedence is that the chairman should be a person who faces the electorate personally somewhere in the area. I think that principle should take precedence, and that the objections should take second place. We can recognize that difficulties will arise, but I think they are difficulties that we should be prepared to work out in the process of time. It will indeed be the job of the elected members in the area to work those difficulties out, but I do not think that we should abandon the democratic principle just because in this specific case it is going to be difficult to implement it.

Most of the members of this House who represent constituencies in the Metro area have spoken in favour of the principle of the selection of a Metro chairman from among the elected members. When I say most of them have said this, I am talking not only about members on this side where I think all of them have come out in favour of either that or of area-wide election, at any rate some principle of election; I am also talking about the Metro Toronto members on the other side of the House.

Mr. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Five out of 19.

Mr. Bryden: Of those who have spoken, in my recollection, most of them came out in favour of this principle.

Mr. Eagleson: Check your *Hansard*.

Mr. Bryden: I will be happy to take the count of the hon. member for Lakeshore, I am glad to see him here. He is so rarely with us, it is nice to hear him from time to time. If he has been checking the *Hansard* while the rest of us have been tending to the business in the House, I would be happy to get the results of his check. I will say only that I am going on my own recollection of what the various hon. members said.

I am now referring only to those who spoke on the bill, but several of them did. I certainly remember several of the Conservative members from the Metro area speaking in favour of the principle that is incorporated in this amendment. Actually, I remember only two who spoke against it of all the hon. members who spoke at all on the bill. The hon. member for Armourdale was one, I think, who clearly spoke against that principle. I cannot remember who the other one was, but I think there was one other. On the other hand there were at least half a dozen, including one of the senior members of the Cabinet, who favoured the principle.

This is the position that has been taken by the people who represent constituencies in this area. I suggested at the time that the government should take some heed of what the people in the area think. I think their elected members can speak for them better than anyone else and there is no doubt about what the elected members said, that the people in this area want the principle of democratic election to apply to the chairman.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that when the hon. members in the Toronto area who spoke in favour of this principle made their speeches, they had the bill before them. They knew what the structure was going to be. There have been

some modifications made in the bill since then but essentially its principles are exactly the same. They knew exactly what the structure would be, they knew the council was to consist of representatives of different levels of status, if I may put it that way, from the constituent municipalities.

They surely saw at the time that some difficulties might arise if, for example, the mayor of Toronto were elected Metro chairman. That surely was obvious to them at the time. I do not think they are stupid, I do not think they failed to note that fact; yet they still spoke in favour of the principle incorporated in the amendment. But now when the issue is squarely before them, suddenly they profess to have discovered a whole lot of difficulties. I would like an explanation of how these difficulties suddenly came to their attention. I am—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: To whom is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. Bryden: I am sure that they were aware of them at the time. Of course, we did read in the newspapers that they were all called into a meeting where one can only assume that the line was laid down for them. One of them, as my leader noted, was quoted in the paper. An unnamed one was quoted in the paper as saying, "We went down fighting with our flags flying."

Well, frankly I do not see any flags flying, Mr. Chairman. I think the flags have fallen down into the dirt. They did not go down fighting; they went down whimpering, they just gave up the ghost. They represent the people of this area, but the government apparently does not care what the people of this area think, so the Conservative members from the area apparently are ready to take it and make the most of it.

If they really believe—as they lead us all to think—that this principle incorporated in the amendment is a sound one, I think they should be prepared to stand up and declare themselves. We read a great deal in the newspapers about the battles that were being led by some of the private members in this area, but the battles all seem to have fizzled out completely.

I trust that a careful note will be taken of how each Metro member votes on this amendment. I do not mean only the members over there, I mean the members here too.

Since we are in committee, we will not have a record taken of how individual members vote; this is unfortunate but that is the way the rules are. However, it is quite easy to observe how the members from this area vote.

I think what the members from outside the area do is of secondary importance. We in Toronto are having this vicious principle shoved down our throats by people from outside the area—if that is what is going to happen—so I think at least the people of Toronto and the Metro area are entitled to know how their representatives voted. I hope a note will be taken of how each one individually votes, and I hope that the Chairman will permit them all to stand in their places long enough so that note can be taken.

I would also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is not good enough for a member to duck the issue by being absent from the House. I believe that every Metro member should be present in this House when the vote on this amendment is taken. They should be prepared to stand up and declare themselves to indicate whether, indeed, they are fighting a battle or have capitulated ignominiously.

One last point, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to draw to the attention of the House is that the words it is proposed to be struck out are "or any other person." In other words, if this amendment is defeated and the section goes through as it is, it will be within the power of the Metro council to appoint as its chairman a person who is not even a qualified elector in this area. They can appoint anybody at all; they could even appoint Mao Tse-tung—I understand that he may be looking for a job fairly soon, in any case.

Surely, this should at least be restricted to a person who is a qualified elector in the Metropolitan Toronto area. It should not be so wide that anybody could be brought in from anywhere. However, Mr. Chairman, that really is only a secondary point. The major point, as I see it, is that the words should be struck out entirely; there should not merely be a revision of them. I think we have to assert, more than a decade after the establishment of Metro Toronto, that the day of the appointed chairman from outside the ranks of the council is over; from here on in we should do what the hon. gentlemen opposite say may be possible in a few years, we should have him chosen from the ranks of the elected members. If it is possible three years from now, it should be possible now. So let us go ahead and do it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out in the first place that I do not support the amendment; I support the idea that is in the bill, and—

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Really?

Mr. Cowling: Yes, all the way.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member changed his tune.

Mr. Cowling: No, I have not changed my tune; I have had the same tune for 12 years, but you know, so many of these things that we hear mentioned tonight remind me of debates in 1953, when the Opposition said of the government. "You are ramming this down the throats of the people. You have not had a vote in the area." As a matter of fact, there were a couple of votes and they were against setting up a metropolitan form of government at any time—

Mr. Ben: If it was true then, it is true now.

Mr. Cowling: And now the people say, "It is a great job you did; it was a wonderful thing the Conservative government of the day did, by setting up a metropolitan form of government." It has proved to be successful, beyond a doubt; everybody admits that—even the hon. member admits that.

Mr. Ben: How are the sewers in High Park, Alf?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Cowling: All right, we will get back to the amendment. I say that we have a good thing going here; everybody says that wherever you go on a platform with political people and other people and the subject of Metropolitan Toronto is brought up, everybody says it is a wonderful thing. It is the only municipality of its kind on the North American continent; we have people coming here from all over the world to study this form of government, including the office of the appointed chairman.

Are we just going to throw that out the window? Something that is successful? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we spend hours and hours and days and weeks and months, talking about unsuccessful things that this government is doing. Well, for heaven's sake, let us agree that this is one thing that is successful. Nobody on that side has said that it is successful—not anybody.

Mr. Bryden: Not even this is successful.

Mr. Cowling: Not anybody.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I have—

Mr. Cowling: Nobody pays much attention to what the hon. member says, anyway.

I am saying this, the government is proposing that we reduce the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto from 13 governments to six—

Mr. Singer: If it is so successful, why change it at all?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, please.

Mr. Cowling: Because it is progress; we are progressing. We are amending the bill. Now, this is simply an amendment to the original Bill 80; it is a progressive amendment, like so many other things we do around here. Nobody is trying to stuff anything down anybody's throat. After all, Mr. Chairman, let us appreciate the fact that we have 77 members over here and they just have a few there. Now, if we could be accused of stuffing things down the voters' throats, the situation might be changed. But it is not; this is the way it is today, so the people must like the way our government is operating.

Mr. Chairman: On subsection 5—election of chairman.

Mr. Cowling: On subsection 5—on the amendment. Mr. Chairman, it is a glorious opportunity to wander just a little bit—just a little bit. We sit here by the hour and listen to the wanderings of the other side. It is just a wonderful experience to wander just a little bit—but stay on Bill 81, in the section.

In conversations with the heads of all the municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto now, every one, without exception, favours the appointment of the chairman, by the council. Now, when we say "appointment" do not forget, Mr. Chairman, that this chairman is being elected by elected people; bear that in mind. He is not just being appointed by the government or somebody outside the elected people. These representatives on the metropolitan council are all elected, so they choose as they believe is right: they choose. So that really the office of the chairman is an elective office when it is boiled right down.

It is a very unique office. There is nothing like it in any municipality that I

know of, and we have nearly 1,000 of them in Ontario. We have many thousands of them in Canada, but there is no top municipal office like that of the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto—anywhere.

Now, we are making a great change and it is amazing to me, Mr. Chairman, how this idea of electing the chairman has become so important, when we stop to consider the really important things that are being brought about by this Bill 81, such as putting all the welfare services at the metropolitan level, by forming a wonderful new ambulance service, by doing something about the disposal of waste.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, and so getting back to the amendment again, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how this rates all the importance that it is getting.

As far as the present chairman is concerned and the first chairman of Metropolitan Toronto—two outstanding men, and they have done a great job, and I say why spoil a good thing? We have got a great government going here, we have a great municipal system operating for the benefit of the two million people in this area, and why change it just for the sake of change? I say leave it the way it is.

Mr. Bryden: Well, why have the bill at all?

Mr. Cowling: There are many other things in the bill that I just told you about. This is progressive. We have got the right man in the right spot, let us leave it the way it is, and move on to bigger and better things.

Mr. Chairman: May I remind the members of the House that there are almost 50 sections in this bill, and we are on section 3. I would ask the members if they would stay with subsection 5 under 3. The Provincial Secretary, please.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, speaking in favour of the section as introduced by the hon. Prime Minister, and against the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I should like to make a few succinct points, I hope, and trust, in view of your admonition.

First of all, the 32 gentlemen who will form Metro council—

Mr. Singer: Or ladies.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Or ladies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or anyone else.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —will have between them the greatest collection of votes ever cast for any body of its size, even with the turnout that they have.

They will have as the reeves and controllers of the five boroughs, as the mayor and the controllers and the aldermen of this city, the top aldermen, they will have amongst them an aggregate of votes that very few bodies of such a comparatively small number of men will have. They will go there with the authorization of the votes of the people of Metropolitan Toronto. Why does the hon. leader of the Opposition have so little faith and confidence in the ability and judgment of five reeves, and one mayor—

An hon. member: Six mayors!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —six mayors, and at least as many, if not more, controllers, and aldermen? Why should he have so little confidence in the people in which over a million people will have expressed their confidence?

Mr. Eagleson: Because the people have so little confidence in him.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I say to him that I do have that faith and I will not lose it. My only regret is that he does not see fit to be in the House when these very important sections are being discussed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Will you please listen to the succinct remarks of the Provincial Secretary?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, why, in this day and age, would he want to limit the ambit of discretion and good judgment? He is not giving to them anything; he is taking away from those to whom a million people or more will have cast their votes. A further field of activity is what it amounts to. The hon. leader of the Opposition would circumscribe the powers of this body. The interesting thing is to follow the definition of the principle of democracy, as enunicated on behalf of one of the spokesmen of the NDP, his principle of democracy. Democracy, as I see it, in the ultimate sense is that anybody who represents anybody should have had at least the opportunity of having that person cast a ballot for or against him. But that is not the principle of democracy which

is the true and ultimate principle that the hon. member for Woodbine subscribed to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is out of the House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is out of the House, Mr. Chairman. I see the quizzical look on the face of the hon. member for Riverdale and I ask him to pay attention to me. Is it not a true principle of democracy that the man who is going to represent somebody in a democracy should be there by reason of others having cast a ballot for or against him? But that is not the principle. Who has painted himself into a box? The hon. member for Woodbine, because he is talking in favour of democracy, but he realizes that that ultimate perfection cannot be achieved in this special case.

Mr. Singer: Not with the Tories.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It cannot be achieved in this special case, so we have to find out what will work. Mr. Chairman, we are in exactly the same position—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, in a way we are almost as if we were discussing a debate in 1954 when I was present. The same arguments which were advanced in favour of an elected Metro mayor were advanced at that time, and I may say we reached a decision, a considered judgment on the basis of experience, we trusted in our judgment that it would work better if we did not have an area-wide elected chairman, and we were right.

Now having been proved right, on the basis of experience—

An hon. member: Who said you were?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member for High Park used—

An hon. member: He is not here either.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I sum it up very simply. It works. It works, the system that we decided, works. You do not, as the hon. member said, tinker with what works. You do not change for the sake of change. Even that great newspaper, the *Telegram*—which also went down with flying colours, because it fought a great battle for amalgamation and an elected Metro-wide mayor having accepted the good judgment of the government, that that was not to be, said, "Well, if that is not to be"—and certainly the Toronto *Telegram* speaks on behalf of Metro residents and city of Toronto residents—"if that is not to be, then let us not circumscribe the powers of the Metro council."

Mr. Chairman, the council that we are now appointing through Bill 81—the powers we have given them are going to give them a lot to digest, not only for the next three years, but for the next six years. Let us change that which needs to be changed, not change for the sake of change.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I was only trying to make an exceedingly short answer, but I want to say I agree with the last speaker, the hon. Provincial Secretary, that the system they now have works.

It creaks, grinds, groans, rattles, squeaks, bumps and coughs, like one of Rube Goldberg's devices, but even they work, and this present system works the same way.

Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say this. The people in the metropolitan area want an elected chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who said so?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Ben: Democratic principles ask for an elected chairman. Hon. members in this House, from the government benches, ask for an elected chairman. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for High Park was even suggested as running for that post.

Mr. Cowling: That is fine with me, but I was not for the election.

Mr. Ben: All I can say is this, Mr. Chairman, if those hon. members from the government benches who spoke in favour of an elected chairman, now choose to vote against the way they spoke, I suggest they go tonight and buy electric razors. It is going to be darn tough to shave tomorrow morning with even a safety razor, without a mirror. And furthermore, all those hon. members on the other side—

Mr. Eagleson: The hon. member would not know what government solidarity meant.

Mr. Ben: Yes, I know what government solidarity means, that is why I was going to suggest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Keep to section 5, please.

Mr. Ben: That is all I have to say.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words—

Mr. Chairman: One moment please. The member for Humber.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, tonight is an unusual night. I am sure that hon. members had at least four invitations at supper time to attend some affairs and I am sure that most of them did. Therefore, I would say that probably they did not read this evening's papers. Now, of all papers, the Toronto *Daily Star* has seen fit to print a letter to the editor from a former Toronto mayor. Mr. Chairman, if you permit me to read that letter, then I would say to the Opposition—usually I am a polite guy and I expect the same courtesy in return—let me read the letter before you start heckling or interjecting.

EVEN TORONTO HAD APPOINTED MAYORS

Your editorial of May 7, "Robarts betrays democracy" is difficult to fathom.

For two periods in Toronto's history, mayors were chosen by city council (for over 30 years) and in the United Kingdom—

Mr. Leader of the Opposition:

—no mayor is chosen by direct municipal vote. The chairman of the London county council is chosen from among the councillors and that job is somewhat bigger than Metro's. Is this a sign of betrayal of democracy?

It has not been explained by the proponents of the Metro-wide-chairman-vote proposal how this would be done, other than by a vote over the entire area—quite a chore. If a party system prevailed, the task would be simplified, but many of us do not agree with this.

It could be argued, too—

Mr. MacDonald: That is anti-British, against the British tradition.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: To continue:

It could be argued, too, that a minority of voters (20 to 40 per cent) selecting anyone hardly constitutes a democratic choice.

In my opinion—

and I wish the Opposition would listen to this:

In my opinion, Bill Allen has done a good job as Metro chairman—

and this is the meat of the whole subject:

—and the elected representatives in 1967 could be relied upon to make a wise choice, whether from inside or outside the council.

That is signed by a former mayor of Toronto, a Conservative, Leslie Saunders.

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to add very shortly my words in support of the amendment. On second reading of the bill, Mr. Chairman, I spoke in favour of a chairman being an elected person and, to paraphrase the comments of the hon. member for High Park, I can say that I spoke to many people in the riding of Etobicoke and each and every one of them without exception came out in favour of the election of the chairman. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment as proposed by my hon. leader.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member know what the amendment says?

Mr. Thompson: Certainly he does.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, in order that we may review this very lengthy debate on a very important part of the bill—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member for Downsview wanted to speak in advance of the Minister.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am rather amazed to hear the histrionic performance put on by the hon. Provincial Secretary when he states his few succinct points on how he is going to explain away something that really he knows nothing about. It is obvious as he talks he does not know anything about them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I brought in Bill 80 that elected the hon. member as reeve of North York.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough South): And we will forgive you for it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may never forgive myself.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the hon. Minister had to do with Bill 80, but he obviously has not understood the progression and improvement of the government in the metropolitan area.

The government has seen fit rightly or wrongly to bring in this Bill 81. When the hon. member for High Park and the hon. Provincial Secretary stand up and say, "Let us not change because everything is fine," they are negating all the principles put forward by the hon. Prime Minister and by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. If everything is so perfect, let them never disturb it at all, let us tear up this bill and stay with Bill 80 and that is the end of it.

I listened very carefully to the hon. Prime Minister's remarks and he said that, perhaps, in three years the time will have come when we can separate the administrative functions from the elected functions. If we can do it in three years, Mr. Chairman, why can we not do it today?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I think it is obvious.

Mr. Singer: It is not obvious at all. All the hon. members of the Treasury benches are able to find Deputy Ministers, and I am certain—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, is the hon. member suggesting that we would split these functions as of now and between now and the election at the end of December, 1966, that we would throw this whole thing into a position where the chairman of the Metro council would be elected in one way or another? Is this what the hon. member is suggesting?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I am suggesting and I suggest you could do it in a very simple way. The chairman would no longer be the head of council and the chief administrator. You would just take away from his duties that of chief administrator.

I am sure the hon. Prime Minister must be familiar with the senior civil servants, the department heads down at Metro. Certainly, among that group there are half a dozen who quickly come to my mind who could be chosen almost immediately to be the chief civil servant for the metropolitan council. There is no point in naming them, anyone who has anything to do with metropolitan council knows that one of the important reasons for success has been that it has a good strong group of senior civil servants. From those one could easily be chosen as the senior administrator. Then, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with having the chairman doing just the political job and heading the council? What is wrong with having him do that in the same way as the Prime Minister runs the Legislature? The Prime Minister is not the chief administrator, the Prime Minister is the leader of the party and the political leader.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He also does a lot of the administration.

Mr. Singer: He does not do the administration, he is not charged with the administration as such. In the same way that the hon. Prime Minister leads the government of the province, so the chairman of the metropolitan council could do it. I have heard several references to the system in England and we know that the chairman of the London county council is chosen from amongst the elected members. In most of the English cities, probably all the English cities, this is the way it is done, and they seem to get their job done even though they hold two offices. The people who elected the Lord Mayor are not unhappy because their alderman is Lord Mayor at the time; they do not seem to worry about the neglect that is going to come through.

Mr. Chairman, even looking at this bill, in the education setup, in subsection 4 of section 129 on page 16: "At the first meeting of the school board at each year at which a quorum is present, the school board shall elect as a chairman one of its members." Good enough for the school board? Why is it not good enough for the council? What are you afraid of? Why is it going to be better three years from now, than it is now?

Mr. Chairman, I would have hoped that the government would have been sufficiently progressive to take this obvious step and to ensure in the minds of the people who live in Metropolitan Toronto that there is a democratic method of carrying on the affairs of Metro. It is as simple as that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has changed his mind.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I have, and I am glad that the hon. Minister has mentioned that. I would think that over the period of five or ten years that Metro has existed, there needed to be a different system because there was serious trouble. The hon. Provincial Secretary was talking about the birth of Metro as though it had been a grand discovery, that this was crisis legislation, that the growth in the whole metropolitan area had completely stopped—no water, no sewers, no schools, no borrowing ability; and the government shilly-shallied and shilly-

shallied, until development was either at an end or something radical had to be done.

It did not emerge as any natural evolution, it was crisis legislation and it turned out to be good legislation, because it started the process going again, and for that the government deserves credit. They did it late, and they did it only after the emergency had reached that extent.

Over a period of ten years, the system has been set on a reasonable basis. The time has come for amendments; we do not agree with the way these amendments are made but the time has come. Why not take the other step now; why not be brave, why not be democratic?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, this has been a most unreal debate. What we are talking about is a power structure—not carried at all, I think it is up to every hon. member of Metropolitan Toronto to get up and express himself on this particular point. I do not think any one of us need apologize for taking up the time of the House about it.

What we are talking about is a built-in structure of political power in the metropolitan area. The only political structure that has existed in the city of Toronto for many, many years has been, in substance, a non-democratic one. The result of the erosion over the years of the balance of power that used to exist in the Metropolitan Toronto area, and particularly in the city of Toronto, required a change in that power structure. The only way that this government could see fit to do it, was to superimpose a second tier of government at a time of crisis on the structure of government in the metropolitan area. Why? Because it was not prepared at any time to provide a democratic system of government. The only time in the city of Toronto when you get an effective government is when you are wedded to and insist upon a democratic system of election of representatives.

If we attempt to continue to mix the English system and the American system, we are going to find that we have the insurmountable logical difficulties to which the hon. member for St. David—and I believe the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions—referred tonight as the reasons why they find themselves able to vote in favour of this particular section of the bill, and undoubtedly against this amendment.

Naturally, if you provide the framework that this bill provides, the government has really presented an almost insuperable obstacle to, at any time, reaching the point where the chairman of the metropolitan council will, in fact, be elected. It is very simple to spell out the logical inconsistencies. Naturally, you must leave in the bill the provision that the chairman is going to be elected from among the members of metropolitan council, or from somewhere else, because in the first instance, if you do elect the first chairman under this particular system, from among the members of the metropolitan council, you are obviously going to be faced three years later, with the problem of what to do with that chairman, and that problem will mean—does that chairman step down and run as an alderman in order that he will be eligible to resume a place on the metropolitan council from which he can be elected back to the position of chairman?

There is no magic in that; this is the system which this government insists is going to be foisted upon the metropolitan area as a method of government. Now that is inconsistency. There is nothing which we on this side of the House can obviously do about it; it is also equally true the metropolitan members on the government side can do nothing about that system. The government has insisted upon that, but does that mean that we must say that we are going to vote for the system and against the proposition that the chairman should be elected? This is what you are asking us to do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If what the hon. member says is true, he is going to make it worse by the amendment. Do not vote for an amendment. Vote against the whole bill then. You would just destroy the whole system.

Mr. Renwick: This is the position we are placed in. Now, this does not mean that we are going to give up the principle that the chairman of the metropolitan council should be an elected person, because the system which this government insists on placing before us in this bill is an unworkable one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If it is an absurd proposition; the hon. member is going to make it worse.

Mr. Renwick: What we are saying is that very simply in two or three or six or 12 years' time, with the system which this government is insisting upon, we will never

be able effectively to elect a chairman of the metropolitan council. There is no method by which this system can evolve into an elective system. One need only refer to the two-tier system of elections which found favour in England and found favour, strangely enough, at the time of the founding of the American nation. In the Constitution of the United States it is quite simple; they felt that it was not wise to provide for the direct election of the President; they provided and the Constitution still provides, that you vote for members of an electoral college and they, in turn, assemble and elect the President, but in the course of time, you know, as well as I do, that that system simply did not work. They did not discard the system, but the election of the President of the United States today, regardless of the form, is a direct election by the people of the United States. But even that kind of system, which was formalized on a two-tier basis to protect against the so-called danger which, apparently, the government fears in the election of a chairman of the metropolitan council, gave way to a democratic overall vote for the President of the United States.

We are not necessarily in favour of that, but what we are saying is that the two-tier system which you have imposed, in this bill, does not even allow that system to evolve. On the other hand, it will not allow the traditional system that we know, to evolve, because you will not go to the proposition where you have directly elected people from constituences—all elected on the same basis. What we have done, and what the hon. member for Humber has pointed out, is to take the English system. For a short period of time the mayor of the city of Toronto was elected from among the councillors or the aldermen who were elected. Then we adopted a portion of the American system and elected the mayor from an overall vote across the city of Toronto. In this way we have mixed the two systems of government and this is what has happened in the metropolitan area from the point of view of an historical analysis of the political evolution of this system of government.

All we are asking is for the government to choose one or other of the alternatives, either to go to a system by which the two-tier system will, in fact, operate and let the due course of time decide whether the people will do as they did in the United States and, in fact, vote directly for the chairman on a two-tier system on a democratic basis; or return to the other system of representative democratic government, which is the one we are familiar with. In a large area such as the metropolitan area, let us have the constituencies in a way in which those who are elected, are elected on a one-man-one-vote proposition.

From among those people let them choose one person in the same way as is done in this assembly to be the person who is charged with the chief executive responsibility for the government of that area, retaining his position as an elected representative from one of the constituencies.

These are the two alternatives which are available. The hodgepodge which the government has presented to us is a mixture of two traditions of government which has now got us into an insuperable box. The metropolitan members on the government side recognize what the box is and what the difficulty is but they are prepared to say, "Well, in that case, we must go along with an appointed chairman, or a chairman who is elected from someone who may not be an elected representative at all."

We do not take that view, regardless of the insuperable obstacle which the government has placed before us. We take the position, and we insist upon the position, that you must elect the metropolitan chairman. We are quite prepared to go for the time being within the strange framework of this bill; we are quite prepared to go on a two-tier system, but we disagree with the proposition that the two-tier system must bring within its framework the proposition that the elected members go anywhere to select the person who will be chairman of the metropolitan council.

It may well be that some of the hon. members—the hon. member for St. George, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions—may be able to talk themselves into the proposition that because of this logical difficulty which they have been so careful to point out to us, we must therefore vote for this bill the way it is drafted, and ignore the elected principle. We do not think, because of the strange mixture of two traditions of government and the insuperable difficulty which the government has placed before us, that we are under any compulsion whatsoever, to give up the principle that in the metropolitan area of the city of Toronto, some time, somewhere, some how, we are going to have a representative, democratic government. We are insisting on that, regardless of the fact that we think that this particular system which the

government insists that we vote on, has this almost insuperable obstacle before we can achieve an elected, properly constituted council for the whole of the metropolitan area, and an elected chief official.

It is for that reason—and it is not very difficult, and I am quite sure that the hon. member for Beaches understands what we are talking about, I am quite sure that all the metropolitan members understand what we are talking about. I think it is quite essential that in this particular vote each of those hon. members stands up, expresses his views, and when the time comes, votes on whether or not he considers that the chairman of the metropolitan council should or should not be an elected member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member a question? I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the argument of the hon. member and I hope I did not misunderstand him.

It seems to me the hon. member was in fact saying that even though he appreciates that because of the system that is employed in Bill 81, this amendment creates an insuperable hurdle to overcome in respect of an elected member of council, in spite of that, thinks this is the only thing he can vote for. In other words, is not the hon. member in fact saying he is going to sabotage Bill 81, because of a principle he has which cannot be incorporated in this bill? Surely he does not mean that?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the hon. Minister this way: The bill as written is the exact bill which came before this House for second reading. At the time many of the metropolitan members on the government side, and the members on this side of the House from the metropolitan area, spoke in favour of an elected chairman of the metropolitan council. The bill has not been changed since that time. All the problems which the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions and the hon. member for St. George have spoken about in the House tonight, were here in the bill at the time they spoke in favour of the elected chairman.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not speak on second reading of this bill. The hon. member is mistaken.

Mr. Renwick: If I may just complete the answer, I was under a misapprehension, I thought that the hon. member had spoken on second reading of the bill.

But what we are saying is that, in the almost insuperable difficulty in which the government has placed us, we are not prepared to say, "All right, because that is such a closed-door operation in this section of the bill, therefore we are going to vote for that and not in favour of an elected chairman."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Even though it threatens the success of this?

Mr. Bryden: You said yourself that election might be possible in three years; so it is just as possible now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are faced with an amendment and you say that even though the amendment may be unsuccessful in its operation, you are still going to vote for it? It is ridiculous. It is our duty here to present a bill which is going to be workable in Metropolitan Toronto, and because you feel that you cannot vote for this principle, you are going to vote for the amendment even though you feel that the hurdle is so insuperable that the bill will not work. That is ridiculous. It is our job to present a successful bill that will work in Metro.

Mr. Thompson: It is half-baked.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then vote against the whole bill. Do not let us pass a half-baked bill, if that is the way you feel about it, but make sure you are not going to destroy it by an amendment which you do not believe in.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the underlying fear, I think, is that in this subsection 9—it is the personality of the Metro board of directors, as it were. There will be nine aldermen from the city of Toronto elected by the largest vote.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: You cannot believe that anything you say can help us here in Toronto.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Grey North, please, on subsection 5.

Mr. Sargent: I can see, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to be sitting here until Christmas, if this goes on. I cannot get through my mind the fact—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: I have suggested to the hon. Minister that I think that we have two factors here. We have a Metro council and local government, and you are trying to appoint a board of directors. The concern is, on the part of the government, or I think it should be, to get an able man to head up this board of directors. That is the concern, right?

We will pinpoint the fact that we are looking for an able man. The concern is that elected at large we may not have the able man they need, and so the government is putting in safeguards in this clause to protect the fact that this big board of directors will have the best man available. I think that is good.

However, I think the hon. Prime Minister has not made explicit to me, as a citizen here—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not think I ever could.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I always spoke well of you anyway.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: I think it is important that we should understand—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: I think you fellows are so close to the forest you cannot see the trees and that you are going to have a lot of people elected by accident, as I said before, in a popularity contest, who are not able to sit on this board of directors. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, if the hon. Prime Minister is not able to answer as the Minister, if he sees anything wrong with people who would sit on the Metro council to call their shots, as it were, and say, "I am going to run for Metro council." And then they can show their qualifications to sit on Metro council.

Mr. Cowling: They do that now.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: To the section, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: I do believe though, Mr. Chairman, that you will have to separate the two. If you are running at local level in a borough, that is that; but if they are going to run for Metro they should state their qualifications, and say "I am running for Metro council." Why the devil they would run at the salary you are going to give them, of $2,000 a year, further on here, I cannot see.

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the member that we are dealing with section 5 and the election of a chairman.

Mr. Sargent: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say that I would like the hon. Minister—and I will forever keep quiet—to tell me why we cannot separate the two and say one is Metro, one is local, and get a board of directors that is able to do the job. I think that maybe is your concern.

Mr. Chairman: I think the members pretty well agreed that the Minister would wind up the debate on this section of the bill.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I truly think I will probably be the last one here. I wanted to say a few words on this, because as is obvious, this is a very important principle that is involved.

We in this area of Metropolitan Toronto have been faced, since Metro council has come into effect, with the overall decline in the number of people—that is percentage-wise—who have been casting their vote. Between 1949 and 1959, before Metro came in, of the people in Toronto proper, I think only about 40 per cent voted. In the suburbs, I think only slightly more than 30 per cent cast their vote. Today, on the average all over Metropolitan Toronto, about 33 per cent of the people who have the right to vote, actually cast their vote.

I think one of the main reasons for this decline is the lack of a top personality who would attract the voters. The main administrative job today and virtually the main power in Metropolitan Toronto is held by the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto council. He is the super-mayor, and at least under this amendment that we have before the House, a person who holds the job as Metro chairman, should be elected. I am one of those who would have preferred to have seen amalgamation for the entire area, and if that had come about I certainly would have wanted to see the so-called super-mayor elected from all the people. But here, under this present bill, we have to be practical; but to be practical we should not forget the principle that the top man who has the major responsi-

bility and who has vast power—virtually one of the most powerful men in Canada, in the amount of money that he controls—the amount of influence he has is, literally, that of chairman of Metropolitan Toronto.

I feel, and certainly the hon. members of this party, feel that we are overlooking a basic, democratic principle when we allow our council to say that they can appoint anybody. It allows too much room for backroom politics, the fact that anyone can be brought in from outside that council.

I am disappointed, after hearing so many speeches a few days ago from hon. members on the other side of the House, where they favoured the principle of having an elected person as chairman. Unfortunately, whatever they call it—solidarity—in their party, the individuals concerned have forgotten about the people of Metropolitan Toronto. In the dying hours of the debate on this section, I want to add my voice—filled with laryngitis as it is—to the fact that we must have, I feel, in the long run, if we are going to be loyal to the democratic principles which our forebears established in local government, we should and must have our chief men, and especially the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, elected. After all, the Premier of this province must be elected and the Prime Minister of Canada must be elected. Why is it that the super-mayor of Metropolitan Toronto can quite possibly get in because he just happens to know the right people? There is too much kitchen politics involved, and again, I would support the amendment and wish that certain hon. members over on the government side would have a change of heart.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): In referring to section 5 just very briefly for a moment, I think it was just three weeks ago tonight I said in this House, and I just want to quote very shortly from the bottom of page 2554 of *Hansard* of April 21:

> To me, one of the most disappointing features about Bill 81, is finding that we are going to perpetuate the old-established rule of having the most powerful official in the metropolitan council, namely, the chairman, remain completely unanswerable to the people. I say, sir, that in this day and age this is a completely wrong principle.

Mr. Chairman, I think even at this late hour, this particular Thursday night, that there are very few people who disagree with that. But I also went on to say three weeks ago:

> —that ways and means could have been found for bringing in recommendations that he or she might have been chosen from one of the elected officials who are entitled to sit on metropolitan council.

I feel, sir, that particularly during the past three weeks, and certainly before that but particularly during the past three weeks, every effort has been made to resolve this question. As the hon. member for St. George has pointed out, there has just not come to light any feasible, working arrangment. I have every confidence that before the next few years are out suitable answers will be found in this regard, but until they are, I have no choice but to support the government in this particular clause, because we just have not had any sensible answers from the other side.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I think it is apparent to this House that attempts are now being made to shift sides just because party policy has been laid down. This is what is happening. The other thing is this: The Minister of Reform Institutions is trying to tell us that since they are presenting us with a fait accompli, we should go along with what they want to do; he is saying to us that since the government refuses to hammer out a unified policy, since it is trying to bring together two irreconcilable philosophies, that we should go along with them in that kind of argument.

We have put before this House a solution to the problem. It is a solution which has been worked out over the generations in the British pattern; it is working across the world today.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where?

Mr. Young: Right in this Legislature at the provincial level. It is working at the federal level; it is working right through the British Isles and throughout Europe. If we could have the common sense to adopt that kind of policy, with a unified council elected by the people electing from among their members their chief magistrate, then these problems would disappear and men like our good friend the hon. member for Beaches would not be in the spot he is in tonight.

But because you insist on trying to harmonize irreconcilable factors you find yourself in this box. You expect us to get in the box

with you, and then five years from now when you find that this does not work, you will say to us. "You voted for it!" Well, we are not voting for it and we are not standing for this kind of contrary philosophy tonight. We are saying to you that you should have accepted our basic philosophy and then you would not be in this difficulty, then you could have voted for us on this amendment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Young: So, Mr. Chairman, I simply say that this amendment, even though it is difficult under the circumstances you have laid down, is right in principle and we will stick by it.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, if we may get back to the subject-matter in subsection 5, I think there are a number of basic things that we should bear in mind. This afternoon the hon. Prime Minister gave a very clear and concise explanation of the government's position in connection with this matter. When you examine this section of the bill, you will find that there is nothing to stop the metropolitan council from electing one of their own members as the chairman. He may retain his seat and he could probably very well continue to be an alderman in the city, because you know there are some aldermen in the city on the present council who were elected with less than 3,200 votes. It is not very difficult.

As a matter of fact there are some aldermen sitting on the city council who got no votes at all! They were elected by acclamation and at that time the council had to decide itself which of those two would represent that ward on the metropolitan council.

Another point that we have to bear in mind is that the metropolitan council is not a municipal council. It is an organization provided by statutory legislation to perform and to provide certain municipal services in a certain defined area. That is exactly what it is.

Now, the next thing I would ask you to bear in mind with relation to the chairman, is that his duties are those of a chief executive officer. Someone has to be a presiding officer for an organization of this kind, and therefore in the original Bill 80, the present metropolitan corporation Act, the presiding officer was also the chief executive officer.

There is one other point to bear in mind, and it is not contained in subsection five but it is contained in subsection seven; and that is that if the metropolitan council itself should reach an impasse that it cannot elect its own chairman, that the Lieutenant-Governor in council will do so within one week after the first meeting of the newly elected council.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, bearing in mind—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister accept a question here?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, I was going to deal with a question you asked a few moments ago.

Mr. Sargent: On that last question, Mr. Chairman, it is very elementary, but I think you should add the words, "provided that appointment comes from within the sitting members of the Metro council." You do not specify that in the bill here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what the amendment is, in case you do not know it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: At the present time, and within subsection five, of section three, the metropolitan council shall organize as a council and elect as chairman one of the members of the metropolitan council or any other person to hold office for that year and the next succeeding two years. If the metropolitan council cannot—and it could very well be that in a council of 32 members that there would be an equality of votes—if there is an equality of votes it is a negative motion, it just does not pass. Therefore someone has to reach a decision and the next point to bear in mind is subsection 7, which says that if the metropolitan council does not within one week after holding its first meeting elect a chairman that the Lieutenant-Governor in council shall do so.

As a matter of fact we were not very many days away from having to undertake that the first time that the present chairman of Metro was elected.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a very lengthy debate on this question. It has been debated on second reading of the bill, it has been debated now and we have gone very far afield. I would suggest that under the circumstances, with the explanations that have been given, with the debates that have taken place in the past, considering that we are leaving in the hands of locally elected people the right to operate and to organize

and to provide the services for which they have been charged with responsibility, that now is the time to vote against this amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition and to leave subsection five as it appears in Bill 81.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Thompson moves that section—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have not read everything very carefully, I may be offbase on this. Can the Minister explain the meaning of section 5, subsection 5 in relationship to the—

Mr. Chairman: We are on section number—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am just referring to the taking of the seat, suggesting he could hold both jointly.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No; this is to provide that if a member of the council were to be elected as the chairman he shall be deemed to have resigned as a member of such council and his seat on such council thereby becomes vacant. That is to confirm the stand which we have taken, that we realize the position of the chairman and the chief executive officer is a most important one and should be a full-time position.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Thompson moves that section 3 be amended by deleting from subsection 5 the words: "or any other person" in the fifth line thereof.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair the amendment lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of Mr. Thompson's motion will please rise.

All those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 20; the "nays" 39.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and the subsection carried.

Subsections 5 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

On subsection 9:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would bring to your attention that this is a new subsection 9 in the reprinted bill. It is to meet the request of the city council of the city of Toronto.

Subsection 9 agreed to.

On subsection 10:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I still feel that last sentence should have after it, "provided the appointment comes from within the sitting members of Metro council."

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, Mr. Chairman, subsection 10 of this bill deals with the composition of the council of the city of Toronto. It has nothing to do with the composition of the metropolitan council. For the years 1967, 1968 and 1969, the city of Toronto shall consist of nine wards and shall have a board of control, consisting of the—

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry. I was wrong.

Mr. Chairman: The member has withdrawn his objection.

Subsection 10 agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, speaking with reference to subsection 2 of section 5—am I in order—properly called subsection 2 of section 8 as shown here. May I speak to it now?

Mr. Chairman: Just one moment.

Subsection 1 agreed to.

On subsection 2, the member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I was very impressed by the arguments of the hon. Prime Minister before the six o'clock recess when he was describing what an important function the chairman of the metropolitan council plays in the affairs of this area. He referred to him as an adminstrator. These remarks were repeated, in a sense, by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I agree that he is an administrator. In fact you might refer to him as a deputy minister or, in some circles, he might be called an under-secretary, what might be termed the chief permanent administrative official because his appointment by council seems to fall in a regular pattern. There have not been more than two of them; the first chairman resigned, which necessitated the appointment of a second one, and it would appear that he has a sinecure there also.

So it is rather important that there be, so to speak, no conflict of interest. But at the present time there could be a conflict of interest and I think it is regrettable that the most important official, vote-wise, is one who is not elected and not appointed. To me it would be synonymous to the Deputy Minister of The Department of Municipal Affairs running that particular department. Now, perhaps that is the situation, but still to me it does not appear right that most of the power, the greatest power, should be vested in an appointed official.

There was an interesting article in the Toronto *Telegram* of Wednesday, May 4. I should like to read some excerpts from an article written by John Marshall who is, I believe, the chief of the city hall bureau of that newspaper. He describes the position of the chairman of the metropolitan council as a powerful figure, more or less in the same vein as did the hon. Prime Minister. I would like to read just four paragraphs:

> With a $28,000 salary he can devote all his time to the job and consequently he is the only council member fully conversant with all departmental operations.
>
> Because of this, and because of his tie-breaking vote, he has more than normal influence over the decisions of the Metro executive. Its recommendations can be rejected only by a two-thirds vote at the Metro council level.
>
> The chairman has a vote in council's committee of the whole and a tie-breaker in the council sessions. All of which gives him a potential three votes on each issue.
>
> He also has a vote on each of the council's four standing committees and he is a voting member of the virtually autonomous police and licensing commissions and of the planning board.

It is amazing that a person who is not elected, but appointed, should have so many votes among elected officials.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs made a statement which, frankly, caused me to look deeper in the section and to rise at this particular time. He stated that the chairman would have a tie-breaking vote in the event of a tie. And that were there a tie, the motion would fail.

With metropolitan council divided as it is at the present time into two factions, the city and the suburbs, and these two factions continually pitting themselves one against the other, they inevitably were deadlocked, and the functions of metropolitan council would have come to a standstill if there had not been this tie-breaking vote. So one could hardly quarrel under the present circumstances with the chairman having a tie-breaking vote. However, Mr. Chairman, under the proposed setup, no bloc will have enough votes to create a tie, unless all the boroughs vote in unity; in fact, if they all vote in unity, there is no tie; they will overwhelm the city. Nevertheless, if you take the combinations that exist, it is difficult to align these boroughs in such a manner that they have an equality of votes.

The most probable circumstances under which the chairman would have an occasion to break a tie would be in the absence of some members, either from the boroughs or from the city, which would give rise to such a situation. If that situation arose, it, in essence, would not be a deadlock caused by two factions simply opposing each other, but a deadlock caused by the absence of a member which could be broken at a subsequent meeting of council.

Under the circumstances, I respectfully suggest that the chairman of the metropolitan council need not have any voting power. In fact, I think it would be in the form of a conflict of interest.

1. He is the administrative head, the deputy minister, so to speak;

2. His function is to act as chairman. I suggest that as chairman, he should be impartial and it is my submission that he does not need any voting power at all. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I move that section 5 of Bill 81 be amended by deleting from section 8, subsection 2 thereof all the words following the word "only," in the second line thereof.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Ben moves that section 5 of Bill 81 be amended by deleting from section 8, subsection 2, all the words following the word "only," in the second line thereof.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would like to have someone from this group speak first, I do not really find myself convinced by the eloquence of the hon. member for Bracondale. We have just had a battle on the question of whether or not the Metro chairman will necessarily have to be one of the elected members of the council; that battle has been lost. It is still open to the council to choose some person from outside—from, indeed, anywhere in the universe—and we know from past experience that that is likely to happen, considering the balance of power that exists at the

present time in this area. We can assume—and I have no doubt that the government is assuming this, too, whether or not it is stating it—that the chairman of the Metro council will not be an elected member of council, he will be a person who will have been added to the council from non-elected ranks after the election, and I would say that the less voting power such a person has, the better.

As I understand it, the bill as it now stands, provides that the chairman will have a vote only in the event of a tie. I suppose if there is a tie you have to break it somehow or other, although of course a tie motion simply does not carry. At any rate, this is the only instance in which he would have a vote. I am not even sure if he should have a vote to break a tie. Let a tie motion be lost, but certainly I would not want to give him any more than that, since he will probably not—almost certainly not—be a person who himself has faced the electorate.

Therefore, we in this group do not feel inclined to vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the hon. member for Woodbine? By his proposed amendment—

Mr. Bryden: I have proposed nothing.

Mr. Chairman: He has no amendment before us.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Then may I ask a question from you, sir, as you understand it? Would that amendment give the chairman two votes?

Mr. Bryden: One vote only.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Two, if you do what the amendment says.

Mr. Bryden: My interpretation is another reason why I do not feel inclined to support the amendment. My interpretation would be that the chairman would have a vote on every question—if I am wrong on that, I will be happy to be corrected—and that actually, if there was a tie vote the motion would be lost. Would not that be what would follow?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, Mr. Chairman—does the hon. member want to speak again?

Mr. Ben: To answer, because there was not an appreciation of the situation.

The chairman has more than a vote just in the case of a tie. In council he has a tie-breaking vote, but as I pointed out—perhaps the hon. member for Woodbine missed it—he also has a vote without there being a tie in committee of the whole. He also has a vote without there being a tie on the executive committee. He also has a vote in all the other committees of which he is a member ex offico. So it is not simply his having a vote in the event of a tie. That is the situation only in council. So perhaps you may rephrase your thinking on that.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I think we might resolve this by gaining from experiences of the past. Many of the hon. gentlemen present in this House were at one time members of the councils of various municipalities in this great metropolitan area; some of them have served on the metropolitan council.

This legislation contained in Bill 81 is not contained in Bill 80, and it has been the experience where the chairman has used his tie-breaking vote authority—in the case of Mr. Gardiner, from 1954 until his resignation in late 1961, there were seven occasions on which he broke a tie. Of those seven, three of these were on procedural matters, the other four were on matters involving the metropolitan government.

In the case of Mr. Allen, who has been there since January 1, 1962, until the end of 1965, he used this authority on eight occasions: five of them in respect of procedural matters and three in matters involving metropolitan matters.

In none of the votes in the past, have either of these gentlemen, Mr. Gardiner, or Mr. Allen, used their tie-breaking vote on a straight city-suburban split.

With the new metropolitan council, there will be a greater difference in the representation, city versus the other municipalities. It will be in the proportion of 12 to 20. I think it would be almost impossible to have a tie vote, and at one time we did discuss not having that authority to the chairman, but it was thought that it would be desirable during this transitional period that that should remain, and for that reason I would ask the members to not support the amendment. Once Metro has lived with this for the next short while, a few years, it may be quite reasonable to suggest that this be amended in accordance with the recommendation made by the hon. member for Bracondale.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment—

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on my amendment, instead of striking out the words after the word "only," I only wish to strike out the words after the word "vote" in the third line.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think we in this group misunderstood the intention of the hon. member for Bracondale. We now understand his intention very clearly and we support the idea. We do not think that this person who is not an elected member of council should have a vote at all, and we will support the amendment in its rephrased form.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if he is elected the amendment would take away his vote, also.

Mr. Bryden: After this carries you can put in another clause to cover that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You assume he will be a non-elected member—

Mr. Bryden: I think that is a very fair assumption. I suspect that the hon. Prime Minister realizes that just as well as I do.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister pointed out to the House that where the council could not agree upon electing a chairman for the Metro council because there was a tie, which was a negative vote, the Lieutenant-Governor in council would have to step in. You have to have a situation where somebody has to resolve it. I vote against the amendment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, once again the hon. Provincial Secretary displays his abysmal ignorance of municipal affairs. Had he served any time at all on a municipal council he would recognize it is a practice of all municipal councils that when there is a tie vote, the vote is lost. When there is a tie vote the proposition that is put forward is lost. The Minister who claims authorship of Bill 80 should have discovered when he was writing Bill 80 that this is a well established principle of municipal politics.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment by Mr. Ben will please say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of Mr. Ben's amendment, will please rise.

All those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 18, the "nays" 36.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and subsection 2 of subsection 8 of section 5 carried.

Subsection 9 agreed to.

Subsection 10—1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Everybody is pretty familiar with these subsections, and certainly with the bill. Would it be possible to deal with the section and then if any—

Mr. MacDonald: No. Where was the hon. member this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This was established and agreed on.

Mr. Chairman: Section 6.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on section 6—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, in the event there is going to be some debate on this section, we have been in such a sweet mood of compromise today, I am going to suggest the committee rise.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the committee of the whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the Budget debate and on Monday we will resume in committee of the whole House for consideration of various sections of Bill 81.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 108



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 13, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 13, 1966

Questions of Mr. Dymond re OMSIP, Mr. Bryden, Mr. MacDonald 3436

Questions of Mr. Yaremko re teachers of language classes, Mr. Ben 3436

Question of Mr. Yaremko re adopted children, Mr. S. Lewis 3436

Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko 3437

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Reuter, Mr. Ben 3437

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ben, agreed to 3461

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3461

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests in the Legislature today students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Riverview public school, London, and in the east gallery, Sturgeon Falls secondary school and T. R. McEwen Sr. public school, Oshawa.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege regarding press and radio reports last night which portray me as the villain in this piece following the hon. Prime Minister's accusation of nasty insinuations and innuendoes by me. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member could assure me that one of his privileges was offended by quoting the paper? Has the member a copy of the paper so I can be assured on this point?

Mr. Sargent: If you want me to hold the House up I will go and get one, if you want to do that.

Mr. Speaker: No, I just wanted some assurance.

Mr. Sargent: You can take my word for it, I think, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Prime Minister and the government have clearly broken the laws written in the statutes of this province, and I demand a retraction from the hon. Prime Minister because of the following reasons: The Talisman ski resort requested a liquor licence and held a public referendum.

The vote was defeated by a great majority by the citizens of the township—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, it becomes embarrassing for a member of this House to draw to your attention a clear breach of the orders of the—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am very doubtful that the member has a point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I intend to show the House where this government has clearly broken the laws as written in this book here.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but I am afraid the member will have to do that at some other time; he does not have—

Mr. Sargent: I demand a retraction from the hon. Prime Minister because of the fact that a member, Mr. Speaker, cannot get up and ask questions in this House about public business without the hon. Prime Minister saying they are nasty insinuations and innuendoes.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that the member should have asked for the retraction at the time, not today before the orders of the day.

Mr. Sargent: As the facts developed overnight, the House should know the facts I have to make this man—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the member does not have a point of privilege and I have so ruled.

Mr. Sargent: The press release will be out shortly on my statement and the House might as well hear it firsthand.

Mr. Speaker: If we have it that way it would be much better. The member does not have a point of privilege now. If he did have one, I would be very pleased to grant it to him.

Mr. Sargent: With all respect to you, I do have a privilege.

Mr. Speaker: As you do not have the paper pointing out this matter, I am afraid I will have to deny the member the opportunity this morning. If he can produce it

at a later date, I will be glad to give him a hearing.

Mr. Sargent: If you will hold up until I get it—

Mr. Speaker: Yes, at another time.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South asked a question the other day when I was unfortunately unable to be present.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. Minister would mind turning to the microphone; we cannot hear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am very sorry. I was not here to answer the question; I am in a position to do so now, sir. The question was: Is there any reason why OMSIP coverage for persons eligible in April but since removed from the welfare rolls cannot be automatically continued until July 1, instead of requiring application for coverage to that date?

I would answer as follows: OMSIP coverage is granted upon one of two conditions—the individual makes formal application for the contract, or he is designated as a welfare or social assistance recipient, hence is automatically transferred onto the OMSIP roll. The individual covered by OMSIP under the second condition who ceases to receive social assistance is not automatically covered by OMSIP under existing regulations, but the medical services insurance council has recommended – and I have agreed – that such individuals should be granted temporary assistance for a period of three months. Arrangements are being made for individuals who are removed from the welfare rolls to apply to OMSIP for this temporary assistance to ensure there is no break in their eligibility for benefits.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, May I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question?

Can I conclude from his answer that the person removed from the roll is specifically and personally informed to make application, so that we do not run into the possibility that they failed to do so because they had not been informed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is right. They are informed and they are advised that they have three months' coverage, and there is no loss of benefit during this time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, during the course of the estimates there were a number of questions that were asked on which I did not have the information at hand. One question was that of the hon. member for Bracondale, which was: "Now getting back to this business of education, will the hon. Minister tell this House how many teachers his branch employs in his language classes, where these teachers are located, what their qualifications are and how much are they paid in relationship to the salaries received by the Toronto public school system?"

The answers are: 1. How many teachers? 56. 2. Where are they located? In Toronto 39; London, five; Sudbury, three; Hamilton, three; Kitchener, two; Stratford, two; Amherstburg, one; Schumacher, one. 3. What are their qualifications? Teaching certificate alone, 23; teaching certificate and summer course, TESL, 15; other qualifications, experience such as private tutorials, etc., 18. Also bachelors' degrees, six; master's degree; one; doctorate degree, one. 4. What are they paid in relation to Toronto public school teachers? The answer is less.

The hon. member for Scarborough North asked a question relating to possibility of any action relating to the deletion from court orders, that is adoption orders, of the name of the child so that the same would not be public. I have been in discussion with the Deputy Minister of Public Welfare; this has to deal with The Child Welfare Act and I understand it will be considered at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bracondale also asked certain questions relating to the use of postage stamps by members of this House in relationship to the last federal campaign. But in view of something you have indicated to me, I will await his return to the House before answering those specific questions relating to members of this House.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have the newspaper now for your consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member draw attention to the article in the paper?

Mr. Sargent: In its entirety?

Mr. Speaker: No, just refer to it where it offends one of your privileges.

Mr. Sargent: On news broadcasts last night on CKEY, Toronto, radio station, there were the words nasty insinuation, innuendo—a quotation by the hon. Prime Minister

which put me in a very bad light, as the member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: In this morning's *Globe and Mail*; for the Speaker's information it is here on page one, column one.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member quote something?

Mr. Sargent: This is very mild to what it had on the air, but I will give it to you: "Premier Robarts rose to say the Liberal member had left some very nasty insinuations about a trip I took to Talisman." That was the point, and he goes on to further mention innuendo.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is the right of any member of this House—

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): All factual thus far.

Mr. Sargent: —to talk about government business, how things are handled, the powers of the government, and for the hon. Prime Minister of this province to place anyone who could criticize him as being a villain—he turns the whole thing around and I am the one who is wrong on this.

Mr. Speaker: If the member wants to put the record straight, go ahead and put the record straight, but do not make a speech.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, sir. So because of the following reasons, I wish to tell this House, and it is important to show my cause right now. First, the Talisman ski resort requested a liquor licence and held a public referendum—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is completely out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Any reference to that is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: I wish to show the House the reason why I should have this right. It is quoted in this statute 1961-62 and I will quote to the House.

Mr. Bryden: It is a good point, but it is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, this statute shows that the government—

Mr. Speaker: No, I am afraid the member—

Mr. Sargent: —issued a licence contrary to law.

Mr. Speaker: That has nothing to do with the member's privilege in the House that he rose on. So, therefore, I am afraid the member is out of order, and I will have to ask him to desist from speaking further on this matter. I am quite sincere on this point. If the member had a point of order, or a point of privilege I would have been only too pleased to allow the speaker—

Mr. Sargent: My point of privilege is that the hon. Prime Minister had no right to say what he did because—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, he has misled the House and that is important to me. He did not tell the House that Mr. Graydon was director of Labatts, in contravention to this law. He did not tell the House that the London hunt club was the first club to get this type of licence in the province.

Mr. Speaker: That is now part of another debate and I have asked the member to desist from speaking further on it. I do not think that the member has a point of privilege or a point of order at this time, and I shall have to ask him to take his seat.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko begs leave to present to the House the 1965 fourth annual report of the Ontario municipal employees' retirement board.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, during the ten-year period from 1956 to this year, 1966, the total expenditures of Canada's ten provinces have risen by 229 per cent from $1.6 billion to $5.2 billion. It is interesting to note that Ontario is just slightly over the average increase in this respect, with a ten-year increase of 232 per cent. If we translate this percentage to dollars the actual amount of the ten-year increase is slightly over $1 billion to an all-time high of nearly $1.5 billion.

This is a staggering sum of money, and

if we add the capital disbursements to the ordinary expenditure the figure is close to the $2 billion mark.

I wonder, sir, how many of our average citizens realize that the hon. Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. Allan) has to find such a tremendous amount each year? Every year as the budget figures are released, the so-called highlights are emphasized in the press in terms of tax increases and, of course, there can be no criticism in this respect. However, the general public is mainly aware only of the increased taxation, without a full comprehension of everything that goes to make up the whole fiscal operation of the province.

The scope of provincial operations is increasing each year. Every new budget includes one or more additional departments or programmes such as the medical services insurance plan this year and The Department of University Affairs last year. The ever-increasing complexity of provincial affairs is such that the average citizen would be hard pressed to make either heads or tails from a look at the financial statements. Therefore, he must depend upon the reports of the news media. I do not suggest that a good job is not being done by these various agencies. Indeed, sir, I often feel that they are to be complimented on presenting the reports that do appear when the annual budget is tabled and the annual public accounts are complete. Sometimes, of course, reports are somewhat slanted, or parts of the whole are presented out of context, resulting in an unfair view to the public.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of our province are entitled to know just what takes place each year regarding the public finances, and that the government, in fairness to itself, should see to it that the citizens are given a fair presentation of the facts. The public accounts and the annual audit report are much too complicated and lengthy for the average citizen to comprehend, and while these reports are essential, I feel that something a little different could also be prepared and distributed. The press, radio and TV are doing their part, but I would offer the suggestion that a condensed statement could be prepared and be made available to every citizen.

For example, a simple two-page presentation might be devised which would provide the basic information as to expenditures, with the major functions expressed in dollars and percentages, and similar information as to revenues and the sources thereof. The terminology would be plain and simple and explanatory notes could be included giving the major changes from the previous year.

As an illustration, the presentation at the present time might appear as follows:

You could have a two-page report, the first page of which would set forth the provincial expenditures; there could be two columns showing the figures for this year, the figures for last year, with the corresponding percentages, and it could be broken down into comparatively few sub-headings, such as Education and University Affairs, Health and Welfare, public debt, highway maintenance, Municipal Affairs, Attorney-General, Lands and Forests, Agriculture and all other departments.

Such a statement of expenditures could be completed by adding notes. For example, a note for this year could include the fact that nearly $50 million is included in this year's programme to cover the estimated cost of the new medical insurance services plan. And also note an important fact, that the provision for educational purposes includes an increase of $40 million in grants to school boards for vocational facilities, in addition to over $50 million in general grants for school purposes. And so on. The important facts pertaining to the annual expenditures could be appended to the page covering those expenditures.

The second page, of course, would be set up in the same manner, showing the actual dollar expenditures for this year compared to last year, with the corresponding percentages. Also the increases in taxation and other sources of revenue could be shown as notes to explain the various items making up the total revenue.

I believe a condensed statement such as I have outlined would be very helpful to our citizens, and would be beneficial, not only to the government in getting facts publicized, but should meet with no criticism from the Opposition parties. In fact, a very simple factual presentation would serve all parties equally well.

A quick, easy comparison of a condensed statement of the type I have mentioned showing revenue and expenditures will show, for example, that the combined revenue from gasoline tax and motor vehicle licences and fees is little more than enough to pay the cost of health and welfare services. The liquor profits would easily be seen as revealed as being only about 40 per cent of health and welfare costs, and by comparing the statement and analyzing it, it would be easy to see that in order to derive sufficient from liquor profits to pay these social services

it would be necessary to charge $15 for a $6 bottle of whisky.

The combined revenue from corporation tax, gasoline tax and liquor profits is clearly shown as being insufficient to pay the total costs of education. Similarly, it is evident that the motor vehicle licences and fees do not produce sufficient revenue to pay for the cost of highway maintenance. These comparisons are not, of course, necessarily relevant, but a good broad concept of provincial financing could be obtained.

There has been a great deal of complaint that the province does not pay sufficient in the way of assistance to municipalities or, to put it a little differently, that the municipalities are desperately in need of relief from the burden of the real property tax. Based on the latter proposition, I agree wholeheartedly with the complaint.

The theory of real property taxation for municipal revenues is no longer adequate to provide an equitable tax levy. For example, in the case of two identical homes of equal value, one occupant with an annual income of $4,000 will pay the same municipal tax as his neighbour with an income of perhaps $10,000. The great inequity in municipal taxation, therefore, is the fact that the whole theory is unrelated to the taxpayer's ability to pay.

This situation must be corrected, of course, and we are all waiting to see if the Carter commission will produce some new formula on a federal basis, and whether some desirable recommendations will arise from the Smith committee deliberations. It is significant, I believe, that the findings of the Quebec Royal commission, recently released, recommended increased personal income taxes, increased tax on insurance premiums, increased sales taxes, increased taxes on motor fuel, on tobacco products and on liquor. It was also recommended that a capital gains tax be imposed, and on the matter of lotteries, it was suggested that the income in this respect would be far less than anticipated —a mere $10 million a year.

Whatever is contained in either the Carter or the Smith report, one basic fact will remain unchanged—it will be the taxpayer and the consumer who must provide the funds at any level, either federal, provincial or municipal. The main objective, of course, is to obtain a better distribution of the tax burden at all levels.

As far as Ontario is concerned, I can see little room for criticism of the extent of assistance to municipalities. Ontario led all the provinces in the 1965-66 year by providing 38 per cent of its total expenditures for municipalities. As mentioned earlier in my remarks, the 1966-67 figure will be over 40 per cent and in dollars this represents $772 million. There has been a progressive increase in this respect from $187 million in 1957, which was more than doubled by 1962, and which has more than doubled since 1962. The greatest single factor accounting for the tremendous increase is the cost of education, and while the national average stands at 28 per cent, Ontario leads with nearly 40 per cent of the total expenditures.

During the debate on Bill 89, which was the Act respecting regional development councils, there was considerable discussion about regional planning, regional development and regional government. At that time, I believe I expressed my views in that connection quite clearly, and while I had intended to speak at some length during this Budget debate regarding regional matters, no purpose would be served in repeating all of my remarks at this time.

I would, however, like to emphasize some of the main points in connection with this all-important matter of municipal government and related regional concepts. There are those who think that a master plan for a regional basis of government should be prepared for all of the province and, if I remember some of the comments of last week when I was speaking on the subject, they think, apparently, that it should be imposed on our people. One comment was to the effect that the Metro concept was so imposed, but I would remind this House that such is not the case, according to the facts.

In 1950, it was at the requests of the area municipalities including Long Branch, New Toronto, Mimico and Etobicoke that led to action by the Ontario municipal board. Public hearings were held and applications for several different arrangements were considered, all of which led to the creation of Metro, based on a report of Dr. Lorne Cumming, dated January 20, 1953. And so, Mr. Speaker, even as the metropolitan concept developed as a result of local initiative, so have at least five other examples of local initiative led to current studies on the municipal scene.

This government has also taken a considerable degree of initiative in the very fact that the select committee was established to inquire into, report upon, and recommend upon municipal matters including local government revision. An excellent report was

prepared and presented under the very able chairmanship of the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett), and said report has become known as the "Beckett report." This report has not been simply set aside without consideration, and I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) made this quite clear when referring to the matter last week in this House.

Our county system continues to provide adequate local and regional government in many parts of the province and all that is required in those areas is a degree of modernization. In the other areas—areas that are highly urbanized and that are, in fact, small Metro regions—the needs of the people will be determined by study of the circumstances. I do not hesitate to reiterate my belief that desirable and entirely acceptable solutions will result from the special studies and due consideration to the Beckett report which the hon. Prime Minister has told us this government intends to do at the earliest possible moment.

There is one other matter I want to discuss at this time, Mr. Speaker, and that concerns the process by which those statutes called "private bills" are enacted into law in this House. I do not refer here to private members' bills, and I think the hon. members are all aware of the difference in this respect.

To put it quite briefly, a private bill, if approved and passed by this House, will enable a municipality or an organization, or an individual, to do certain things for which no provision has been made under general law. Sometimes the requested legislation is the only way in which a municipality can correct, for example, an error or omission in its past actions. Perhaps the approval of the Ontario municipal board has not been obtained for certain necessary expenditures, and the works programme for those expenditures has already been carried out and moneys have, in some cases, actually been disbursed. Illegal actions of this type could place the members of a local council in a position where they might be found personally responsible for repayment of the funds. Usually, however, there has been no wrong intent on the part of anyone connected with that particular municipal action, and the whole situation has been created either through ignorance of the law or through inadvertence.

Errors and ignorance in matters of law are, I believe, usually inexcusable, and in branches of law other than municipal, financial or other, penalties are the normal result. However, financial penalties in the case of municipal ignorance or error would really serve no real purpose other than to create a hardship on other parties—the local taxpayers—and it is usual then that a petition for a correcting statute in this respect is granted by way of approval by this House of a private bill.

Sometimes a municipality wishes to adopt certain measures for the benefit of its own inhabitants. When the council of that municipality has agreed that such a programme is desirable, but finds that no provision to do so may be found in the existing statutes, a petition for special permission is filed with the Legislature in the form of a private bill. In such cases, however, a principle is involved, and it is not merely a case of correcting an error, but a whole new concept is at issue, and the private bills committee must carefully consider the effect of such legislation. A good example of this, sir, is Bill Pr25 of this session under the provisions of which the city of Hamilton was successful in its efforts to have the private bills committee report favourably on a petition that will enable that particular city to grant certain tax exemptions to certain of its ratepayers.

There are a great many other grounds upon which a petitioner may seek special permission to do specific things, and subject to certain rules of procedure the process is relatively simple. During the 1965 session of this Legislature I was afforded the privilege of presiding over the meetings of the private bills committee, and the honour was again given me for this current session of 1966. As chairman of the meetings of this important committee I have made certain observations regarding the rules of procedure and the actual procedures, and I propose at this time to pass some of my observations to this honourable assembly for its consideration.

Rule 63 pertaining to petitions for private bills sets forth the requirements as to time of presenting petitions to the Clerk. Under this rule, no petition is received by the House after the first two weeks of each session; nor may any private bill be presented to the House after the first three weeks of each session. The rule goes on to state that no report of any committee dealing with a private bill may be received after the first six weeks of each session.

These rules are quite clear and should present no difficulty as far as interpretation is concerned. I found it somewhat confusing to reconcile the provisions of rule 63 with the provisions of the following rule 64 which sets forth the amount of the levy to be

charged to a petitioner when there is a breach of the provisions as clearly stated in rule 63.

The rules, orders and forms of procedure of this assembly were approved by the assembly on April 3, 1939, more than a quarter of a century ago. I think, Mr. Speaker, that while these rules were quite proper and adequate in 1939 and perhaps in most respects are still quite acceptable, there may be certain areas in which amendments to some rules might be desirable. I think it is reasonable to assume that present needs and circumstances may have changed considerably during the 27 years since the existing rules were approved by this honourable assembly.

The 1965 session, which commenced on January 20, lasted until June 22, a total of 101 sitting days, whereas the 1939 session, which began on March 8 and prorogued on April 27, lasted for only 44 sitting days. The whole area of governmental function and purpose has been extended, and with the extension in scope, the complexity in the nature of things has increased. The convenience of the Legislature must certainly be a prime consideration, but not, I would think, at the undue inconvenience of the public.

In this respect, sir, I believe we could properly amend the rules regarding private bills to be a little more rigid on one hand for the convenience of the Legislature, and perhaps a little more relaxed on the other hand for the convenience of the individuals, the municipalities and organizations who may find it necessary to petition the Legislature for a special privilege not obtainable under general law.

The work of the private bills committee is becoming quite heavy, so much so, that it is a matter of difficulty for the staff of the Legislative counsel's division to prepare the material necessary for the committee to complete their deliberations within the first six weeks of each session. Private legislation is equally as important as the public statutes, and in some cases precedents are set which will lead to general legislation. The final meeting of this year's committee lasted for four and a quarter hours simply because the day's agenda was too heavy, and one previous meeting deliberated for four hours for the same reason. During the last half-hour or hour there was an alarming drop in attendance, and I suggest that this situation is anything but desirable from all points of view.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that consideration be given to amending this particular rule so that the private bills committee may report upon private bills during a period of eight weeks after the commencement of each session, rather than the first six weeks as at present.

There is no particular difficulty that I can see regarding the petitions of individuals or organizations other than municipalities. In the case of municipalities, however, the point has been raised that there is insufficient time for a municipal council, after having taken office and holding its first meeting of the year, properly to prepare the necessary documentation for the promotion of a private bill. Rule 64 requires that a copy of the bill must be presented to the Clerk of the House at least eight days before the meeting of the House. Rule 66 further requires that the applications for private bills must be advertised in both the *Ontario Gazette* and a local newspaper for a period of six weeks prior to the consideration of the petition.

On the surface, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there is indeed a difficulty in this respect insofar as municipal councils are concerned. Those who raise this objection are basing their claim upon the premise that a newly elected council will, right at the beginning of their term of office, recognize and decide that something is wrong and requires immediate correction by private legislation; or that they will suddenly decide a private bill is desirable to implement some new programme in their local activities.

I find it quite difficult to accept the proposition that the circumstances I have outlined would actually prevail. Surely, during the course of a year, a sitting council will realize any errors or omissions; surely they can determine policy and course of action before the final closing weeks before their term of office expires. It would seem to me that a municipal council could place such matters on their agenda during the last few months of the year, and thus provide ample time to fully discuss and resolve any matters upon which the provincial Legislature must deliberate in order to grant a special privilege. Even if the matter is of some urgency, and if it has just arisen in the last few weeks of the year, the present council can make a decision and take action without facing the charge of binding future councils. If the new council is opposed to the measure of the previous council they can appear at the meeting of the Legislature's private bills committee to register their opposition, or can withdraw the bill.

Reverting to the provisions of rules 63 and 64, I have determined that the confusion I encountered in reconciling these two rules arises from the apparent invitation in rule 64 to file and present petitions and bills at a time later than as set forth in rule 63. However, I have been informed that such a situation rarely occurs, and that a suspension of the provisions of rule 63 must be obtained from the committee on standing rules, and approved by the House before the bill can be considered.

In any event, I believe that consideration should be given to extending the time for presenting petitions and bills. A degree of relief to the petitioners would result if the time in each case was extended for one week. Most bills have been properly processed early in the session, and in view of the recommendation to extend the time of reporting by the private bills committee to eight weeks, I would think a week's extension at the other end would be beneficial.

Now, sir, with reference to the requirements pertaining to advertising of application for private bills, as set forth in rule 66, I can see no magic in the six-week requirement. In the case of applications that have been prepared several weeks or even months before the House convenes, there is no particular objection other than the cost involved. In the case of later applications, either commencing just before the end of a year or at the beginning of a year, the situation is such that the committee on standing orders is sometimes required to recommend the approval of a motion to modify the requirements in this respect.

Apart from the cost involved, I believe that this is an objectionable requirement in that the six-week provision serves no useful purpose, and tends only to sometimes delay action and create unnecessary consideration by the standing committee on standing orders. I believe this requirement could be reduced from the six-week stipulation to a four-week period with no serious loss of the intended purpose, and I would recommend that rule 66 be so amended.

In numerous instances private bills have reached the committee with certain amendments which have been proposed by the petitioner at the last minute, so to speak. In some cases, the amendments are of considerable importance and require extensive explanation and subsequent debate in committee. I do not believe it is fair to the members of the private bills committee to have to deal with amendments of which they have had no knowledge prior to the sitting of that committee. Neither is it desirable that the legislative counsel's division should be faced with the task of hurriedly preparing the necessary documents in order to convey the intent of the amendments to the private bills committee just when that committee is prepared to consider the bill as originally presented to the House. I would, therefore, recommend that a rule be devised by which a petitioner may not file an amendment to a petition for a private bill later than one week after the bill has been presented to the House. The foregoing provision would not prevent the committee from approving an amendment that might arise as a result of the committee's considerations.

Also, regarding amendments to private bills, some amendments are not at the request of the petitioner, but arise as a result of the examination by the legal officers of the government department or departments concerned with the bill. I suppose, in some cases, many consultations are necessary before the petitioner and departmental officials finally get together on the content of a bill. The staff of the legislative counsel division still has to examine the bill at this point, and I suggest that this is a point at which many delays occur. I respectfully suggest that the departmental officials concerned should get busy on the examination of bills just as soon as they have been properly received by the Clerk of the Legislature, rather than engage in a last-minute rush, as I suspect now takes place.

Finally, sir, in respect to private bills, I have noted that some bills reach the committee for their consideration in something less than a desirable form. The legal phraseology is poor in some cases, and in other instances the terminology is incorrect. In fact some bills carry a degree of ambiguity that results in long discussion in order to determine just what is intended. This fault is not entirely with the office of the legislative counsel division. After all, that office must try to present the bill in accordance with the petitioner's desire, and in many cases the legislative counsel has very little time to devote to perfecting a petitioner's bill.

The law clerk involved must do many things in examining a bill. He must see that the subject-matter, first of all, is within the competency of the Legislature; he must correct any obvious errors and ascertain that the bill is not an amendment to a general statute. It seems to me that the legal counsel for the petitioner should also make a greater effort to see that the bill is properly drawn in every respect. He should consult carefully

with the solicitors in the various government departments concerned, as for example, The Department of Municipal Affairs and, of course, the legislative counsel division. In one particular case this year a bill that was withdrawn last year was again presented although the circumstances had not changed, and the particular situation was one that would possibly be corrected in the very near future without special legislation. Had the petitioner's solicitor consulted at greater length with the appropriate officials, the bill would probably not have been presented.

The recommendations I have made regarding private bills, Mr. Speaker, are offered in a constructive manner, and while my views may not be supported by those who may be in a better position to judge than I, it is hoped that a careful scrutiny of the whole procedure may be undertaken as a result of my remarks.

Before I relinquish the floor, sir, I must express my admiration and respect for the excellent manner in which you continue to conduct the affairs of this honourable House. The hon. member for Eglinton is also doing a very fine job in his new position as Deputy Speaker, and I wish to extend my congratulations to him on his appointment.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to rise on a Budget debate at a time when not half of the estimates of the different departments of government have been considered by this House. Many of the reports concerning the departments have not even been tabled, or given to the hon. members of the House. However, the Budget debate has started and we are obliged to make some criticism of the conduct of this government, so far as we are able, based on the limited information that has come to us in the Budget debate to date.

My particular department is supposed to be The Department of Reform Institutions. I have made many statements in the past on it and I have many more to make. I am pleased to see the Minister of The Department of Reform Institutions in the House.

The hon. Minister on February 24, 1966 criticized me for contributing to unrest in these institutions that he deals with, particularly Millbrook, by my describing as "inadequate" the educational level of reformatory guards. He said, in part:

> —you have to be careful of the nature of your criticism. This has already caused disruption in two of our other institutions —and the inmates begin needling the staff and make life very difficult.

That is the statement that he made. I might point out that the statement was reported the day following the statement I was supposed to have made in this House. And this causes me to compliment the Minister on the excellent communication system he has provided for the inmates of these institutions.

I think that Telex should come and see the Minister to find out what system he has devised which enables the inmates of these institutions to get this information, or a copy of *Hansard* or however they managed to get the statements, that I was supposed to have made in this House, so quickly. One knows that the morning paper published in this city, which is sent to places outside of Toronto, is the first edition. It starts rolling off the press at approximately nine o'clock in the evening and did not carry any of the statements made that evening in this House. At any rate, somehow, through a nonexistent radio, or through a nonexistent TV, the prisoners got this information and the hon. Minister took me to task.

Now, I wonder what sort of restraint the hon. Minister is suggesting. Open discussion is one of the characteristics of our system. Some of the consequences of it may be unwanted, but I am sure the Minister would not suggest we change the system. The Minister told the House in a scandalized voice that my remarks about guard training had caused disruptions in two of his institutions, as I have mentioned. He also accused me of seeking headlines—I ask, who was seeking headlines then in view of the statements I just made about the lack of communication into those institutions?

What the hon. Minister overlooks is that the training of guards is his responsibility, not mine. If the inmates have been needling the guards about the extent of their education, the answer is not, as the Minister recommended, to stop talking about it. The answer is to do something about it. I do not believe that any discussion of the conditions in Ontario jails and reformatories should labour under the impediment that the hon. Minister would impose, that of refraining from any comment that will embarrass the guards. It is too bad the guards were upset by the needling, but as another member suggested—the hon. leader of the NDP—they should be mature enough to take it. It is patently silly to suggest that because the guards are upset, I should drop the whole thing. The hon. Minister knows that as well as I do.

Neverthless, I disagree with the hon. member for Woodbine about the hon. Minister's

performance on this question. I thought the Minister was at his excellent best on the matter of the education of the guards. I appreciate the dilemma faced by him in setting up appropriate educational standards for guards; as he pointed out, what is there in the content of grades 10, 11 and 12 which would enable an individual to form a better relationship with inmates with a view to modifying their attitudes in a desirable direction? I can only say that there is probably little or nothing in the content of the grades. But the success of the individual in achieving them does, to some extent at least, if only in a most general way, indicate superior intellectual equipment, a superior ability to master a task.

The probabilities are that a guard educated to grade 10 or 11 level is better equipped for his job than one who has reached only grade 8. I do not think there can be the slightest disagreement with the hon. Minister's statement that a man can be well qualified for the duties without extensive formal training or education. But it is difficult to judge. I am not prepared, as the Minister appears to be, to place my trust so unreservedly in the ability of the prison or department officials to size up a man. Formal education to a certain level gives us an assurance of a basic standard and a better guarantee of fitness for the job. A level of academic achievment may not be an infallible standard, but in the absence of other intelligible and measureable standards, it is the best one we have.

I do not suggest a requirement of grade 10 or 11 education as an inflexible standard, but as a general rule, to be breached only in exceptional circumstances. Lacking any more reliable standards, we must have recourse to the one of education; if we do not, we are simply settling for dropouts. I might state that I was deeply shocked to hear that the hon. Minister had been contemplating reducing the minimum required education level to grade 8, but evidently he has been forestalled by the civil service. That is a statement I heard; I am not saying it is true. Perhaps the Minister at a later date will comment on it.

I would like to talk for a while about Millbrook. I was very disturbed about the statements that have been made in this House during the Throne debate. If I recall correctly, I had been accused of making allegations of brutality and other charges in Millbrook. In reading *Hansard*—and I recommend the reading of *Hansard* to the hon. members of this House—I find that at no time did I make allegations of brutality in Millbrook. As a matter of fact, the people who introduced remarks about brutality in Millbrook into this House and into *Hansard* were the Minister of Reform Institutions, who did so, alleging that I made the remarks about brutality, and the hon. member for the riding in which is located Millbrook reformatory. The first time these charges were raised in this House were by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers); if he wishes to check *Hansard*, he will find that was when these charges were first raised. As a matter of fact, he imputed to me—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What about outside the House?

Mr. Ben: There is no record of my making charges of brutality, because I got a photostatic copy of the *Globe and Mail* morgue and I got a copy of the *Star* morgue; I got all the photostatic copies of every newspaper here. The charges that the hon. member for Durham spoke of were made in the Peterborough *Examiner* and intentionally or unintentionally he imputed those remarks to me. I say maybe intentionally. But I would suggest that he read *Hansard* and avail himself of the clipping service here under the special services provided, and just see where those remarks originated.

I can only tell you what I have seen at Millbrook and what I have read about Millbrook, just as the hon. member did; he read about Millbrook, but saw very little of it. But Millbrook has been something of a special study for me. I believe there is no other institution that mirrors so well the fundamental sickness of the reform system in this province.

To begin with, I would like to ask a few questions about Millbrook and then make a few points. I would like to know, from the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, how many letters of complaint from inmates the Minister has received in the past two years? I would like to have his assurance that this mail is forwarded unaltered. I would like some clarification of a remark made by J. M. Marsland, superintendent of the reformatory, to us when we visited the institution that an inmate's mail is never altered without the consent of the inmate. I would like to know how they go about getting the consent of the inmate. I believe the Minister should table this correspondence to give the House an idea of the nature of inmates' complaints if, in fact, he does get complaints. It is not too much to expect that members of this House will be able to determine how serious

they are if he has received them and does table them.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has made it quite clear that neither he nor his department give any credence whatever to the stories of inmates about the conditions in Ontario reformatories and jails. This is the attitude of the department; the prisoner is never to be believed. It obviously is the attitude outside the department and elsewhere in the government. The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management asked me whether I would believe them. The answer to that is that it depends on the credibility of the man. In certain circumstances, under certain conditions, I would believe an individual prisoner's account of abuses in our institutions. When that account is given by many different prisoners, there must be a strong presumption that they are telling the truth.

But let us not deal with the prisoners' charges; let us look elsewhere. On July 9, 1965, following four days of disturbances at Millbrook reformatory, and after five inmates were charged with arson, an unnamed Millbrook guard was reported in the Peterborough *Examiner* to have said that life at Millbrook was like hell. Another guard was reportedly critical of the senior administrative staff. A third said that three different administrative officials run the reformatory in three different ways, resulting in alternating severity and laxity and inconsistent treatment of prisoners. A fourth said that reformatory workshops are being operated only by deviates and addicts.

As the hon. Minister seems unprepared to listen to his prisoners, will he not listen to his guards? They have charged inconsistent treatment of prisoners. Is this so? Thirty-four guards were reported to have quit in the previous 15 months. Is this so? There were reported to have been 27 assaults on guards in the previous four months. Is this so? What is the record for the past year in each of these respects? How many riots or breakouts have been foiled there in the past year? How many have not be publicized?

What proportion of the guard staff work at other jobs to supplement the $4,050 minimum paid them by The Department of Reform Institutions? It was reported last year in the *Examiner*, which along with the reporter David Allen, deserves thanks for an excellent and penetrating series of articles on the Millbrook problem, that 50 to 60 per cent of the guards are moonlighting. It must be obvious that men with the responsibility of custodian in these institutions cannot be expected to be at their best when they are engaged in other employment for an additional three or four hours each day. If they must take on extra work to supplement their income in order to provide for their families, there is something wrong with the pay scale in these institutions.

This must be obvious to anyone not wilfully blinded to the problems of these institutions. What would prompt a responsible newspaper like the Peterborough *Examiner* to comment editorially: "We have good reasons to suppose that were every Ontario reformatory exposed to intelligent public scrutiny, the public would be outraged"? What would prompt the same newspaper to comment that a system which relies upon starvation, mental oppression and solitary confinement for control has little or no chance of ever being successful?

I must mention at this point, Mr. Speaker, that a private member can only go so far in investigation of this kind. The hon. Minister continues facetiously to refer to my research staff. I am flattered by his remarks, because it implies that whatever I am doing in this House must be the efforts of many people, not just I. But it is the government which knows the facts, and the government which withholds them. But I repeat, as I have stressed every time I have risen on this subject, that the system is wrong.

As Arnold Edinborough, editor of *Saturday Night*, commented in an excellent article in the magazine's March issue, it seems impossible for authorities to escape from a stone and steel thinking.

Mr. Speaker, others more qualified than I have been telling the government this for years. I know the hon. Minister must appreciate the wisdom of their thinking. There is a whole body of academic literature reporting their views. The hon. Minister is far too intelligent a man to dismiss this, and the Minister has never articulated a case to suggest they were wrong. So what is holding him back? What is he waiting for? A favourable conjunction of the planets? I will tell you what has happened. He has allowed himself to be trapped by the system; he is locked in a prison of the past. The hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) was good enough to commend me on February 24, for expounding what he called a philosophical treatise of what ought to be done, and to remark on the, quote, "many bits of wisdom and the many excerpts which many of us have used from time to time in this House." I regret that I did no more than repeat what

I gather the hon. member for Yorkview and others have said many times. But I am astounded that if this really has been the case, still little or nothing has been done.

In the magistrate's court at Cobourg, five Millbrook firebugs told the magistrate of receiving no answers to letters written to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. Can we add this to the sins of omission of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions? In providing a list of the letters received by him from inmates, perhaps the hon. Minister will be good enough to indicate the number to which he has replied. Perhaps this report was erroneous; perhaps he did reply to these inmates; perhaps he denied their requests. But until such time as they are tabled, we will not know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member seriously suggest that the Minister would have time to answer personally all the letters from inmates? If he does, he is unfamiliar with what goes on in penal institutions. I would be spending my time doing nothing else, and I would doubt if that would give me enough time.

Mr. Ben: I am astounded at the direct admission of the Minister. When he implied it would be beyond the capacity of the Minister, without interfering with his other affairs, to answer all the letters he receives from inmates, he must receive a fantastic amount of correspondence from these inmates, or else they would not take up so much time. At least he has answered one question that I asked earlier. He is receiving a fantastic amount of correspondence from these inmates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member know that in the jails as well as the reformatories—and those in jails have the right to send a letter to the Minister—in a year there are incarcerated some 60,000 people?

Mr. Ben: That is another good figure we received. According to the statistics for last year in the Ontario report, there are only 58,000 people incarcerated. Mr. Speaker, will the Minister please take note? I have no objections to the hon. Minister rising to ask me a question during this speech, but if he has statements to make, he should wait.

The same firebugs—the ones brought to trial before the magistrate at Cobourg, who the hon. Minister will undoubtedly discount as reliable witnesses—told tales of brutality at the institution and said they were being turned into "vegetables" and "animals" at Millbrook. The hon. Minister reproved me primly the other day for calling the man on the outside, the common criminal who preys on society, the dross of society, which, of course, is apt. But he had not the slightest hesitation in condemning all the men on the inside in his so-called reformatories as inveterate liars as well.

A prisoner said that in a normal day at the reformatory, an inmate spends 14 hours alone in his cell. Would the hon. Minister tell us how many hours a day the men spend alone in their cells? Would the hon. Minister table a description of the day-to-day schedule of the different classifications of the prisoners in Millbrook and tell us the number of prisoners in each of these classifications?

On July 12, 1965, in the *Examiner* it was reported that L. R. Hackl, the Deputy Minister, flatly denied there was a physical punishment at Millbrook. How are we to reconcile this with numerous independent reports of physical punishment? Are we dealing with a legion of liars? What is the truth? All we are asking is for the truth.

Upon the same occasion, the same Deputy Minister remarked that the senior administrative staff had "a great deal of training in the operation of such an institution."

Does the Minister expect that any intelligent observer will be persuaded by such generalizations? How much training? Mr. Hackl never told the public, and the hon. Minister has never told us. But it is worth noting that despite his glowing account of the calibre of the administrative staff and his laudatory statements about the institution, the Deputy Minister recoiled at the suggestion that reporters be allowed to tour this model institution, and the request was summarily denied.

In the debate of February 24, the Minister said he would not trouble us with a full breakdown of the training given to the guard staff until we got to the estimates, and he did not. He did not give it to us then, Mr. Speaker, and he has not given it to us to date.

Mr. Speaker, it would be no trouble for the hon. Minister to give it to us now. The hon. Minister has said that I criticized the department on the basis of its introductory training for guards only. He said this was only a small aspect of the training. What, then, is the larger aspect? Will the Minister trouble us with this information?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought I gave the member that information.

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister did not, Mr. Speaker. He gave us a typical promise. On February 25 I inquired why the original Millbrook specialized staff of one supervising psychologist, two full-time psychologists, two full-time social workers and two part-time psychiatrists had been reduced to one full-time psychiatrist and two part-time psychiatrists. The hon. Minister said that there was a shortage of trained staff. Evidently there was not a shortage when it opened up; what, then, was the true answer?

In the view of the Peterborough *Examiner* the Millbrook reformatory has deteriorated from what promised to be a pace-setter rehabilitation to "what is probably the blackest hole in North American penology."

I quote from the *Examiner*:

> The reformatory, built in 1957 for $3.5 million, was supposed to have a therapy scheme designed to treat the rejects from every other provincial institution. The original idea was to bring the toughs from other institutions and then restore them to usefulness, but all they do now at Millbrook is break them.
>
> The *Examiner* investigation revealed brutal treatment of prisoners, charges of misadministration, evidence that some senior officials are unqualified political appointees; a breakdown of staff morale; psychological torture of inmates and inadequate security at the so-called maximum security prison.
>
> Colonel Hartley Paterson, the first superintendent, tried to operate Millbrook as a rehabilitation unit and planned a climate of healthy human relations between staff and inmates, but his ideas ran counter to those of his superiors, and within two years he quit the superintendent's job.

Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Paterson to be aligned with those the hon. Minister would have us understand are not to be believed? I recommend that Mr. Paterson and other such competent witnesses be summoned to give sworn evidence on the penal institutions of Ontario before a committee of this House.

We, in this province, are not bound, as the Minister suggests, to wait supinely for action by Ottawa on the problems of our penal system. We have had this offered too long as a specious excuse for inaction in this province. If Ottawa was made aware that this province attaches great importance and urgency to this question, Ottawa would act. It is because Ottawa is well aware of the passive attitude of the government of this province in this field that Ottawa has not acted, and do not tell us that Ottawa will not listen!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the hon. member invited me to question him while he was speaking? I was a little—

Mr. Ben: I did not invite the Minister to, but he can go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the member aware that the statement I made in respect of the problems we have because of the lack of action on the part of Ottawa, is precisely the statement which Mr. McGrath, the executive director of the Canadian corrections association, made just a few weeks ago?

Mr. Ben: The answer is "no."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it is a fact.

Mr. Ben: The answer is "no"; but do not tell us that Ottawa just will not listen and that Ontario must await the indulgence of Ottawa because there are a lot of things that this government has been doing without waiting for the indulgence of Ottawa. The excuse for not starting a new Mercer reformatory—according to reports—was because of the alleged indulgence of Ottawa. Finally, you started action on a new Mercer and you are calling it the Vanier institute for women. I just hope that this institution does not get to be known by the English pronunciation of the name of the Governor General of this country.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): What is it?

Mr. Ben: It is all right; it will come to you when you are sleeping tomorrow, or some other time.

And do not tell us that you have tried your best, as a former Minister of Reform Institutions so readily stated in his sole contribution to this debate: You make them listen; if you insist they listen, they will listen; and if you demand they act, they will act.

There is a mandatory eight-day confinement in solitary for all who enter Millbrook; you might call it the "hole" because they have different types of solitary confinement and I do not wish to engage in an academic argument with the hon. Minister. This solitary confinement is for all those who are

classified in group 1. As described by the Peterborough *Examiner*:

> The men are confined behind two heavy steel doors. The inmates practically go out of their mind in there. Their meal is a cold slab of meat loaf shoved under the door. The inmates sit in there, sometimes almost in the nude, and a staff member said that there was nothing more demoralizing to a man than having his clothes taken away.
>
> A source said that the results of Millbrook's own peculiar brand of therapy is demoralization of the inmates, and the reduction of them to infantilism.
>
> Training facilities are almost nonexistent, and inmates often spend weeks in their cells with nothing but a few scrub details and odd visits to the library to break their monotony.

As a matter of fact, the report of the hon. Minister, his so-called Ontario plan, shows that there is not even an instructor on the staff at Millbrook.

I am compelled to wonder, Mr. Speaker, what effect the threat of confinement in the hole—solitary confinement—may have as a form of sanction in this prison for breach of the regulations when the inmates are thrown into the hole the minute they enter the institution for nothing at all. Except being honoured by The Department of Reform Institutions with the privilege of having room and board at that place; what frightening aspect is this hole going to hold to the prisoners once they go through their introductory period? They have been punished for nothing, except having been convicted and sent there. So why should they fear that same punishment for a breach of the regulations?

It is no wonder that when I was checking the records, those isolation cells seemed to be full all the time. Some people live there; some people even ask to be sent there and they spend weeks and months there at their own request. Still everyone in group 1 is put into that hole on that special diet for eight days.

Now, the hon. Minister tried to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the people who came in group 1 had come from other institutions. The Minister neglected to explain that this is not necessarily so, that a prisoner could come direct to Millbrook from the courts. For example, if a person had been an inmate at Millbrook and at the time of his discharge had still been classified in group 1 category—that is, he had served his complete sentence and there had been no change in his classification—were he to be convicted again, he automatically went back to Millbrook, and he automatically went through the same procedure of being thrown in that hole for eight days, spending another eight days outside what is called the "hole"—it is on the other side of the corridor—but still in so-called isolation.

I was going to ask how this sort of thing can be reconciled with what an official critic of The Department of Reform Institutions—the hon. member for Yorkview—described as the tremendous progress that has been made by the department over the past year. I took the trouble to question the hon. member about that statement, and he pointed out that his statement lauding the department had been with reference to the Minister's good sense in appointing some good people as department and sub-department heads. But the same critic also said of the Minister: "He makes good speeches, but those speeches are too often the cover-up for a situation that exists."

Now, as far as I am concerned and, I am sure as far as the hon. member for Yorkview is concerned, we both think that one cover-up is one cover-up too many.

In the Peterborough *Examiner* it was stated that two informed staff members said that:

> The senior administration of the reformatory at Millbrook is in the hands of political appointees with little or no training in institution management or penology.

What truth is there in these charges? I know the background of Superintendent Marsland. I know the background of Deputy Superintendent Brand. I would be most interested in knowing what specialized training they have had in penology. I understand Superintendent Marsland has been taking an extension course, and perhaps the hon. Minister may tell us the extent of that course.

When we raise this question about the training and we ask the Minister what truth is there in these charges, he glibly answers, "none." But what positive assurances have we that there is no truth in these charges, aside from the Minister's statement? The answer is also, none.

Now, is this good enough for the members of this House? Is that the sort of statement you are prepared to accept? I say it is not good enough. I say there is not one member of this House who can accept it as good enough. Remember, this is not just my problem, and other critics' problem, and a problem of the Minister of Reform Institu-

tions. It is your problem, and it is your obligation to see that something is done about it.

There is an unwholesome secrecy masquerading as security in The Department of Reform Institutions. It finds its expression in the cover-ups which seem to be accepted as a necessary part of the operation of such institutions. It is expressed in the unwillingness of the department to allow reporters to tour its institutions, and its reluctance even to have members of this House do so. It is manifest time and again, a veil of secrecy has been drawn about these institutions.

About four years ago, a Millbrook guard was stabbed in the back. It was almost 48 hours before the department would acknowledge what had taken place. What went on in that 48 hours? Why were 48 hours necessary for the department to make up its mind to inform the public about this incident? Is it possible that evasions were contemplated, or that the department considered not informing the public at all? Why the holding back? What other public information short of a report on a murderous stabbing is being withheld from the public every week?

Colonel Hartley Paterson, a veteran of the reformatory service, who was both governor of the Don jail and superintendent of Millbrook, said that he had talked almost daily with reporters during troubled times at the Don jail: "We had 100 per cent support from the press and the people knew our problem." Again: "These institutions are supported by the taxpayers, and the taxpayers have a right to know what is going on in the inside." Is it possible that there is a member of this House who will deny that right?

The Minister has already denied that there has been a breakdown in communication between the administration and the guards. He has denied that there has been brutal treatment of the prisoners by the staff. How long are we going to accept these unproved reassurances from a Minister who has amply demonstrated that his main purpose is not to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There are many things which the hon. member has raised which should be answered at some stage, and have already been answered. I do not want to interrupt him too much, but this is such a patent bit of misinformation to say that I have denied that there was some lack of communication between staff and administration at Millbrook. As a matter of fact, in my statement, I said that this was one of the problems that apparently had developed and we were correcting that.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps I should accuse the hon. Minister of more denials, then we will get admissions from him. But I thank the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I gave it to this House.

Mr. Ben: The last statement was that he has denied there has been brutal treatment of prisoners by the staff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree; I did deny it.

Mr. Ben: You did deny it, all right. How long are we going to accept these unproved reassurances from the Minister, then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not lie to this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I have documentation, at least.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Are you trying to prove the documentation from the person involved?

Mr. Ben: You are being facetious and asinine. The Peterborough *Examiner* ran series after series giving chapter and verse. What is the matter, does not the government, the caucus here, have a dime to buy the paper, so that you people can read something and become educated even if you have not gone to school?

Mr. Walker: I was simply asking for facts, not fantasy.

Mr. Speaker: No crossfire.

Mr. Ben: I never heard such an asinine remark. The hon. member for Durham got up here and made the most cutting insinuations that members of the Opposition had raised charges of brutality in Millbrook, when in fact he was quoting from the Peterborough *Examiner*. He did not even have the courtesy to supply the other members of caucus with copies of these articles so that they could inform themselves. He did not have the courtesy to inform them that special services in the library will photostat these articles. As I say, these are asinine interjections, displaying complete ignorance of the topic, and saying where are your facts.

Mr. Walker: Just a lot of talk—loud, but not factual.

Mr. Ben: You just let the Minister get up here, or go to him in the caucus, and say: "Answer those charges, Mr. Minister, you owe it to him."

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: You want to take up reading.

Mr. Ben: Take up reading? One has to know how to read before one can take up reading. The ignorance is appalling.

Mr. Walker: Stick to the facts.

An hon. member: He is.

Mr. Ben: Are you implying that there is something here not factual? Specify or withdraw.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just told you.

Mr. Walker: You do not know anything about the story—

Mr. Ben: Perhaps the hon. member can rise after I finish here and give his story. I will yield the floor to the hon. gentleman so he can tell us his story.

Mr. Walker: It would be just about as factual.

Mr. Ben: Do you want to tell us the story? I will yield to you to tell us the story. You claim that you know the story; you claim you know the facts. I will yield. I will sit right now and you tell this House the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: I guess maybe the answer to that is put up or shut up.

Mr. Ben: Now that is not parliamentary. I am trying to be very kind to them.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member has taken his place, he cannot yield the floor to the hon. member for Oshawa, and I would respectfully suggest that the hon. member for Muskoka be called on to give his speech.

Mr. Ben: No, I think there must have been a backlash from the whip, and he is not himself. My offer to yield the floor was not accepted, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: He cannot accept it.

Mr. Ben: It was not accepted, so I do not have to explain that the interjection of the hon. whip had no meaning.

Mr. Walker: You do not even know the rules of this House.

Mr. Ben: That is a true statement, because rules seem to be manufactured from day to day in this House, and we in the Opposition do not have any hand in it at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Speak to the chair.

Mr. Ben: I apologize to the Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister admits there is insufficient professional staff in these institutions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ben: As I was saying, the Minister admits there is insufficient professional staff in these institutions, but he would have us believe there is little or nothing he can do about it. Well, one thing he can do about it is to give his department more forceful representation at the Cabinet level, so that the department is provided with sufficient funds to meet this real objective and obligation to the prisoners and the public. "Money is no object," said the Minister—then he leaves unexpended for his department more than $4 million of an appropriation of $20.5 million last year.

The hon. Minister describes himself as no shrinking violet, and he is not a shrinking violet. The Minister loves to describe himself as a fighter and obviously relishes being so described. Well, let us hear a little more of that fight here and in Ottawa. Why does he not fight for the implementation of the Stewart committee report and the Fauteux report? Why does he not fight to have—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have!

Mr. Ben: I have told the hon. Minister before, Mr. Speaker. I indicated to the hon. Minister that I feel I have an obligation to this House. If the hon. Minister wishes some advice, I will be most happy to proffer it to him any time he wants to see me, and he would not have to make an appointment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I advised the hon. member in this House that I

did go to Ottawa on a number of occasions and spoke to the Ministers of Justice, because there have been more than one and they keep changing. I have asked them to do these things personally and by mail.

There is no other way I can think of, unless I go there and bludgeon them over the head, which is illegal.

Mr. Ben: I am not going to dispute the hon. Minister's statement. I will, however, make a statement, which I trust he will not dispute, that I checked to see what correspondence had passed between this government and the government at Ottawa, I think it was in the past two or three years, regarding at least one aspect of the Fauteux report—taking over the prisoners sentenced to six months or more. I was told, but it may be erroneous, that there was no such correspondence. So, Mr. Speaker, I had others check for me to see if perhaps I was getting the improper information. They got the same answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member want the correspondence tabled?

Mr. Ben: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then why did the hon. member not ask for it?

Mr. Ben: I am asking now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, I read some of it into the record here during the debate.

Mr. Ben: I have made these same statements before, the hon. Minister could have tabled them.

An hon. member: That was when he was in Florida.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I have not seen Florida in my life, but he says I was down in Florida.

Mr. Walker: For four weeks he was not in the House.

Mr. Ben: He must think I am a Tory with all that bag money available or something. Mr. Speaker, I demand a retraction from the hon. member, he told an untruth. He said I was absent from this House for four weeks.

An hon. member: That is an interjection, it is not on the record.

Another hon. member: Never mind, the hon. member should not be so thin skinned.

Mr. Ben: It is not a question of thin skin. I think we should endeavour to stick to the truth here.

An hon. member: Why does the hon. member not get down to facts?

Mr. Ben: Well then, if that is an interjection I will not say anything, but it is a false statement too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I refer the hon. member to pages 894 and 895, when there was a debate between the hon. member and myself. He was here, and I referred to the correspondence. So he was not paying attention.

Mr. Ben: Does the hon. Minister wish to read the correspondence?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member like me to read it right now?

Mr. Ben: Please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, the hon. member would like me to read it, Mr. Speaker. On page 894, February 24—

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is now about to read some correspondence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At the invitation of the hon. member.

Mr. Oliver: Yes, but he had referred to it previously. Now, my hon. friend knows quite well that one of the rules of debate is that when he refers to correspondence then he is bound to table it, according to the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will be glad to table it.

Mr. Oliver: Well then, table it and do not read it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, the hon. member said he would like me to read it.

Mr. Oliver: At the time, not now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But the hon. member has asked me to read this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Oliver: It should have been tabled at the time, and the hon. Minister did not do it, that is the trouble.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He never asked me to table it.

Mr. Oliver: It does not matter whether you are asked or not, you are supposed to table it.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, do I understand that your ruling now is that every letter which is read in this House will in the future be tabled?

Mr. Speaker: I say the letter is already in the record.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The dean is reviving a rule of the House which, unfortunately, has not been used for at least ten years.

Mr. Speaker: May I say the letter is already on the record?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that perhaps I was asking this House to deviate from its rules, but I had no recollection of the hon. Minister having done any such thing as he suggested he had done. I have opened *Hansard* at page 895, and now I have a very vivid recollection of what had occurred. I thank the Minister for drawing to my attention the evasive manner he adopted on that particular occasion, because, if you remember, I brought up The Penitentiaries Act and I established, I think to the satisfaction of this House, that neither this Minister nor his predecessor, who interjected at that time, even knew of the existence of The Penitentiaries Act. Let me read now, this is from *Hansard*—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You have just ruled, sir, that we cannot read these and now you are going to permit the hon. member to read them.

Mr. Speaker: It is already on the record, there is no need to read it.

Mr. Ben: All right, it is on the record. As a matter of fact, I think with the ability of the hon. Minister in taking evasive action he should be up with the air force or something.

Mr. Speaker, may we get back to the debate now?

Mr. Speaker: Continue, get back to the subject.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, why did not the Minister fight to spend his whole allotment of $58,000 for badly needed staff training, instead of meekly spending half the amount, $28,915? Why does he not fight for the Harold King farm and the good work being done there so that institution does not have to resort to public subscription to keep it going? Now, that to me is shameful. The hon. Minister will probably say that they are making donations to the Harold King farm, and that if it became a government operation nobody would have confidence in it. Well, that last one thing I would accept. Anything the government touches, nobody has confidence in it.

Now, to me it is not good enough for the Minister to tell us that it does not matter whether the King farm gets its money from The Department of Public Welfare or his department, the fact remains it is not getting enough government support and it is the hon. Minister's responsibility to fight for it. The wages of social workers within The Department of Reform Institutions range from $4,600 to $6,900. This is what the government pays a person with two years university training beyond the BA level.

I could not agree more with the member for Woodbine than when he said this is absolutely ridiculous—$4,600 for a person with a bachelor of social work degree. Some day labourers, in fact most day labourers, earn more. Why does the Minister not fight for these people and those at the custodial level? Salaries went up 66 per cent last year and who got the increase? Not the social workers, not the guards, not the very people upon whose attitudes success in the reformatories system depends. If these people are content with what they are getting, it may be a tribute to their dedication, but not to their common sense. It certainly is no tribute to their employer, this government.

The investigation last year of Millbrook by David Dougall, Reform Institutions chief inspector, and Douglas Penfold, a former member of the therapy staff, was nothing more than a red herring, a whitewash, an insufferable papering over of the facts. Let us have an independent investigation, if we are to have any investigation at all—an investigation of the kind I strongly urge, of the whole system under the department's control. The Dougall-Penfold report to the Minister refuted the prisoners' complaints that they had wanted to take up trade training and it was a motive for the unrest. It stated that all prisoners had such trade training available to them. What trade training? I point out to the Minister again that in his report for last year's activities—that beautiful report that came a little late for us to consider when his department's estimates were up—it states that there is not a single instructor on the staff at Millbrook. So what kind of trade training are

they getting there if they do not even have an instructor? Would the hon. Minister tell us what trade training these men have available to them, and spare us these inanities in the guise of facts?

An hon. member: He is reading the funny papers.

Mr. Ben: Oh yes, but he is reading "Andy Capp" and I like it too.

Now, the Minister is gravely described as being concerned at constant inmate turnover with sentences of 30 days to two years or more. It is creating "an abnormal amount of discontent, unrest and tension in the institutions under his control." But the hon. Minister solemnly and regretfully adds: "It is not within the power of The Department of Reform Institutions to change it." The Minister tells us that the provincial system, its physical facilities and programme are "not designed for persons serving sentences of more than two years." The Minister has asked that remission on time be equalized for federal-provincial prisoners. That has not been done yet.

Mr. Speaker, what has been done so far? Well, the Minister will tell us that staff co-operation during riots is excellent. Yes, sir, we can pat ourselves on the back for that. "Give me the rubber hose, Charlie, he is coming my way." That is their attitude, and what did the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that not a charge of brutality?

Mr. Ben: Charge of brutality? Obviously, it is self-defence—"Give me the rubber hose, Charlie, he is coming my way."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member said that he agreed with that, now what—

Mr. Ben: Now what did this diligent man do?—Dougall and Penfold report on that Millbrook riot or, if you like, disturbance—

> Disturbance gas was used to subdue the prisoners.

They reported just what their chief wanted the public to hear:

> 1. Wages may be too low but they are under negotiation.
>
> 2. The riot itself—25 inmates out of 200 created a disturbance which could hardly be called a riot;
>
> 3. Alleged inconsistencies—flexible and varied disciplinary and therapeutic treatment are necessary, but co-operation between junior and senior members of the custodial staff "could bear improvement."

Get that, "could bear improvement." Mind you, the hon. Minister has admitted to that.

> 4. Security—At no time was it in jeopardy, and the superintendent and his staff were at all times in complete control.
>
> 5. Staff—in the previous 18 months since January 1964, 22 persons had resigned; 13 to take up better jobs.

Sir, let us call those men before the special committee that I propose. Let us get from them the story of why they resigned. I suggest to you that many, if not most of them, were given the option of resigning or being fired for reasons that The Department of Reform Institutions would prefer to withhold.

> 6. Property—Not more than ten instances of destruction of property in the previous six years.

Mr. Speaker, to anyone with experience of these prisons and the men in them, this absurd claim can be rejected out of hand. Imagine, not more than ten instances of destruction of property in the previous six years! If that is the case, indeed, the inmates in that institution are next to angels!

> 7. Brutality—

Now listen to this:

> No shred of evidence to support the charge of brutality by the staff. In fact, less strict there with the new superintendent.

I surely do not need to point out to you how this statement conflicts with the views of the former superintendent, Colonel Hartley Paterson who "tried to operate Millbrook as a rehabilitation unit and planned a climate of healthy human relations between staff and inmates, but his ideas ran counter to those of his superiors and in two years he quit the superintendent's job."

> 8. Archaic system of penology—

What did the department reply to this charge? It replied:

> The presence of a maximum security institution enables troublemakers to be removed from the general run of prison population and permits the department to operate some of the finest, most open therapeutic settings in any correctional field on this continent.

What this means, with the officialese stripped away, is that Millbrook may be a hell hole, but look what there is elsewhere. "Some of

the finest, most open therapeutic settings in any correctional field on this continent"—Guelph, for example, Burwash and Mercer—all open, therapeutic rehabilitation centres. Beautiful.

An hon. member: Trees, flowers and shrubs!

Mr. Ben: Oh yes. Remember that statement about the Mercer people raising poultry?

Mr. Speaker, this is too gratuitous and misleading a statement to be deserving of reply, but the danger of such rubbish is that it misleads the public. If the public is to be persuaded that two training centres, five industrial farms and two open forestry camps can wipe out the blot that these institutions are upon the record of this department, the hon. Minister would employ his usual tactics of ignoring or minimizing the real problems, replying with non sequiturs, and throwing a veil over the real doings and negligence of his department.

The tractable duo—that is Dougall and Penfold—found that salaries were too low; 22 persons had resigned in 18 months; and they readily admitted that the department had as yet insufficient professional staff. A line or two later they reported a general critical shortage of professional staff. And then in almost the same breath tell us that the department's progress is in the forefront of modern correctional procedures.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I had to laugh so that I would not weep.

The Peterborough *Examiner* says:

> The only Toronto newspaper to take a sustained and enlightened interest in this problem has pointed out repeatedly and insistently, the need for an inquiry into conditions in Ontario reform institutions. I congratulate the paper for its intelligent enterprise, and for its views of the situation and the remedy it proposes.

I heartily subscribe, notwithstanding the hon. member for Durham.

The Rev. S. G. West has persuasively argued in a commentary on Millbrook that the isolation of the already spiritually and sociologically damaged personality is the worst treatment possible, in that it simply reinforces the conditions and attitudes which have sent the prisoner there. He has said that the highest echelons of the civil service at Queen's Park are a self-protective, threatened group of people who regard the so-called reform institutions as their own private preserve and not the people's business.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What did Mr. West say about the hon. member?

Mr. Ben: If the Minister gives it to me, I will read it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member read it.

Mr. Ben: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member want to read it?

Mr. Ben: I read it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister is asking me to tell what it says. If he will give me the article, I will be very glad to quote it here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member does not have it?

Mr. Ben: No. I will be very happy to comment on it, I assure the hon. Minister. As a matter of fact, if the page boy will be kind enough to get me that, I would be most happy to pass some comments on it. If somebody will do me the courtesy—one of the hon. members—I will be very happy to. Now, Mr. West spoke of:

> —a thin veneer of modern correctional thinking over the top of archaic and vengeful thinking in an effort to hoodwink the public.

Those were his words. I continue:

> The grand jury at Mercer was shown a typewriting class which was typing gibberish under a supervisor who could not type.

It was explained that they were lacking a teacher and that another member of the staff had been trying to take up the slack. Now, that may be laudable, but the fact was that this department's negligence in providing proper instructional staff necessitated a supervisor who could not type to substitute for a properly qualified teacher, and no matter how laudable was her conduct, the fact remained that this government's negligence and laxity made that necessary.

The responsibility, no matter how sugar-coated that may have been, lies over there.

Reverend West has charged that boys as young as ten are being sent to reform institutions in this province. Is this so? It must

be, because I note that there are some seven-year-olds.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was the charge?

Mr. Ben: Boys as young as ten are being sent to reform institutions in this province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Utterly absurd! Utterly absurd!

Mr. Ben: Is the Minister distinguishing between reform institutions and training schools?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, there is a difference.

Mr. Ben: Then I will abide by the Minister's argument.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Youngsters as young as seven go to the training schools.

Mr. Ben: This is a statement that he made—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are a lot of other statements he made that were inaccurate.

Mr. Ben: This is a statement that he made, and this is called The Department of Reform Institutions. It does not say department of training schools, so you can hardly blame the Reverend West.

At any rate, I am glad that the hon. Minister made the admission that they do send ten year olds to training schools, because if this is so, this department is engaged in a process of so-called reform for boys' characters which have not even been formed. And what about the so-called hopeless cases, the inmates whom a department official has described as parasites? The paradox which the department is too blind to see is that these men and women are often the most reformable, the more docile people are, the more the administration loves them and yet the less likely they are to become law-abiding citizens and self-directing human beings.

The department's answer to Mr. West is: "Has he been to Millbrook?" Well, I know he has been there, and I have been there, and I support his views. The only probing and inspection of some of these appalling institutions that is allowed by the department is by its own servants, whose reports are controlled, and who are censored in what they say to the press and to the people. The recent Mercer grand jury was one of the few that insisted on looking under the rug, and we know the sort of treatment that was accorded to that grand jury by this government.

Now, I have spoken of the inefficiency of The Department of Reform Institutions. One measure of the efficiency of that department and its hon. Minister is the belated presentation of his report to the members of this House, only hours before the members were expected to commence debating it, on the very date that the debate was commenced. If that was not inefficiency, it was cold calculation. The Minister would like to disqualify a critic of his department by describing him as irresponsible. This is the easy way, and the Minister has proven that he approves of the easy way. It saves talk and effort. It obviates the problem of making a genuinely thorough and compelling reply.

What can the hon. Minister reply? That he has been wrong? That he has been ineffectual? That he has been idle? Of course not—every effort must be made to save face. It is reckoned that the average Canadian has about three times the chance of serving time in prison as the average citizen in Britain, Scandinavia or Holland. That is a profoundly important statistic that indicates something is very wrong here. What are they doing right in Britain and Scandinavia and Holland that we are doing wrong here?

Will the Minister, who refers frequently to his research department, be good enough to ask his experts to provide full answers for this House? Will he ask them to publish something in this field? Surely such detailed studies have already been made. Surely something has already been published, despite my inability to find it. This is the sort of information you need if you are to make intelligent decisions. But I must make another criticism of The Department of Reform Institutions, based on my studies in this field.

The department, as its studies show, has a few good theoretical intellectuals, and a great many non-theoretical, non-intellectuals, but it has not enough non-theoretical intellectuals, practical men who can go out and get a job done.

Do you want me to repeat that for you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I lost you.

Mr. Ben: You lost me, well all right.

An hon. member: You have said it again and again, there is no question about that.

Mr. Ben: Not only I, but other members of this House have been telling them this

for years and years and years, and they say, what is that again? It is fantastic, you know.

I am beginning to suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the government hon. members of this House must have better facilities than we do here. Somewhere they must have a place where they sleep during the sessions of the House; I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are not generally here Friday at all.

Mr. Ben: Generally? I beg to differ with you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now another Minister the other day suggested that I did not do my homework, whereas I think it was obvious to the House that I asked him ten questions for every five answers he was able to give. As a matter of fact, I think I asked him 100 questions for every ten answers he was able to give, so even without homework, I was able to ask ten times as many questions as he was able to answer. I hate to think what would happen if I did homework.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: You know, I think this is one of the reasons that the reform institutions of this province go on in the peculiar atmosphere of their own. You know, sort of seemingly detached from real life.

There is an information gap, Mr. Speaker, and this department and the newspapers are to some extent responsible for it. The hon. Minister, with his over-commitment to other commitments, must take the major responsibility for it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where did you get that one?

Mr. Ben: Oh, I got that from the hon. member for Sudbury. As I said, the Minister with this over-commitment to other commitments must take the primary responsibility for it. He is defending the old orthodoxies instead of playing for new ones, and he is wasting a magnificent opportunity to introduce a fight for long-needed reforms. His is a department with lots of motion and no sense of direction.

As one research study has shown, in a period of ten years some executives gained ten years of experience, while others had their first year of experience repeated ten times. As a matter of fact, I believe this phrase was used in this House. This is the history of this department for the past 20 years—a history of persevering harshness, interspersed with periodic hollow vows of reform. Now, what I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, as has been suggested so often in the past, is that you put aside the academic theorizing for a while and try to feel the fact of the system, a system of which none of us can be proud.

What about the five Ontario clinics, the first of their kind in this country? The one guidance centre and the one treatment centre for females? How are they being administered? How capably are they being run? What results are they getting?

The case histories statistically? The Minister told us on February 23: "We do our utmost to reduce the terrible ravages of crime." Well, try to prove it to us. Do not just make a statement. Try to prove it to us. Really show us that in some area at least, you are really trying.

We look in vain in the Minister's annual reports for the information of a sort that is necessary for a genuine understanding of what is being done. These clinics are being run by The Department of Reform Institutions. This in itself is a palpable mistake. They should be run by the Health and Welfare departments, which are equipped to do, and capable of doing, the sort of job that is required. The treatment most inadequates receive in prison tends generally to increase their inadequacy and dependency. We want them to be more responsible when they get out, not less: What is it like at Millbrook where the prisoners learn such useful, wholesome and stimulating trades, as scrubbing clean floors; where their outdoor activity is extremely limited; where the grinding monotony and inactivity has frequently caused prisoners to become mentally sick? What a commentary on the Ontario system which the government so proudly tells us provides "the finest, most open, therapeutic settings in any correctional field on this continent."

You know, for the world of me, Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to find this field he speaks of, where these open institutions are. They must be up some place near the Arctic Circle. Certainly not down here. That is where it is, in the research field.

But as goes the Minister, so goes his department. Douglas Penfold, former psychologist at Millbrook, blames the Peterborough

Examiner for sensationalism in reporting brutality at Millbrook. He accuses the newspaper of a tawdry motive. Well, I got to the reporter who wrote the story, and I would describe him as intelligent, restrained, careful, and extremely conscientious in the manner of his approach. And what did Mr. Penfold say in reply to the *Examiner's* charges? He said that investigators spoke to about ten guards at the reformatory, "in a random survey and some of them were placed under oath."

Are we to believe that a random survey of about ten guards is an adequate response to these great charges, particularly when the guards' employer is conducting the survey? There must be an open, expert and completely impartial investigation of these institutions by the most competent and excellent people they can find, and I would suggest that they be not on the hon. Minister's staff, or perhaps not even on his advisory board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All those competent people are on our staff.

Mr. Ben: Oh, so there are no more of them? Now the hon. Minister is saying that there is nobody in this province or elsewhere who is competent, because if he was, he would be on his staff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right, we have got them all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Penfold said the guards refuted the brutality charges. I can just see them. "Who, me? Brutal? Heaven forbid!" They were, he said, shocked at the paper's story, that terrible newspaper.

No inmates were interviewed. Why not? The answer is: "The psychologist"—that is Penfold—"said he knows the nature of the Millbrook inmates, and if there was brutality"—and remember these are Penfold's words—"the guards would have known about it."

It is difficult to believe that statement was made seriously. The mind is overwhelmed at the thought of an earnest Mr. Penfold being reassured by a guard: "Oh, no, sir, I am never brutal."

This Penfold, I think we should get him on a bench. He would put lie detectors out of style, that man would. He could tell by looking at him whether a man was telling the truth or not. Mr. Penfold said there was "force but not brutality." Now that is a nice subjective distinction if I ever heard one. What force? Let us hear about the force that skirts so delicately the field of brutality. Mr. Penfold asks of Mr. West's condemnations, "Has he ever been to Millbrook?" Well, the answer is that he has been to Millbrook, and I have been to Millbrook, and I came away dismayed with what I saw there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a disorderly world and we cannot stop that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What did the hon. member see there?

Mr. Ben: I saw them doing nothing. I saw them doing absolutely nothing except wasting their time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member did not see any brutality.

Mr. Ben: Well, I doubt if they would introduce me to that particular topic.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member does not need to be introduced—

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister is being naive to imply to this House that a member can walk into that institution and just go right through those pearly gates. My goodness, man, any time I went to visit any other institution I could not get past the front door until they phoned up the department to see if it was okay. And do not tell me otherwise, because at every institution I have gone to except Millbrook I had to wait while they phoned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member whether he was ever stopped until they phoned head office to find out if he had permission.

Mr. Ben: That is absolutely the fact.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where was that?

Mr. Ben: At Guelph and at Mercer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the hon. member identify himself as—

Mr. Ben: I identified myself with a little card that the Speaker's department was kind enough to give me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I want to get this straight, because if it is true, I want to investigate.

Mr. Ben: As a matter of fact, when I went to Guelph I was told by the superintendent—I told him I was there on a surprise visit—and he said, "I am sorry, it is

the practice. We must phone Toronto." They have a direct line, but he could not get on the direct line, and I had to sit there and wait while he tried a circuitous line. This same thing happened—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is against our directions.

Mr. Ben: It may be. I am not criticizing that practice, Mr. Speaker. I cannot expect every superintendent in every institution to take the word of everybody who comes up to the door.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member—

Mr. Ben: I presented a card, but it does not have my picture on it. I am not being critical of that. If I had my picture on there, perhaps they would let me in right away.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Now, we live in a province where the crime rate is increasing steadily and, inexorably, a province with an increasing prison and reformatory population. There is, and has been so often and so unavailingly stressed, a need for a new approach to this problem. One forward step would be to take the responsibility for children under 16 away from The Department of Reform Institutions and give it to The Department of Education, which would meet the needs of these children in special modern institutions with expert staff. The Department of Reform Institutions should be responsible only for persons sentenced to less than six months. Others should go to modern and effective institutions run by the federal government. The only way to launch a new approach, however—and I lay every stress upon this point—is by an impartial investigation. And I believe the hon. Minister when he says this is what he is trying to accomplish, that is, this department being responsible only for inmates sentenced to less than six months. But I also firmly believe that if constant pressure was put on the government in Ottawa, we would have had more results by now.

I refer again to The Penitentiaries Act where I drew to the hon. Minister's attention a provision whereby Ontario and Ottawa can enter into a contractual arrangement for Ottawa to take over the care and custody of prisoners sentenced to more than six months.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They refused to do it.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking of correspondence, it was in this regard that I had a thorough check made of the file in Ottawa to see if any correspondence had been received from this department. I would be most pleased to be shown some correspondence with reference to The Penitentiaries Act between the Minister's department and Ottawa and I assure him I will be the first to apologize.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a little red herring the hon. member has brought out. I explained that to him during the estimates.

Mr. Ben: I submit that you have not, and I could quote at page 895 of *Hansard,* the page that the Minister referred me to.

The reformatory at Millbrook was the last word in escape-proof prisons when it was opened in 1957. It was designed not only to hold but to treat the most troublesome inmates in Ontario. Guards were given extensive training in the first few years. Now, useful and progressive training in the treatment of prisoners is at a dismally inadequate level. As far as pay is concerned, the government consider reformatory guards deserving of little more than is paid to day labourers. I suggest you remember that up to 60 per cent of the guards are reported to be moonlighting.

According to an article by David Allen in the *Examiner,* one guard's training consisted of "two and a half days of pushing buttons and trying keys in cell doors. Many guards appeared to be unsuited for the job." That perhaps may be an overstatement. But I did read to this House the complete syllabus of training for guards in Millbrook reformatory. As I pointed out, the Minister said that was only the preliminary training. He promised during the estimates to give us a list of all the training. We have not received it yet, as I drew to the attention of the hon. Minister.

In another of his articles, Mr. Allen presented the story of a former inmate of Ontario institutions, given for the purposes of the story, the pseudonym, "Ken Kellogg," who said that Burwash near Sudbury—a minimum and medium security institution—was little better than Guelph which left him an unchanged man. "But at least they keep you busy there," Kellogg said.

Kellogg also said that Camp Bison—I think that is its name—up at Burwash, is an old foul-smelling shack built over a swamp. The shack holds 100 inmates, and he states again:

"Once the inmates attempted to burn it, but it was so wet it would not burn."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suggest the hon. member should visit that place.

Mr. Ben: As a matter of fact, you know, if we received some co-operation from this government, and we did not receive all these nasty innuendoes that we were not in the House—because there are so few of us that we cannot work in shifts—we would have time to go up to see these places. But every time we are out of this House trying to investigate something at our own expense and our own time, some sanctimonious and pious government member gets up and says, "You were not in the House." After all, we have to start at two o'clock, we stay here until after 11:30.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member made the charge earlier today.

Mr. Ben: What charge?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That there were not enough hon. members here.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the interjections be stopped and the member continue with his speech.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this camp that was supposed to be described, I will try to visit it, Mr. Speaker. I imagine this is one of the most modern and open therapeutic settings on the continent—I like that phrase, you know.

Now, Kellogg described a guard at Millbrook as "probably the most hated man in Ontario reformatories."

Was this man one of those that the Minister referred to when he said:

> We are interested in obtaining the type of person with a sensibility for other people; with some understanding of other people; and the ability to maintain a reasonable level of objectivity.

I, myself, could go on to describe this particular guard he is speaking of, but perhaps the Minister will be able to tell us a few laudatory things about him.

Kellogg told of physical and psychological cruelty by the guards, and demeaning and demoralizing work for prisoners such as uselessly moving snow and gravel from one place to another and then returning to the unspeakable boredom of the cells, where it is often so cold there is ice in the toilets:

"Often there is no work," reported Allen, "and treatment or rehabilitation is almost nonexistent." The most open and therapeutic setting on the continent!

Now, in all truth, I believe that I should say that the Minister has discontinued a form of occupational therapy whereby gravel was moved from one location to another and I laud the hon. Minister for it. I might also say that the isolation cells in Mercer reformatory have been sort of isolated from the rest of the prison and they are no longer used.

I also made the statement after I visited Millbrook that there is so little to occupy the prisoners there, even in the line of work, that perhaps bringing back these rock piles to a place like Millbrook would have a therapeutic effect and in those surroundings may be an improvement on the present system.

Not long ago, a dismissed Guelph reformatory guard named Patrick F. Lindsay, wrote to an hon. member of the New Democratic Party, claiming that his dismissal resulted from protests he made to the government officials about abuses in the reformatory. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions replied that: "No doubt he has caused this trouble because he was encouraged by a couple of members of the NDP."

This from an hon. Minister who trembles with indignation when a member imputes his motive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where did I write that?

Mr. Ben: This? I am quoting the Minister verbatim. These are his exact words: "No doubt he has caused this trouble because he was encouraged by a couple of members—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member said that I wrote that. Where did I write it?

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister said it in *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is different. The hon. member gave the impression that I wrote this to Mr. Lindsay. I said it in this House.

Mr. Ben: Did I—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, the hon. member said that I wrote it.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister said it in this House at a time when there was no opportunity to reply.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That has nothing to do with it. I want to be factual about it.

Mr. Ben: This is what I said:

> Not long ago, a dismissed Guelph reformatory guard named Patrick F. Lindsay wrote to a member of the New Democratic Party, claiming that his dismissal resulted from protests he made to government officials against abuse in the reformatory. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions replied—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member said "wrote" the first time.

Mr. Ben: Oh, well—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is quite a difference.

Mr. Bryden: No difference that is important.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, it is important. The suggestion was that I wrote to a member of the staff saying that he should not have done what he did in respect of getting in touch with a member of this House.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister followed his normal tactics of attacking the member personally.

Hon. Mr. Grossman. The hon. member's tactics are always honourable, very honourable! He is a very honourable man.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ben: The Minister is like the official historian who records what happens and much else besides. The dismissed guard, Lindsay, sent in a petition signed by several guards with the letter he wrote to the Minister. How many guards signed that petition about conditions at Guelph reformatory? Why does Mr. Penfold not interview them? Lindsay cited the death the previous August of inmate Ronald Franklin Cross, aged 19, of Belleville, who had an enlarged heart that prison doctors knew about, and who died of a heart failure after working with pick and shovel in a gravel pit, at least, this House was informed. A gravel pit makes a fine therapeutic setting for a man with a heart condition.

Kellogg, the former inmate, said that of all the reform institutions he served time in, Brampton was the only one with some semblance of rehabilitative procedures. He said that the medium security institution at Guelph was appalling, and that perverted sexual favours were often the price of protection:

> I hear the place is a big orgy now. Younger and younger men are getting sent there all the time; they do not have a chance. When I was there, only the strongest survived. If you did not belong to the right clique, you had to pay.

Kellogg said that all inmates were running protection rackets. He said:

> I feel sorry for any young fellow going into Guelph. You cannot beat the place. Guelph is the ruination of many men. When I came out of Guelph, I had not changed at all.

Now, this is a man who is not a prisoner, who has been out for some time, and is ostensibly going straight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess he was changed, if he is going straight.

Mr. Ben: Evidently through no efforts of the hon. Minister. If he will read those articles he will see that what did have a salutory effect was getting married.

An hon. member: What a woman does for a man!

Mr. Ben: Perhaps that is the best form of reformation and rehabilitation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Now, this is the institution that the Minister would have us believe is impeccably up to date in its outlook and methods; this is the institution a former Premier described in 1952 as: "A great place where every opportunity is given for reform."

The high ethical gloss with which the hon. Minister tries to mantle his department loses a little of its lustre when we learn of such conditions. But the Minister refuses to get too worked up about these problems. He would like all of us to regard them with the same mindless passivity and quiescence.

Last year, a special committee of the Toronto Anglican diocesan council for social services was established to study conditions at Millbrook. According to Rev. J. E. Adam, minister of St. George's Anglican church, Peterborough, the reason for this was: "Many people doubt whether all the facts were exposed"—that is at the Millbrook investigation —"and doubt whether a full report of the investigation"—that is the department's investigation—"was made public."

The Minister is obliged to tell us whether any part of this suspect report was withheld.

The inconsistencies are so manifest that one wonders whether the hon. Minister has told the truth about Millbrook. I honestly do wonder. The government report on Millbrook purports to show nothing seriously amiss. It was in the previous two weeks that a mentally ill inmate who stabbed a guard was beaten. There were continuing reports of dissatisfaction and low morale among the custodial staff. Two inmates were reported to have "unusual control" over the administration. Surely, "unusual influence" would be more apt, if true.

It was said that guards were being hired and expected to control some of the most unruly men in the province with little or no formal training. A former guard said that the so-called "training programme" was baffling in its inadequacy. One guard got two and a half days' training but:

> A five-page brief handed to all new guards calls for the first four weeks of employment to be devoted almost exclusively to training.

Now, you see, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the department to say what it is doing, but it is quite another to see what it is doing. The guards at Millbrook have no formal grievance procedure. The guards who protest are given the option of resigning or being fired. The implication—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are members of the civil service association. There is grievance procedure set up for every member of the staff.

Mr. Ben: It is a good grievance procedure; I acknowledge that. I saw what happened to Lindsay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He lost his grievance; does that mean that there is no grievance procedure?

Mr. Ben: How about the petitions that were signed, Mr. Speaker? Why does the hon. Minister not table those?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They were made public here when we were discussing them.

Mr. Ben: All the signatures of the guards?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I tabled a copy. If the member wants them, I will be glad to give them to him. The fact is that this man went to grievance and he lost his grievance. These were all made public. The hon. member does not have his information right.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the hon. member adjourn the debate?

Mr. Ben moves adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will resume the consideration of Bill 81 in committee of the whole House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 109

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 16, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 16, 1966

Question of Mr. Robarts re Joseph Hirshorn collection, Mr. Sopha 3465

Questions of Mr. Spooner re municipality of Alfred, Mr. Thompson 3465

Questions of Mr. Dymond re quinidine sulphate, Mr. Ben 3465

Questions of Mr. Wishart re Crown Life Insurance Company, Mr. MacDonald 3466

Question of Mr. Dymond re interdepartmental report on disturbed children, Mr. Trotter 3466

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, in committee 3467

Recess, 6 o'clock 3503

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, in the east and west galleries, students from Tecumseh public school, London.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question I should like to direct to the hon. Prime Minister.

What steps, if any, were taken by the government to acquire for the people of Ontario all or any part of the vast collection of art and sculpture owned by Joseph Hirshorn?

If no steps were taken, then would the Prime Minister inform the House why they were not?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, there were no steps taken by this government. There have been no contacts with me in this regard. Frankly, I did not know that Mr. Hirshorn's collection was in the area where it might be given away by him to any jurisdiction. We had no knowledge of this at all.

I think in the realm of the arts we have done a good deal in this province in the last four or five years, and I would say that we would have been very interested in discussing with him what might have been done, as we did with Mr. and Mrs. McMichael. As you know, they had rather a large collection of the Group of Seven, and we made certain arrangements with them. But in this particular set of circumstances, I had no knowledge of it whatsoever.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would the Minister please advise the House if his department has taken any action on receipt of correspondence from the law firm of St. Jacques et St. Jacques, Ottawa, regarding the municipality of Alfred, Ontario?

If no action has been taken regarding this matter, when can the ratepayers of this municipality expect action to be taken?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I could very easily answer the hon. member of the Opposition's question by saying, yes, and that would take care of the situation.

However, knowing the great spirit of cooperation which will exist here this afternoon, perhaps it might be advisable if I were to provide the House and the hon. leader of the Opposition with more information.

Actually, the problem that I think the Leader of the Opposition is referring to relates to the construction of a building in the municipality of the township of Alfred, not the town. I might tell him that there have been a number of solicitors involved in this, solicitors for the municipality, and the firm of solicitors whom he mentions in his question—St. Jacques et St. Jacques—are acting on behalf of one or more ratepayers.

There seems to be an area of misunderstanding, because the action of the council—the properly elected council—is quite in order, and I see that there is no possibility that the complaint of the ratepayers has any foundation in fact. However, there would seem to be some lack of communication, perhaps, between the administration of the township and the ratepayers who require some information. Our department has and will take the necessary action to reply to the letter referred to but I want to assure hon. members it is quite in order.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

Is the Minister aware that quinidine sulphate, a drug essential to the well-being of many heart patients, and presently in extremely short supply, has gone up in price considerably? I am not mentioning the price because perhaps some do not know what the high price is and they do not charge that much.

Second, is there anything the Minister's department can do to assure a more adequate supply, and at a reasonable cost to the patients, of this drug?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that our department has no responsibility or authority in this matter at all. Unfortunately, even if we had, there is not very much we could do about it. The supply is short because of the difficulties presently being experienced in the Far East, but this matter falls within the purview of the federal government, and the provincial government has no authority whatsoever.

Mr. Ben: May I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister? Would it help any if the Minister made some overtures to Ottawa to see what could be done, especially since the political situation in Indonesia has changed slightly and they might be able to increase the supply?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have discussed this matter. We have all discussed this together, and so far the federal government is not able to do anything else. It is just impossible to get the product from any other source of supply at the present time. I am quite certain that when it is possible to resume the flow of the product necessary for the manufacture of quinidine, this will be done.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General.

Has the government investigated charges regarding procedures followed by Crown Life Insurance Company in its relation with its agents as outlined in articles in the Sudbury *Star* on April 28 and May 10?

Second, will the superintendent of insurance be taking any action in this connection?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the superintendent of insurance has investigated the circumstances outlined in the articles to which the hon. member refers.

I think the member may be aware that insurance companies make advances to their agents against or in anticipation of commissions to be earned by the agents. In this case it appears that the actions are being taken for recovery of commissions or unearned portions of commissions from agents who have left the employ of the company, and in some cases the actions have to do with straight loans which were made to the agents and for the recovery of those advances.

I should like to point out clearly that this is not a matter of premiums. Premiums are not involved.

We are very interested if there is any question of agents not applying the premiums to the purpose for which they are intended, that is the purchase of insurance. Due to the fact that this is a matter simply between the company and its agents in the manner I have outlined, the superintendent of insurance will be taking no further action.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Attorney General a supplementary question? Does the superintendent of insurance have no jurisdiction at all over licensed agents when they are hired, as is alleged, under false pretences and in some instances they leave under duress—they are forced to leave, and things of this nature?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I accept the premises the hon. member puts forward.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, they are part of the article.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They may be part of the article, but in these cases so far as our investigation shows it is simply a matter of the recovery of advances made in anticipation of commission and the recovery of loans made to agents and no question of premium is involved.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, the hon. member for Parkdale on Thursday asked a question.

Would the Minister inform the House whether he intends to table in the House the report to him by an interdepartmental committee representing The Departments of Health, Education, Welfare, Reform Institutions—and I might add there was also the Attorney General's department—on the subject of emotionally disturbed children?

In answer, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that we do not intend to table the report. It was a report prepared for guidance of the various departments.

As I stated during the presentation of my estimates, we have received this report and it is now in the hands of the five departments concerned, where it is receiving close and careful study to the end that we may produce for the government a co-ordinated programme that can be brought into operation.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask then, Mr. Speaker, will there be a copy available to the Opposition?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I had not thought of this, Mr. Speaker. This is something that we do frequently. I ask for many studies and I do not usually make these reports available. I really have not given it consideration. I will give it consideration, nonetheless.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order; committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

(continued)

On section 6:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, section 6 deals with the executive committee of the metropolitan council. The theme that is set forward is a 50 per cent division between the city of Toronto and the suburbs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the government has made much about the idea of readjusting representation in accordance, or roughly in accordance, with population. The government did not see fit to accept the amendment of my colleague from Bracondale which would have made a better alignment of representation by population, but in refuting that amendment the hon. Minister said we strive for something like representation by population.

This deals with a very important part of the function of the metropolitan council. We are dealing with the executive committee and those who have had some experience with the functioning of the Metropolitan Toronto council, or the city council of Toronto or any council that has a board of control, will recognize not only by law, not only by the provisions of The Municipal Act, are boards of control, and in this case the executive committee of Metro, given very substantial powers, but they are the people who are seized with almost all of the day-to-day information about the operations of that particular council. The statute particularly requires that except in very minor matters they cannot be upset except by a two-thirds vote.

Not only are they given that statutory protection, but in addition, Mr. Chairman, since they are seized of most of the facts it is very difficult, if not impossible, for any councillor who feels aggrieved by their decision to successfully argue against their wealth of information, which by and large is not made available to the ordinary member of council.

I wonder how the hon. Minister can justify his remarks about believing in representation by population, when in section 6 he discards that approach and discards it completely. He gives the city of Toronto, with a population approximately one-third of the total population of the whole Metro area, 50 per cent of the representation on the executive committee.

The executive committee is then going to be a small group of representatives, who, by and large, are going to run the affairs of the metropolitan council. And the whole idea of representation by population is thrown out the window, because the executive committee is going to consist of 50 per cent of representatives from the city of Toronto—50 per cent of representatives from an area that has only one-third of the population.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the one serious fault that I found with the metropolitan council was that if there was a conflict between city and suburban views, I regret very much that in the reorganization of Metro the government has not seen fit to reallocate the boroughs so that they would be approximately equal in size, in population and assessment. For some reason or other, they are paying very high attention to the artificial boundaries that have been created over the last 100 or 150 years, and which have no validity in fact. For some reason or other, Steeles avenue is a magic line, beyond which nobody can stray, because at one time it was the northern boundary of the township of York. Now it is the northern boundary of the township of North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke. There is no rhyme or reason for it.

For some reason or other, the boundaries of the city of Toronto are treated as sacrosanct. Why, I do not think anyone knows. Why they are being preserved in this statute, again I am sure that no one can tell us. As

I say, Mr. Chairman, the government has missed a glorious opportunity to put into this two-tiered system of government, units of approximately equal size, six units equal in population, in area and in assessment.

Having missed that opportunity—and it is obvious that their intention is to continue to miss it—they have resisted the changing of any of these boundaries. They have resisted the extension of the northern boundary up to the watershed line at Richmond Hill; they have resisted the extension easterly, and the extension westerly, so they are not seized with any imagination in these lines. But having resisted all of those things, Mr. Chairman, I would like to understand—and for the life of me I cannot—why they believe there is magic in giving to the city of Toronto 50 per cent of the strength on the metropolitan council.

Is it by population? It cannot be by population, because the city of Toronto is one-third of the population of the whole of Metro. Is it by assessment? It cannot be by assessment, because Toronto has little more than 40 per cent of the assessment. At one time, it had 50 per cent. At one time it had more than 50 per cent. Today it has 40 per cent, and that percentage of the assessment is going to reduce as time goes on. Is it by reason of the fact that there is a desire to preserve some economic strength, some assessment preferment in the city of Toronto, in the core city? If it is, then for goodness sake, Mr. Chairman, let the hon. Minister explain it to us. What is the reason? What is he trying to preserve?

By continuing this setup the way it is set out in the Act, or by carrying forward the setup the way it is set out in the Act, the hon. Minister and the government are encouraging the one serious flaw that presently exists in the whole administration of the metropolitan area. They are continuing the city-suburb split, and markedly continuing it.

Let us look at what is going to happen, Mr. Chairman. A question comes up for decision. It is dealt with first by the executive committee. The executive committee consists of 50 per cent from the city of Toronto. The executive committee makes a decision. The suburban representatives out in council want to challenge, or dispute, or disagree with that decision. It will take every single suburban representative voting together, plus one or two city people, to upset that, to get the two-thirds vote. Mr. Chairman, it is highly unlikely that the suburban people are going to stick together to that extent. It is much more likely that the city of Toronto people are going to vote as a bloc, as they have done on most major issues that have come before the metropolitan council. If the government is serious about paying attention to the idea of representation by population—and I suppose this is a new democratic procedure that does not occur to this government—if they are at all serious; if the words of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs mean anything; if the words of the hon. Prime Minister mean anything, then surely they should carry this principle forward into the new constitution of the executive committee. I would throw out another thought, and perhaps I might get an answer on this one, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Does it really make any sense that the persons holding the executive, or Cabinet positions, should be chosen in advance by the electors? Does it really make any sense, or would it make any sense, if after the next election, or if after the last provincial election, the Prime Minister had chosen for him by the voters, the Minister of Lands and Forests, a man who he would inevitably be stuck with for the rest of his term whether he liked him or not? Or the Minister of Reform Institutions, or even the Provincial Treasurer? But this is what you are doing in the metropolitan council. You are allowing these people to be chosen in advance whether they are the best people or whether they are the worst people. They are not going to be chosen by the people who have to work with them.

The hon. Prime Minister, as the leader of this government, chooses the people he feels are best qualified to work with him. But neither the chairman nor the members of the executive committee have this privilege at all. This idea, again, is thrown out. Does it make any sense, Mr. Chairman? And can the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs explain this to us?

What, in fact, is happening, Mr. Chairman, is that if there is a very effective representative on the metropolitan council, should a complainant happen to come from one of the small municipalities, should he be very able, it is almost impossible that he would get on to the executive committee at all. By the present setup he is almost entirely ruled out.

I can think of one or two people in recent years, Mr. Chairman. For instance, the present reeve of Forest Hill, Mr. Edwin Pivnick, who has been on the executive committee because he has been recognized as a man of sub-

stantial abilities by his colleagues. It is highly unlikely that he would have, or perhaps even could have, obtained election over a wider area, but he made a very substantial contribution to the executive.

And in my time I can think of the reeve of Long Branch, the former reeve of Long Branch, Marie Curtis, who again came from a small municipality and who was elected by her colleagues to sit on the executive committee. Under the present setup, sir, a Marie Curtis sitting on the council would almost automatically be denied the right to sit on the executive committee.

I do not think the Minister has thought through either the power or the control that the executive committee is going to exercise in the metropolitan council. If he has thought it through, then he does not recognize the problems that, in fact, do exist.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to bring better sense to the present setup of the executive committee, I am going to move an amendment to section 6, which will be as follows:

> That section 6 be amended, deleting from section 12.1.c thereof, the word "four" in the second line, and inserting the word "two"; and by deleting from section 12.1.d thereof the word "four" in the second line, and inserting the word "two."

The effect of this will be to reduce the representation from the city of Toronto to one-third of the executive committee, and will give the two-third representation to the other five boroughs.

I think before the government digs its heels in and says, "because it is written this way in the Act, this is the way it has got to be," I think that not only the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, but also his colleagues who have been telling us since this bill has come before the House that they believe in democracy, they believe in representation by population, they believe in accountability, I think that all those gentlemen who have made these speeches in the House should seriously examine their position and stand up and tell us that they honestly believe in the wording of this section as it is presently written. I would like to hear from the hon. member for St. George. I would like to hear from the hon. member for Forest Hill; from the hon. Minister from Bellwoods; from the hon. Minister from St. Andrew. I would like to hear from the hon. gentleman from High Park and the hon. gentleman from Beaches. My friend from Lakeshore, I think, should get into this. I think it is most important that if this is going to go forward and be a part of the continued setup for the indefinite future of Metropolitan Toronto, that we at least hear from those Metropolitan Toronto representatives that they believe it is fair; that they believe it is equitable; that they believe it is democratic; that they believe it is in concert with our ideas of what responsible government means. This is their last chance insofar as the Act is concerned, and in this particular aspect, to speak up and to have their voices heard.

Mr. Chairman, with regret, I do not anticipate any of these gentlemen accepting my invitation. But there is always hope, and I would hope that these gentlemen deem it fair, or at least make fair sounding speeches, and would accept this challenge and speak in favour of this amendment.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I will take up the first part of the invitation of the hon. member, and that is to speak. I had full intention of speaking prior to his invitation, but I certainly will not speak in support of his amendment.

Mr. Chairman the Opposition, the whole rank, seems to have forgotten the very nub of what we are discussing when we discuss the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. This is a concept, this is something that we have brought into being. This is not a municipality, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs explained that very clearly. This is not a municipality per se. It is a concept of getting a number of municipalities, now six, reduced from 13 to set up a working arrangement that will inure to the benefit of the people of this whole metropolitan area. Now, I am speaking—

Mr. Singer: A play with words. It means nothing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is not a play with words. What that side of the House lacks sorely is imagination. They have not had an imaginative idea in 25 years, and this is an imaginative idea. Mr. Chairman, right now I will speak as a member for Toronto. I will now speak as the member for Bellwoods riding, who found himself, in dealing with the concept of the new changes in the Metro concept, aware of the position that he must take, first as a citizen—as a taxpayer of Toronto—as one who has resided most of his senior life in Toronto and has a great deal of regard for it, and as a responsible member of an administration who must think beyond the realm of Manning avenue, Euclid

avenue and the taxes on those streets, and heaven only knows my sympathies are with them this week. But I must also recognize, as we did in 1954 when I no longer was a resident of North York, the problems of North York and the problems of Scarborough, and come up as we came up then with an idea.

Mr. Singer: You had to.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We did not have to. The hon. member for York East talked about this having been a problem in his time. Probably even before I was born, it was a problem of this area.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Even during the last Liberal regime.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out we have attempted to work out a concept. It is a compromise, and what in government is not a compromise when you have a multitude of divergent ideas! The one thing that has happened is that on the government side we have come up with a satisfactory compromise, and that is in Bill 81.

Mr. Singer: Why do you not speak to the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will speak to the amendment. It is part of the whole idea. We could have had a pure representation by population situation and swung the pendulum from what it was 12 years ago to where it would be on a purely mathematical basis. But you do not get justice on a mathematical process.

The problem, sir, was to maintain for Toronto, if not a dominant position in the structure, at least a significant part in the structure, and that was done in several ways as I have pointed out. It is the only city in comparison with five boroughs. It maintained its representation of twelve, which was not lowered. We could have maintained the old number of seats on Metro and reduced Toronto's representation. We did not, we maintained this proposition. Then when we came to executive council, and here this was one of the most brilliant ideas, to have this balance, Mr. Chairman, not of suburban against urban, of suburbs against Toronto, but a balance of ideas, as I have pointed out. Those residents who live in Scarborough have a loyalty to Scarborough and to the heart of Toronto. Those who live in Etobicoke have a loyalty to Etobicoke and a loyalty to Toronto. Very few, if any, have a loyalty—I speak to the member for Etobicoke himself, he will find that very few of his residents have a rapport with Scarborough. They may have a member of the family there; they may have a friend there; but the rapport is with the heart of the city of Toronto in far greater degree.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): I do not agree.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member does not agree. I suggest that he walk through his riding and come to this conclusion. The very spirit of the enlargement of the executive council is because it is going to have more to do. The effect of the even balance—and this is the interesting thing—it all depends on the point of view. The hon. member pointed out that it is the city that will have control, and he got his idea from an article by Ron Haggart which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star*, but it is interesting that Mr. Marshall in the *Telegram*—

Mr. Singer: He got his idea from me.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He wrote it before the hon. member expressed it.

An hon. member: Where did you get your idea from?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not know he had a ghost writer, but to take John Marshall—

An hon. member: He is just a ghost of a writer!

Mr. Chairman: Order! Might I remind members that the Provincial Secretary has the floor?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is the position of John Marshall. He says, and I quote from the *Telegram*:

> Even now the city does not control the necessary two-thirds council vote to defeat an executive fiscal decision.

So it all depends on which side of the coin you want to look. I think that we do not look at the side of the coin, we look to the coin itself. This is the good coin, the idea, and I can say, Mr. Chairman, the reason why this Bill 81 in all its aspects can be supported by all hon. supporters of the government, whether they be from Etobicoke, Scarborough or North York or the city, is because it is the best answer to the problems of the greatest municipalities on the continent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does the hon. member for Parkdale think about the hon. Minister's amendment?

An hon. member: Or Dovercourt!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or Dovercourt!

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I think that the dispute which has now arisen points very clearly to the basic defect of this legislation from beginning to end.

What we really have before us is a proposal that the representatives of the city of Toronto should line up in a unified, cohesive camp and take up arms against the suburbanites who will also presumably be in a unified, cohesive camp and will take up arms against the city.

Unfortunately, this has happened all too often in the past. This is the way it has worked out and in my opinion the government's legislation will perpetuate this stalemate which has become more and more the characteristic of the present metropolitan setup. Here we will have it again; there is going to be an even representation.

The hon. member for Downsview, who lives in a suburban area—although I am not suggesting that is the motivation behind his amendment, but he does, in fact, live there—is suggesting that there should be some sort of an approximation to representation by population on the Metro executive. Three out of the eight only should be from Toronto, he says. And that is three out of the eight people who are elected; I do not want, at this point, to count the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, personally, although I am a city representative, I am quite ready to go along with the proposed amendment. I do not think that if I do so I am going to be selling out the interests of Toronto. I think it is far more important, as far as it is possible within the straitjacket this legislation imposes, to develop a sense of community, a sense of the area as a whole, on the metropolitan executive rather than a sense of two factions engaged in mortal conflict with each other.

I think it is very important that the suburban representatives, for example, should face up to the acute problems, the specialized problems, that arise in the core area—I admit I speak as a Toronto representative and perhaps without a proper appreciation of their point of view—but if I may say so I think in the past they have failed to do that; they have looked at the problems of the total Metropolitan Toronto area in terms, all too often, of their own narrow parochial interests.

"How much is in it for us?" This, all too often, has been the attitude.

Let me say that I think that the Toronto representatives also have to look at the problems of the suburban areas. They are different problems; they are the problems of new developments, of opening up new areas, and so on.

But both problems relate to a unified, organic municipality. The problems of the core area and the problems of new development are equally important and you will ignore either one of them at your cost.

Toronto right now is faced with a desperate problem with regard to its sewage system; its whole sewage system is completely out of date.

Toronto residents were assessed, and in my opinion quite properly so, to provide the water and sewage facilities that were necessary to make expansion possible in the suburban areas. But now that Toronto is faced with this formidable problem of what really will amount to replacing its entire sewage system over a period of years the suburban representatives, or a good many of them, take the attitude that they just could not care less, that it is not their problem.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is their problem, that it is definitely to their interests that the core area should develop, that it should not degenerate into a slum—or any further into a slum than it now is—that it should not be choked and unable to develop further. That is just as important as the development of the outlying areas and I think it is time that some of the suburban representatives faced up to that fact.

It is also not to their advantage for Toronto to be discharging raw sewage into Lake Ontario, because their water supply comes out of the same bay that raw sewage goes into. They have to face up to that problem just as Toronto has to face up to it.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member has never presented a request for the reconstitution of those sewers.

Mr. Bryden: Let us just—

Mr. Singer: The hon. member has never been before the council on it.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest, from some of the comments that some of the suburban representatives have made, that it would not have gone very far if it had.

However, it is a problem, a common problem. Most of these problems are common problems and I think that we in this Legislature have to do whatever we can to encourage the attitude that problems are common; not suburbs versus Toronto or Toronto versus suburbs but the whole area for the benefit of the whole area.

As I said, I think that the entire bill before us militates against that constructive type of approach. I would say that to provide something of an unequal representation, a representation more or less by population, as the hon. member for Downsview has suggested, would encourage rather than discourage this overall approach.

You see if we set them there as two equal armies to contend with each other, the first thing we know that is exactly what they will be doing; they will be contending with each other instead of facing the overall problem. So I would feel quite happy, even though I am a city representative, to see Toronto with slightly less than half of the elected representatives on the Metro executive. I think that this would be to Toronto's benefit in the long run, because I think it would tend to depress the notion that has been all too strong in the past that it is a battle between Toronto and the suburbs for benefits that one can obtain at the expense of the other.

Neither can obtain benefits at the expense of the other; they are all going to sink or swim together. So I feel, and I think I can speak for the whole of this group here, both those who represent suburban areas and those who represent ridings in the city of Toronto, that we are quite happy to go along with the proposed amendment. Indeed, we support it. We think it might be constructive in helping to break down the attitude that has prevailed in the past that there are two separate contenders in conflict with each other.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): In arriving at this amendment, we were looking at the cost of the operation of Metro.

If you examine the figures of the taxable assessment of the city of Toronto, as it will be constituted January 1, 1967, and the five boroughs, you will find that its share of the total cost will be considerably more than the 40 per cent that the hon. member mentioned. It will be closer to 50 per cent than to 40 per cent.

Now, I cannot tell you the exact figures because no one knows at the moment. I have to depend on figures made available to me by the staff of The Department of Municipal Affairs, figures which are taken from certain documents that are provided to our department by the city of Toronto as well as all other municipalities.

Considering that the board of control in a municipality has certain authority, this executive committee has the same authority as a board of control in the city; and considering also that the city of Toronto is still the core of Metro—my colleague, the hon. Provincial Secretary, very clearly enunciated that principle a few moments ago—I feel that with this reorganization through consolidation of the metropolitan municipalities that where there has been some, perhaps you might refer to it as disagreement between the city representation and the suburban representation, that this should now be eliminated. Those who will be elected in the next municipal elections to sit on the metropolitan council, to be members of the executive committee, will think of Metro, not they themselves being representatives of the city of Toronto or the head of the borough of one of the five component boroughs. So, Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances, bearing in mind the studies which have been undertaken by Dr. Goldenberg and others, considering the opinions which have been expressed by officials of The Department of Municipal Affairs, considering the support that has been given to this legislation by members of the Legislature who are representatives of Toronto and metropolitan municipalities, I would ask the hon. members to not vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Singer's amendment will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of Mr. Singer's motion will please rise. All those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 17 and the "nays" 41.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Subsection 1 agreed to.

Subsections 2 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise something with regard to subsection 2 of section 7.

Subsection 1 agreed to.

On subsection 2:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, subsection 2 of section 7 of the bill re-enacts subsection 6 of section 24 of the Act—keeping track of these numbers is a bit of a problem. However, the content is the important point and the content relates to sick leave credits, or more specifically to the protection of the sick leave credits of employees who are transferred as a result of the reorganization that is taking place. I think most of the transfer of employees takes place as a result of the transfer of the welfare function from the area municipalities to the Metro municipality.

Now, the hon. Minister, and I believe all members of the Legislature, have received copies of two letters with similar contents. One is from local 79 of the Toronto municipal employees union, which is a local of the Canadian union of public employees; and the other is from the national representative of the Canadian union of public employees. These letters call attention to an injustice that can arise as a result of the enactment of this clause as it now stands. I would seriously question if it is intended that in the reorganization any employee should suffer injustice, but this could certainly happen here. The point I think is quite adequately summed up in both letters, but I will quote two or three sentences from the letter of Mr. Wrightman, the representative of the Canadian union of public employees.

> I should like to draw to your attention a hardship that approximately 500 of our members will suffer under Bill 81, which I am sure was never intended by your government.
>
> I refer specifically to clause 7, subclause 2, having to do with the protection and transfer of sick leave credits. An employee of the corporation of the city of Toronto on retirement is entitled by bylaw to 100 per cent of his accumulated sick leave credits standing to his credit on retirement up to, but not exceeding, six months' salary. An employee of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto on retirement is entitled by personnel regulation No. 6 to 50 per cent of his accumulated sick leave credits standing to his credit on retirement up to, but not exceeding, six months' salary.

Thus the situation is that the people in the welfare department and certain other places in the city of Toronto are now entitled under their contract of employment, and by a long-established practice I understand, to receive 100 per cent of their sick leave credits on retirement up to a total of six months. When they are transferred to Metro, as far as I can see from subsection 6, of section 24 there will be nothing to prevent this benefit from being cut in half as far as these employees are concerned. In other words, they would be put under what is now the Metro sick leave plan, and under that plan they would be entitled to only 50 per cent of their credits up to a total of six months.

I am not going to get into the merits of the question as to whether 100 per cent or 50 per cent is fair. I do not think that is the point before us, the point is that a group of employees, apparently about 500 in number, are faced with an arbitrary withdrawal of benefits which have been part of their contract of employment and which they had every right to expect. They were serving on the payroll of the city of Toronto on the understanding and in the expectation that when they retired they would get this particular benefit.

So whether or not we think it is a good idea to give 100 per cent of sick leave credits is really quite beside the point. The point is that these people were offered and accepted that particular condition of employment in good faith. They have continued to serve in good faith on the assumption that they would get it, and I do not think that we by law should suddenly pull the rug out from under them.

I think that as far as the specific employees are concerned their benefits should be protected, the benefits that they have been led to believe all along they were going to enjoy. As far as any new employees are concerned, that is a matter for the Metro council to settle in negotiations with its unions. They would not be affected, but I am now referring only to the specific group, which apparenly consist of about 500 people all told. I certainly do not think we should arbitrarily deprive them of benefits which they have expected all along and have every right to expect. In fact, I would be surprised if the government or the hon. Minister intended that these people should be arbitrarily deprived of benefits, that their contract of

employment should be arbitrarily changed by an action of this Legislature.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 2 of section 7 of Bill 81 be amended with respect to the proposed new subsection 6 of section 24 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, by adding thereto the following words:

> And no employee shall be deprived of any benefits he would have enjoyed if this subsection had not come into force.

This is merely designed to protect the benefits of this particular group of employees.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up very much time of this House on this particular point. I was absent from the House for a few minutes, and in the interval, the hon. member for Woodbine rose. Our party had an amendment similar in principle to that moved by the hon. member for Woodbine, the only difference was in the wording, but the principle behind the amendment was identical.

The arguments that the hon. member for Woodbine presented in support of his motion, we adopt almost in total. So having said that, Mr. Chairman, I just go on record that we will support the amendment of the hon. member for Woodbine.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Woodbine makes abundant good sense. Very simply, there are a small group of employees who have presently certain benefits. On the new setup in Metro, they are going to lose those benefits. In other words, to a group of employees, however small it may be, something is going to be taken away from them which they have bargained for, and which they have, and which is of substantial benefit.

The objective of the amendment is to stop this unfair treatment of a small group of employees. To my mind, this legislation should not penalize anyone. In this case, the hon. member for Woodbine brings to our attention, not only the possibility, but the probability that a small group of employees will be hurt unless an amendment similar to his is written into the legislation.

I would hope that the hon. Minister, as a fair man, would adopt this amendment.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to wonder what has happened to the Conservative appreciation of the sanctity of contracts. So often in the House we have pronouncements about the validity of contract, and the hesitation with which outside bodies, particularly a Legislature through arbitrary acts, should intervene and wreck a contract which has been voluntarily entered into. I raise the question because here we have another instance of it. It is, in its broader context, part of the same problem we had quite a battle over throughout the months of November, December and January, on the question of pensions, and significantly the government has lapsed into some silence on exactly what it is going to do on that issue.

But on this particular issue, these people were hired by agreement, with the assurance that they would get this. It is part of a contract under which they have been working, and I would like the hon. Minister to answer why he thinks the government has the right to intervene and, in effect, scrap that contract that was voluntarily entered into.

The second point I want to add just briefly, Mr. Chairman, is that I suggest that if the government is not willing to accept this amendment they are violating the spirit, if not the letter, of an assurance that was given by the hon. Prime Minister, when this bill was first introduced—or rather the general proposal was announced some few weeks or months ago. At that time, when there were protests from some of the smaller municipalities in the west end of the metropolitan area to the effect that they were uncertain as to what was going to happen to their employees, the Prime Minister gave assurance that all employees would be retained and they would be integrated in some fashion. Now, I do not know exactly what his words were, but I assume that the spirit of that assurance is that they would be integrated at the level in which they were then being employed, rather than in some downgraded position. I submit to the hon. Minister that in addition to the basic principle which I first enunciated, I think if he is not willing to accept this amendment, he is, in effect, violating an assurance that was given by the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, there is no intention in this legislation that anyone should lose anything. You have said that, I accept it. But that certainly was always our intention. However, we must realize that a number of employees will be moving from one municipality to the new consolidated municipalities. Some will be moving from a municipality to the metropolitan municipality, and there will be some

problems which will have to be adjusted. Without going into the details of all of those things, we decided it would be better to leave this broad clause the way it is now in the bill, and leave these matters of internal negotiations to take place at the level where they should, and that is at the level of the metropolitan council itself, and its administrators, and the city and borough councils.

I must warn the hon. members that I do not wish to examine the city of Toronto sick leave bylaw, because if what you have told me is correct, that bylaw may not be legal, because The Municipal Act has certain restrictions in it, and if what the hon. member for Woodbine has said is—

Mr. Bryden: You got those same letters. Did you not read them?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well now, I got those letters. This has nothing to do with letters. I am suggesting to you that I do not wish to know anything about the city of Toronto sick leave bylaw. There may be something else in it that you have not mentioned, because if what you have said is correct, that it pays certain benefits, I suggest to you that that should be examined in the light of The Municipal Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe the law should be examined.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, all right, but at the present time the law is that way. I suggest to you that these are matters that are best left to negotiations between the union representing the employees and their new employer, which may be the city of Toronto, or may be the metropolitan corporation, or may be one of the boroughs.

In Mr. Goldenberg's report, he made this recommendation—this is in the form of advice to the new metropolitan council and to the new municipal councils—in integrating municipal staffs, the new authorities should offer employment to all employees who have permanent status on the first day of April in the year preceding the effective date of the reorganization. Existing wage and employment standards should, as far as possible, be protected.

I can only accept that because I do not think that you or I at the moment can say just what all of these various employment standards really are. Until such time as the Metro corporation and the new consolidated cities and boroughs get into the activity of integrating staffs where they wish to have them, for January 1, 1967, or for the year 1967, I do not think we can do anything better than what we have done in this piece of legislation. Therefore, I would suggest to the hon. members that we vote down this amendment and proceed with the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is not quite consistent in what he says. He starts out by saying he does not want to interfere in the arrangements the metropolitan councils and others make with their own employees. The only thing is that he is doing that right here in the bill. There are certain areas where it is necessary to interfere, and he has interfered by proposing this section. He is saying that these people, as soon as transferred, will be integrated into the Metro Toronto plan.

What we are saying to him is that he should consider the rights of the people. These are long-term rights; they are rights that were promised to them a good many years ago, and they have been serving in the expectation that they would receive the benefits. This was a contract, as my leader and I and others have pointed out. Now, the Minister is just suggesting that this contract can be thrown out the window. "Well," he says, "let us just leave it to negotiation with the metropolitan council." Well, heaven knows what might happen there!

Under this law, the minute these people are transferred, they have to be put under the Metro plan. There may not be time for any negotiation. That happens the moment they are transferred under what you have there.

All we are suggesting is that these people should not lose any benefits they now have. This may be a little easier for us to do than the metropolitan council, because it would put this particular group in a somewhat different position from all the rest of the employees that the metropolitan council will have. That, I think, is justifiable in view of the fact that when they are transferred they bring certain benefits with them.

I refuse to accept the rough, offhand way the hon. Minister wants to dismiss the rights of, admittedly, a small number of not major people in the community, just good, faithful servants of the community. So they are not big wheels in the community. So do their rights not matter? He just wants to brush them aside and say: "Let us leave this to the Metro council which will have a thousand problems to deal with."

I suggest that we are directing that

these people should be brought under the Metro plan, and I am suggesting further that we should direct that they should not lose any contractual benefits they now have. I think that is an absolutely reasonable and fair proposition.

Once again, however, we see that the Tories have no respect for contracts when they are contracts for the benefit of little people.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Yak, yak, yak!

Mr. Bryden: Here we have the case of 500 little people—

Yes, and here is our hon. friend over here, the sum total of his contribution to the debates is to say: "Yak, yak, yak" when we are trying to talk about human rights. He regards it as a "yak, yak, yak" matter. This is Tory philosophy in all its naked brutality.

Now, if the government—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask members not to interrupt, and the Minister to stay with the point, please.

Mr. Bryden: It is a sad state of affairs if this government cannot see the rights of this group of small people, not particularly highly paid, not particularly powerful, merely servants of the community who have served for years under a certain understanding, under a certain contract. I submit they have a right to carry through to their retirement on the basis of the understanding under which they have been serving up to now.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept the explanation of the hon. member, because he is all wrong.

Now, there is nobody, my dear sir—with very great respect—who protects the "little" people more than this side of the House, and I would suggest that the member think of that.

There are a number of protections that are already in this very legislation and other legislation. For instance, The Labour Relations Act of Ontario has protection for what the hon. member calls the "little" people. That is there for everybody, and already a number of the municipalities and the municipal councils themselves have made statements in which they have said, "No one coming into our employ as a consolidated municipality, will lose any of their benefits.

Of course, the hon. member does not really mean what he says when he says that these benefits have to continue until retirement or something like that, because if he were to develop a union agreement of working conditions today, certainly when it expires, or before it expires, we arrange a new agreement. There is always some improvement in these working conditions and benefits and so on. It may very well be that the people involved in this matter of becoming consolidated into what is a "successor" employer may find themselves in a better position to bargain for other benefits which they would prefer to have instead of this sick leave gratuity.

Therefore we should leave it to them to settle these matters themselves within the confines of the law as it now exists to protect people who have contracts, working agreements, and so on and so forth. I would suggest, again, that we vote this amendment down.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister will, let us forget about the "little" man for the time being and let us forget about this business of contractual rights; let us just look at it from a moral point of view, or at the principles of the matter.

Here we have employees who have been engaged by different municipalities for years and years. Under their rights with their employer, whether they be contractual rights or simply rights that accrued over a period of time, they had been entitled upon termination of their employment to receive 50 per cent of their accrued sick benefits—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ben: No, 50 per cent of 100 per cent of their accrued benefits.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member is getting mixed up now.

Mr. Ben: No; they were not entitled to receive all their sick benefits, but 50 per cent of all their sick benefits whereas of now they will be able to receive only 50 per cent to a maximum 180 days.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: How does the member know that?

Mr. Ben: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: How would the member know that?

Mr. Ben: Because that is the maximum that they are permitted to receive under the new setup.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: How does the hon. member know that the agreement that the metropolitan corporation may develop—

Mr. Ben: Let me finish. Let me finish! That is why I rose, Mr. Chairman, to use logic and common sense.

It is fine for the hon. Minister to say, "Well, look, you are not a crystalgazer, you do not know, Mr. Member for Bracondale"—but if I am not a crystalgazer, then I respectfully submit to the Minister that he is not a crystalgazer either.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, and that is my point; the employees and their employers will develop their own agreement.

Mr. Ben: We have to try to ensure that they will not lose these benefits; that is all we are trying to ensure. The Minister very glibly gets up and implies that perhaps Metro will recognize these rights. As a matter of fact, he goes much further to presume that perhaps they will recognize these rights. He is implying that they will, but I beg to differ with the Minister. I beg to differ because more municipalities that are now being merged into the new boroughs, which will be part of the new Metro Toronto, do not give benefits to their employees on retirement than do.

It is improbable to me to assume that all of a sudden Metro council, which every two years engages in long, drawn-out negotiations with their employees, is going to say: "All right, we will give all the other employees the benefits that have accrued to that small minority because they had the fortune to be employed with slightly more enlightened employers."

Now, I cannot see why the hon. Minister is so sure what Metro is going to do unless he has them in his hip pocket. Is he so adamant in his position that he will not accept the very slight amendment which would ensure that no one loses any benefits by coming into Metro?

If the hon. Minister feels so certain that their rights are going to be protected, then why should he hesitate and object to it being put in writing that their rights are going to be protected? After all, it does not cost that much more to print the final bill if we insert this little clause. If they are going to do it, then what is the Minister's objection? Put it in, if he is so certain of it. Or is he endeavouring to deceive us, or is he not certain, and that is why he does not want it in?

But surely, if tomorrow is Tuesday he should not hesitate to put in writing that tomorrow is Tuesday, unless he is not sure.

I think that it is utter nonsense to try to prognosticate or predict in this House what Metro is going to do; we are trying to ensure that Metro will do the right thing. We are not inclined or ready to leave it to chance, as the hon. Minister is.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. Minister raised the question of the recommendation made by the Goldenberg report, because this particular amendment, which my colleague the hon. member for Woodbine has introduced, is only one minor reflection of the exact recommendation which the Goldenberg commission made. And indeed, the very same statement, in substantially the same language, reappeared in the statement by the hon. Prime Minister issued on January 10 about the Goldenberg report and about the plan of this government in implementing its recommendations.

It seems to me it is not up to the Minister to stand up and first of all cast aspersions on whether or not the sick leave plan of the city of Toronto is or is not legal, that is a complete red herring and has nothing to do with the point that my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, has raised. It seems to me that if the Minister is not prepared to accept even this kind of a minor amendment, then we have no alternative but when we come to clause 14, which re-enacts part VIII of the metropolitan Act, to introduce an amendment which will make certain that the qualifying phrases in the recommendation of the Goldenberg commission do not hold and that we do not have this kind of weasel language, which appears here, which states that in integrating municipal staffs the new authorities should offer employment, it should be obligatory on the area municipalities, to offer employment to all persons who had permanent status on April 1.

Similarly, the existing wage and employment standards not "should as far as possible be protected"; those standards "should be protected and must be protected." It should not be left up to this sort of pious wish that in some way or other the employees are going to remain under the same standards and conditions of employment at all. And it is not sufficient for the hon. Minister to say, "Well, we do not know what those standards are, and, therefore, we cannot really make certain that they will be maintained." Well, if the hon. Minister or no one else knows what those

standards are, certainly the employees know what those standards are. There is no reason why in this bill there should not be in part VIII, when it is re-enacted, a specific definite statement that the municipal staff shall be offered employment—those who are on permanent status on April 1—and a similar definite statement that the existing wage and employment standards shall be protected.

If that means that some minimum standard is going to be laid down in an area which is somewhat higher than the present minimum standard, well, that is all to the good. The sooner we have a common basis of employment and standards of employment throughout the metropolitan area, the better.

I would ask the hon. Minister if he will not consider when he comes to clause 14 of the bill introducing an amendment which will give effect to what the hon. Prime Minister said, and what the Goldenberg report said. Otherwise, we will have no other alternative but to introduce that amendment ourselves.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question? Is the member suggesting that the hon. Minister amend section 14 in addition to the amendment that has been presented—the amendment which has been presented in this House?

Mr. Bryden: I would take that as a substitute.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would give us his undertaking now that he would accept a general clause covering the recommendation to which he referred in the Goldenberg commission, naturally that would pick up this requirement and we would accept an affirmative amendment to say that existing standards will be maintained for all persons who are on the permanent staff at April 1.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has acted this afternoon as if this matter had just come before him for the first time. I would point out to the House that it was brought to his attention actually by two letters, one dated April 29 and the other dated May 3, so it has been before him for some substantial time. I think it is regrettable that in that length of time he has not had—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I cannot accept any subtle implications such as the hon. member just made that I was not aware of this. I received that correspondence the hon. member referred to.

Mr. Bryden: It did not sound as if the hon. Minister absorbed it from what he was saying.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, I have absorbed it, but not quite the same way as the hon. member has absorbed it. That is a matter of opinion. Just because I do not agree with what the member says, does not mean to say that I have not absorbed something.

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Minister deny the assertion that is made in these letters, that these people are in danger of losing sick leave benefits which they have expected for many years? Is that a false statement? This is really all I am asking. That is what I absorbed out of it. There is a group of 500 people faced with this danger.

The hon. Minister made some vague reference to the relationship of the city of Toronto sick leave plan in The Municipal Act. Is he suggesting that this sick leave plan of Toronto is contrary to The Municipal Act? I do not know. I would suggest that he should be prepared to carry out what surely was the spirit of both the Goldenberg statement and the Prime Minister's statement, that people will not be penalized by being brought over. This is really all that is being asked. Unless the Minister is prepared to get up and deny categorically that these people are going to lose these benefits, then I think he should be prepared to go ahead and put in a clause that will say that they will not lose them.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would let us proceed in an orderly fashion until we get to subsection 2 of 150, part VIII of the bill, I think the explanation that will be given there will satisfy him. That is on page 35 of Bill 81. That contains a section there which gives very broad powers to the Ontario municipal board to deal with these matters.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I still suggest that is not satisfactory. Surely, in elementary justice, these people should get these rights. They should not have to depend on the benevolence of the Metro council, the Metro executive or the OMB. They should retain the rights they have as a matter of right. I do not think it is satisfactory to deal with it in this way, to say that other people will have the say in this matter and we have no doubt they will do the right thing. Let us just make sure that the right thing is done by protecting these employees. Too often I have seen this sort of thing happen where

bland assurances were made that people did not need to worry, they would be looked after. But when the time came they were not looked after at all.

And, you know, even when you get into negotiations, when the chips are down and you are at the last stage before a settlement, then this becomes a relatively small point in the total picture. So, even though the union may have been pressing it in order to get a settlement, something has to go, because it affects only a small number of employees in relation to the total. To this small number of employees, this is surely a vitally important thing, and really I cannot understand the hon. Minister's unwillingness to guarantee to them what seems to me to be nothing but elementary justice.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would add just one thought to this. Of this group, some may already have received the benefits because they have been sick a certain number of days and have used up their sick pay. Others, because they have been well, have established a bank, and in effect this is their saving because they have not been sick. Now, one group has received it, the other group has it there as a credit. So it seems to me to be common sense to say that those people who have built up those savings should not be deprived of them and to say so in the bill. I do not think this creates any hardship in redrafting, and it is just simple justice for the people who are affected.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is lost.

All those in favour of Mr. Bryden's amendment, will please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" 24.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost, and the subsection carried.

Subsections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9:

Mr. Bryden: Section 9 revives an old debate in this House relating to the partially graded exemptions, as they are called, which have been in effect in the city of Toronto, and I believe in the town of New Toronto, since approximately 1920—some time after World War I, in any case.

Most members who do not live in Toronto probably are not familiar with what is involved, so if I may, Mr. Chairman, I will briefly explain what is meant by the term partially graded exemption. In the two municipalities concerned, it is provided that in case of owner-occupied dwellings only—this is of no benefit whatever to slum landlords—there is a certain relief from the municipal property tax. I do not have the precise figures on me, I have not looked at them recently, but it works out something like this.

If the building only is assessed for $4,000, but not more than $5,000, there is a 20 per cent reduction in the tax rate. If the assessment is $3,000 to $4,000 it is 40 per cent, and I think if it is under $3,000 there is 60 per cent off. Something like that. It is graded and it is partial. In other words, the very small dwellings of very low value carry a reduced tax rate.

There has been a lot of argument about this. The city of Toronto has been trying to remove these partially graded exemptions for a good many years. Mind you, they have the power to do it right now. They can do it by a vote of the electors, but they apparently do not want to do it that way. Either they do not think that the electors would support the proposition, or alternatively they are afraid of the people whose partial graded exemption would be removed.

I have heard it argued that this is a bad principle of taxation. I am not really prepared to get into the argument, Mr. Chairman, although I think on the contrary this is a good principle of taxation. We all know that the property tax is inherently a regressive tax and the principle of the partially graded exemption puts a certain element of progressivity in it. In other words, it reduces the burden somewhat on the man who has a house of low value and in all probability is also a man with relatively low income—the lower the value of his house, the greater relief he gets.

I may point out it only applies to the very smallest houses, those with lowest value. That is a substantial number when you take the city of Toronto. I believe there are about 60,000 householders in this area who at present enjoy the benefit of the partially graded exemption to some degree or other.

Now, I think that they should be permitted to continue to enjoy that benefit. Apart

altogether from the argument as to the merits of the proposal in terms of the principles of taxation—and I think it can be justified in terms of the principles of taxation, but apart from that—we should bear in mind that this has been in effect for over 40 years, Mr. Chairman.

A great many small people are now enjoying a certain benefit and I think it is a brutal proposal that it should be removed at the very time when taxes are going up drastically. Toronto, I think, is going to have a six mill increase this year. I do not blame the city council for that, they have very little escape. I suppose if the partially graded exemption were all wiped out, the city might be able to restrict the increase to 5.5 mills. And how would they do that? By giving an extra increase to the poor man. That is exactly what is going to happen as soon as you take off the partially graded exemption.

The poor man is going to get the same percentage increase as ever other taxpayer plus a further increase. I think this is most unjust, especially at this time when so many small homeowners, and in particular old age pensioners, are having grave difficulty holding onto their homes.

This is a particularly tragic problem for old age pensioners. They are on fixed income, but their property taxes are going up year after year. They skimped and saved all their lives to get clear title on their little home, the only security they have. They are having the greatest difficulty conceivable in trying to hang on to those homes, and if we wipe out that partial graded exemption it will make it a lot more difficult.

I am appealing to this House, perhaps to the members outside the Toronto area, it does not matter at all in terms of—

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber) It does matter!

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps it does. I was going to say perhaps it does not matter in terms of votes, but I was going to go on to say, and perhaps this will satisfy my friend from York Humber, I am sure it matters to them in terms of the human problems involved; and the removal of the partially graded exemption can certainly cause severe hardship.

I have no doubt the hon. Minister is going to tell me that there is nothing that he has put in this bill that will require the city of Toronto, or the new city of Toronto, I guess it will be, and the new borough of Etobicoke, to remove these partially graded exemptions where they exist. I realize that, but I am suggesting that we can very well leave the law exactly as it is. Let it continue in effect, and if the municipalities want to have a plebiscite on the matter let them have it.

As a matter of fact there is a rather interesting change that has taken place in this proposed new section 37a from the time the bill was first introduced until it was revised somewhat by the hon. Minister. The original proposal put before the House was that the city of Toronto, and also the borough of Etobicoke with respect to New Toronto, would have authority to remove the partial graded exemptions in stages.

In other words, they can take off 20 per cent of them every year for five years. This, I may say, was a proposal that the city of Toronto had before this House a few years ago. There was such a hue and cry about it that the House refused to act on it.

It went before the private bills committee. I believe that the proposal passed the private bills committee over the objection of the members for the city of Toronto, but after that it got lost somewhere. I did not inquire what happened to it, I was happy that it got lost.

So Toronto came in a few years ago and could not get it. Now, the hon. Minister is coming forward and recommending this proposal. Even going further than that as I see his revised form of this bill: Not only will he authorize the council to remove the partially graded exemptions by stages over a five-year period, he now also is prepared to authorize them to remove them in one fell swoop without the assent of the electors. At the present time they can do that with consent of the electors, but the Minister is proposing that they can take them all off in one year; at least I trust that is the correct interpretation of what we now have before us.

I was really shocked when I saw it, but to contemplate removing the partial graded exemption all at one fell swoop, without the consent of the electors or anyone else, is really quite terrifying to me. Severe hardship suffered by a great many people.

I would like to submit to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that he really does not have to concern himself about the partial graded exemptions. I know there are people in city hall and elsewhere who can get themselves worked up into quite a state about the iniquitous principle embodied in these exemptions. In my opinion it is not an iniquitous principle at all; but at any rate the problem in time is going to solve itself. As values go up and as assessments go up, gradually the

partial graded exemptions are going to disappear.

I regret that. I think it is a good idea, but I would suggest that the hon. Minister would be well advised simply to let nature take its course. I do not see why, in this period of rapidly rising municipal taxation, the people with the smallest homes should have to bear the biggest brunt of increased taxation; yet that is precisely what will happen if the partially graded exemptions are removed. And it will happen, doubled in spades, if they are all removed in one year.

I am sure some budget chief some year will make himself very popular. He will make the tax increase half a mill less than it would have been; so in terms of the mill rate that is published in the paper it will not look as big.

And how will he accomplish that? By shifting a significant part of the burden on to the poor. We keep talking about a war on poverty in this country and we keep taking steps to shift more and more of the burden of taxation on to the poor. I think it is time we reversed that trend and I would like to make a strong plea, Mr. Chairman, to leave the law unchanged with regard to the partially graded exemptions, except insofar as it is necessary to authorize their continuance in the revised municipalities. I think that the people with these exemptions should be allowed to retain them. This is particularly true in the city of Toronto, where there is a large number of houses occupied by people in low income groups, which are now enjoying the partial graded exemptions.

As I mentioned at the outset, the partially graded exemption is not available if the house is used for revenue purposes to any significant degree. Therefore, it cannot in any sense benefit the slum landlord, it only benefits the little man who owns his own house. In particular, it benefits the old age pensioner whose life savings are embodied in his house. In the city of Toronto, more and more of the people occupying these small homes tend to be old age pensioners. They are the people who settled in what were once the suburbs back around 1920, 1925 and so on. They brought up their families and by the sweat of their brows they paid off their homes. Those homes are the only security they have. I would suggest that we should be trying to find ways of making it easier, rather than more difficult, for them to retain those homes.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would move that clause 9 of Bill 81 be amended by striking out the proposed new section 37a of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, and substituting the following:

> 37a. Any bylaw providing for the partial exemption of dwellings from taxation which is in force in the city of Toronto immediately before this section comes into force shall be deemed to be in force in the whole of the city of Toronto.

It will be noticed, Mr. Chairman, that in effect that retains subsection 2 of the proposed section 37a, and strikes out the proposed subsection 1. I am not quite sure what the necessity of the subsection 2 is, but if it is necessary to keep the graded exemptions in force, I am quite prepared to go along with it. But I am certainly not prepared to go along with the provision of subsection 1, that these can be eliminated by council without the assent of the electors over a period of five years. And I am particularly opposed to what appears to be the additional proposal that the council can simply knock them out in one year, or two years, or whatever period of time it sees fit.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Woodbine, first of all it is my opinion that his amendment is out of order. But that is not the most important factor that I would object to.

Mr. Bryden: Why is it out of order?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): All you have to do is vote against it.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I would like to say to him that the partially graded exemption that exists in the city of Toronto, and the town of New Toronto has no relationship with assessment and income. A junk keeper on St. Patrick street in the city of Toronto could live in one of the poorest type of houses we have in the city of Toronto, and still make $60,000 a year net.

Mr. Bryden: Not exactly a typical case.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: All right. Secondly, we move west to New Toronto. They have the partially graded exemption and I may say to you that equally in proportion, the residential areas of Mimico and of Long Branch, have the same type of houses. Despite the fact that through our daily press we may think Etobicoke is a posh municipality, that is not true. We have many areas equal to the city of Toronto, equal to Long Branch, equal to New Toronto and Mimico. So, therefore, I do not think you can make fish of one and

fowl of another. You either abolish it completely, or you take it over the whole metropolitan area.

But then again, I want to finish up by saying the whole basis or principle of graded exemption is wrong, because assessment is not related to income.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I regret having to rise, because we are doing very fine—this party over here and ourselves. We were agreed on all the amendments to date. Unfortunately, here we must part company.

We do not part company because our feelings towards the people we are trying to help differ, but simply in principle.

I would remind this House that I am the last man to be elected to this House from one of the municipal councils. The last man to come to this House from a municipal council before that was the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, and he came here ten years ago. Now, during the time I was on council, this business of partially graded exemptions was quite a controversial one. As a matter of fact, the whole question of exemptions caused a lot of concern.

I might point out to this House that in the city of Toronto alone, one quarter of the assessment is either partially or completely exempted—$500 million worth is exempt from taxation in the city of Toronto. That is not Metro, just the city of Toronto. At the present mill rate, which is a percentage point or two less than 80 mills on residential property, that would generate $40 million in tax revenue.

Mind you, if all this exemption was wiped out, then this $500 million of assessment would no longer raise that much, because they would not need it, but at any rate—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: How much was partially graded exemptions?

Mr. Ben: Of these partially graded exemptionals totalled $45,975,908 for 1963. That is partially graded assessments. In other words—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: May I ask the hon. member a question? The figure you just quoted, the $45 million, that is the total assessment on these properties?

Mr. Ben: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Do you have the figure for the amount of exemption that there really is?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the figure which I gave is the total exemption—$45,975,908, is exempt. I might explain first of all to the members of the House, Mr. Chairman, who may not be familiar with this system of graded exemptions in the city of Toronto, that it was introduced in 1921 as a method of encouraging veterans who returned from World War I to acquire property. It was not something that was introduced for the benefit of the general public. In its first instance, it was only to permit, to enable, to facilitate, war veterans purchasing their own homes. This partial exemption only applies to living accommodation. It does not apply to land, it does not apply to outbuildings, such as garages, and what have you. It only applies to assessments below $4,000, on living accommodation.

Now, in 1963, the properties that had a ten per cent exemption, totalled 11.9 per cent. Those that had 20 per cent exemption, 21.2 per cent. Those that had 30 per cent exemption, 27.3 per cent. Those which had 40 per cent, 17.3. Those which had 50 per cent, 22.3. That totalled up to 100 per cent.

During my term on council, the assessment commissioner filed a report, and contrary to what the hon. member for Woodbine may believe, the majority of these homes were not owner-occupied, but were absentee-landlord owned. They were rented.

Now, it becomes a very delicate topic. Furthermore, it was discovered that many people hesitated to improve their properties in the mistaken notion that the improvements which needed to be made would increase the assessment. I say "the mistaken notion." Very few people seem to appreciate, although the city of Toronto is in the practice of sending little notices with its tax bills pointing out what can be done without increasing the assessment, such as replacing a deteriorated roof, replacing an old veranda, replacing flooring, moving partitions in the house, replacing existing plumbing, replacing existing wiring, that all this can be done without any increase in assessment. All you cannot do is introduce what was not there. You can replace deteriorated portions of the dwelling, but you cannot add what was not already there. The trouble was we had difficulty in persuading people to improve their homes, especially the absentee landlords, of course, because they felt that their assessment would go up.

Now, these partial exemptions are slowly being wiped out by simple increase in values. For instance, if the hon. Minister has his way and we have one assessment system for all in the province, and we get a new year base for our assessments, then I would sug-

gest that by that one step alone there will not be a property in the city of Toronto, except some outhouse some place down in a most depressed area, which will have an assessed value of less than $5,000. But in the meantime, until this new reassessment comes through, many homes are still standing neglected, especially those owned by absentee landlords, because of this business of partial exemptions. What we believe should be done, Mr. Chairman, is that all exemptions should be wiped out. We do not believe that the little homeowner that the hon. member for Woodbine described should be saddled with $500 million of assessment simply because he happens to be a homeowner.

It is fantastic the amount of exempt assessment we have in the city of Toronto. Every association, every society, that comes to the city council and asks for an exemption gets an abatement of taxes. And who has to pick up that slack but the little homeowner.

We, Mr. Chairman, are as much concerned as is the hon. member for Woodbine, about the plight of the old age pensioners on fixed incomes, and I might point out to my friend that I toured the city in 1963 looking at these homes in particular and also the plight of these old age pensioners. And, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the hon. member for Woodbine take my word for it that the houses in the best condition were the ones that were occupied by these old age pensioners on fixed incomes. They were the ones who had time and the inclination to putter around and paint, and you could almost spot one of their homes.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate their plight, as I was going to say, and we think there is another solution to that matter. As a matter of fact, the city of Hamilton and many cities in the United States are now taking steps to relieve the burden that has been placed on the pensioners and those on fixed incomes by giving them a special abatement in their assessment—the city of Hamilton, up to $1,000; other cities in the States go from $1,000 to $2,000 in abatements. Under the partial exemption—the average exemption for those who have a 50 per cent exemption amounts to $762. And it averages out—the average tax reduction in that particular category is $27.07.

Mr. Bryden: It is a lot of money to these people.

Mr. Ben: It is a lot of money but I would suggest if these senior citizens received $1,000 exemption—

Mr. Bryden: They are not getting it.

Mr. Ben: —that would be the solution, because those are the ones who need the help, not the absentee landlords.

Now, I know it is a very difficult position for this party to take; for any party to take. Obviously in order to force the absentee landlords, who I believe should not be receiving any kind of exemption, to improve their property, you may necessarily have to temporarily hurt someone else. But as I pointed out: one, the partial exemptions are going to go simply by a change in the year base for assessment; secondly, the present exemption does not distinguish between owner-occupants—

An hon. member: It does.

Mr. Ben: It does not, it is living accommodation. You cannot get it on businesses, it is living accommodation. I am quite familiar with this, I lived with assessment for about seven years and I am quite familiar with this aspect. And that is the difficult point. Our party takes the position that there are other ways of helping these older occupants of small homes whose assessment is less than $4,000. We would press for that, but not to continue this iniquitous situation—to continue this business of exemptions, that the little homeowner has to bear.

I might point out to you that the homeowner whose property is assessed for $5,001 is also a small homeowner. He pays his taxes to subsidize those who are just below $5,000. Now, where is the equity in that? Simply because a person has a home that is assessed for a dollar or two dollars more, he loses the exemption. If he is assessed for $500 more, how much difference is there between a home assessed for $4,500 and $5,000? And yet you still take from those people, penalizing them, and help absentee landlords.

For that reason, we will not support the amendment.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bracondale has very eloquently put forward the viewpoint of the city hall establishment on this matter. The city hall can always produce some sort of a survey to prove whatever it wants to prove at a particular moment, but I simply say that they are talking through their hats when they say that the majority of the homes benefiting from the partially graded exemptions are not owner-occupied. The overwhelming majority of them are owner-occupied.

I know in my constituency most of the

houses fall into this category and most of the houses are owner-occupied. I raised the particular case of old age pensioners but I think my argument is equally applicable to other people on low incomes. I am all in favour of some of the other measures that the hon. member for Bracondale thinks desirable —for example, special exemptions for people dependent on old age pensions; I am all in favour of that, but the point is we have not got that.

My friend, the hon. member for Hamilton East brought in a bill with regard to old age pensioners and it was turned down flat in this House. So I am one of those who want to hold on to what I have, not give up what I have for a mirage in the future—what I may or may not get. I will give it up when the other thing materializes. Right now, this is a benefit, a protection, that the small man, the person on low income, the old age pensioners and others enjoy.

The hon. member for Humber comes forth with the normal hair-splitting logic that is used in such cases, that there is no necessary relationship between income and the value of the house one occupies. This is about ten per cent true—one per cent would be more accurate—it is true there is no absolutely necessary connection, but there is a close relationship. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the people who occupy homes of low value are the people with low incomes.

There is always some sort of exception to this rule; there may be the so-called rag dealer making $50,000 a year—I have never met one, but we always hear about him from the Tories so maybe they know of one—who lives in a house assessed at only $4,000. There may be such a case, I do not know, but the overwhelming majority of the people who are benefiting from the partially graded exemptions are the people on low incomes.

As the hon. member for Bracondale has pointed out, and as I myself pointed out, the problem—at least I do not consider it a problem—the situation is gradually going to be changed, the partially graded exemptions are going to be eliminated as values increase.

I think they represent a sound principle of taxation. They represent an attempt to put a progressive element into what is essentially a regressive tax and I would argue in favour of them on principle. I think it is completely beside the point to say that churches and universities and various other similar institutions now have exemptions.

I do not know if the hon. member for Bracondale is advocating that the exemptions now enjoyed by churches and universities and so on, should be abolished; I know that we in the past, in this House, have given some exemptions by private legislation that I certainly opposed, but then most of the exemptions that have been granted are to organizations of a particular type. I am not arguing for or against those exemptions; all I am saying is that this is quite beside the point. Even if all of those exemptions were eliminated, they have nothing to do with the partially graded exemptions which I think, in the interest of elementary justice, ought to be retained. I would like to repeat what I have said before, that I am alarmed at the trend in this country to shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor.

An hon. member: Oh, no!

Mr. Bryden: There are Tories over there who think that is a lot of nonsense; they think it is fine to shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor. Well, I protest it. I admit my protest will be ineffective in this House, but I still protest. We see it in almost every new development in taxation; increases in sales taxes and that sort of thing, and now here a deliberate shift of incidence. As soon as these graded exemptions come off, the poor man is going to have an increase in his taxes over and above any other increase that may come through.

There is absolutely no escaping from that proposition. The hon. member for Humber stated that as far as Etobicoke is concerned it would not be fair for the people of New Toronto only to enjoy the exemptions; that either they should be eliminated or alternatively they should be extended to the whole area.

I agree with him on his main point: That the people of New Toronto should not have a special benefit in that municipality. It should be extended to the whole area.

As far as the city of Toronto is concerned it is no problem, because the new municipalities that are coming into the enlarged city of Toronto are Forest Hill and Swansea, and although I have not studied the matter I am willing to give better than even odds that there will not be any dwellings in either of those municipalities.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: The hon. member is absolutely wrong!

Mr. Bryden: As a matter of fact I am wrong; I am glad that the hon. member

mentioned it. There is a corner of Forest Hill where there are dwellings that would qualify, and probably there are such dwellings in Swansea too. There would be a few dwellings, I think, in Forest Hill and in Swansea, that would qualify. I think that it should extend to the whole city; and indeed what I have retained out of this proposed section 37a would do that, I believe. That, I think, is perhaps the significance of subsection 2.

The hon. member for Humber was not right in suggesting that my amendment was out of order and the hon. member for St. George was not right in suggesting that I could accomplish the same thing by voting against the section; I cannot.

I would like to retain the exemptions; I would like them to apply to the whole of the new city of Toronto; and if the hon. member for Humber would also like to move an amendment whereby they would apply to the whole of the new borough of Etobicoke after the reorganization, I would be very happy to support his amendment. But I will let the hon. members from that area deal with their particular problems; I will deal with the problems of the area that I represent, namely, the city of Toronto.

In concluding what I have to say on this matter I want to repeat once again that I can see that the graded exemptions are going down the drain and the little man is taking another trimming. As far as I am concerned, I stand here in protest and I will protest it at every opportunity.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. member for Woodbine—first of all to the hon. member for Bracondale; for once we positively agree—the hon. member for Woodbine is whistling Dixie in all his statements. I can tell the House that the graduated tax exemptions in Toronto, in New Toronto and possibly the whole of Metropolitan Toronto, are as outdated as the horse and buggy.

Let us deal with financial facts. If what I stated could be a possibility—which I now realize it can—if you were to allow this to be equal over the whole metropolitan area on the exemptions; finally this so-called "little man" would be back up and his exemption would be gone.

I say again, that there is a great co-ordination or consolidation of thought between assessment and income. I am going to say to the hon. member that on another day we shall discuss the man with the fixed income and the old age pensioner who should get relief from his municipal taxes. I believe that this is overdue, but this is not the place to put it.

I think today that if we were to take into consideration, through this government and through the municipalities, consideration of the man with a fixed pension or an old age pension and give them some consideration and relief on their municipal taxation, we would save millions of dollars in building institutions in which to put them, they would be able to remain in their own homes; but that is another day. Therefore I support the—

Mr. Bryden: We had a bill like that before—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this has been a subject for discussion for a considerable period of time in this Legislature; it has been a subject which was discussed at some length by the select committee on municipal affairs and it is a subject in which that committee had a pretty unanimous recommendation. If memory serves me correctly, the hon. member for Yorkview agreed with that recommendation, and that is that we do away with graded exemptions.

Mr. Chairman, the argument for graded exemption is an argument—I think the hon. member for Humber stated it amply—an argument that puts emphasis for assistance in the wrong place. If we are going to use administration of municipal affairs as a method of dealing with the less fortunate people in the community, then I would suggest that we call in the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, the hon. Minister of Health perhaps, and let them take over this aspect of it.

But surely there has to be some reasonable system of uniformity through the whole of the province of Ontario in the administration of assessment matters and in the administration of municipal affairs. Surely, there is good and abundant sense in having—and I hope that this is the direction in which the government is moving, far too slowly, but I think it is moving in this direction—one system of assessment for the whole province of Ontario; having one level of assessors, all trained, all tested, and so on, so that the assessment in Sarnia is the same as that in Toronto and North Bay and so on.

We are not getting there quickly enough, but I hope that we are moving along in that direction. It was with this in mind that we suggested on that committee, and the hon. member for Yorkview agreed with it, that we do have a uniform base of assessment all

across the whole of the province of Ontario, but we have not yet arrived at that.

The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Woodbine would be a retrogressive step in achieving this very important goal.

In fact, sir, I regret that the section is permissive rather than mandatory and I would far rather have seen the word "may" removed and the word "shall" put in and give them a reasonable time.

Now, insofar as it really being a relief, there are certain sections in the city of Toronto—and I am sure that the hon. member for Woodbine knows this—that are being reclaimed where certain individuals have bought up small, 14-foot houses with very low assessment and turned them into very elaborate homes. The assessors move much more slowly than the people who have bought and moved into these homes and there are all sorts of—

Mr. Bryden: That is not the big problem.

Mr. Singer: It may not be a big problem, but this is what is being produced. There are all sorts of people, who by income and by having attractive living quarters—the hon. member for St. George had one; I do not think we need to take up a collection for him for a day or two. I think he is able to pay his municipal taxes. And there are many other people who are doing the same thing.

It is a popular thing to do, it is a good thing to do. Certain sections of the city are being reclaimed by this action.

But are those poeple entitled, Mr. Chairman, to a graded exemption?

This is an old, outdated mode of giving a type of relief which was required for a certain age and a certain day to achieve a certain purpose. That age and that day are gone. This achieves no purpose except to continue inequality in our assessment procedure.

I strongly criticize the hon. Minister not having moved assessment procedures along much more quickly. We should have a system that is aiming at a uniform assessment over the whole of Ontario. He should have made—he has heard this from me many times and he is going to hear it again and again—he should have made his assessment manual mandatory. We should be able to tell in this province the basis of assessment. We are not able to do it today.

This section is a weak excuse for doing anything. Perhaps it is more political than anything else. If the hon. Minister had real courage he would replace the word "may" with "shall."

For these reasons I cannot support, nor can my colleagues support, this amendment.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the hon. member for Downsview and I have heard the hon. member for Bracondale talk about this partially graded exemption. We should recognize the fact that the partially graded exemption refers only to taxations for general purposes. If any hon. member of this House would like to come down to the riding of Riverdale, which is ward 1 in the city of Toronto and about which I have spoken on other occasions, and if he would think for one single moment that the general standard of the services provided in ward 1 in the city of Toronto are commensurate with the general standard in other parts of the city of Toronto, then I could perhaps find some logical justification for removing this kind of a partial exemption.

Mr. Singer: That is not my point. You do not even understand it.

Mr. Renwick: It is quite fine for the hon. member for Downsview and the hon. member for Bracondale to talk about what the Goldenberg report said about the tax exempt property in the city of Toronto. But I think it passing strange that the only recommendation that the Goldenberg report made about exemption, was to remove this exemption from the person whose house is assessed at $4,000 or less in the city of Toronto, and he is taxed on that assessment. The mill rate is fixed, he is taxed on that assessment for the general purposes of the city of Toronto.

Mr. Singer: I did not mention the Goldenberg report. I was talking about the general—

Mr. Renwick: I am talking about the hon. member for Bracondale. He spoke about the Goldenberg report and the tremendous value of assessment which is exempt entirely from any municipal tax.

Mr. Ben: I did not mention the Goldenberg report. I think perhaps you are mistaken.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, the figures are in the Goldenberg report. There are $782 million of tax exempt properties.

Mr. Bryden: He talked about general exemptions anyway.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: It is quite fine. If the hon. member for Downsview is going to go along on some sort of false symmetry because in some small way some few people in the city of Toronto, for a very proper purpose, are entitled to some form of protection against the municipal tax, that is fine. He can go along on that basis. The member for Bracondale can. The member for St. George can.

Mr. Ben: I must say this. I never mention the word Goldenberg unless I can go out and wash my mouth with soap. Excuse me.

Mr. Renwick: Let us not be distracted from the point. The hon. member for Bracondale and the hon. member for Downsview have talked themselves in a convoluted way into supporting the principle put forward by the Tory government, that because there is some suggestion—

Mr. Singer: Supported by the hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Renwick: I might say that the hon. member for Yorkview has discussed this matter with us, and we are at liberty to say that he has now seen the light and he is quite prepared to realize that the problems which exist in the riding of Yorkview are not problems.

Mr. Singer: He was talking for the whole of the province, not—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Riverdale has the floor.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, when and if all the recommendations of that report are put into force across this province, I am quite certain that we will find that we will be prepared to do away with this partially graded exemption. But suddenly to light on one single recommendation in that report; to take away what slight protection the people in a riding such as Riverdale have against the impact of taxes, is not right or proper in this kind of a bill. If there are some other recommendations at some time which the government might bring into effect, which would provide the kind of relief on a more general basis throughout the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, we certainly would support any reasonable proposition that would do that. But to fall for a specious argument that because a very few people have the benefit of this traditional exemption, we should now step in and remove it in order to establish some form of false symmetry in taxation structure across the city, is quite wrong. The standard of services provided across the metropolitan area on general purpose taxation is not the same, and there are substantial tax exempt properties in the city of Toronto which merit attention, and which are not dealt with at all in this bill.

I certainly support, for the reasons which my colleague from Woodbine has put forward, the amendment which he has proposed, as do the rest of the members in our group here. I would certainly say this is no place for the hon. members for Downsview and Bracondale to get up and talk about what may happen in the future, and how happy they will be when at some point or other in the far distant future, there will be proper protection against this kind of taxation for old age pensioners and others out of the mainstream of the market economy.

But we are not going to accept the specious arguments which have been put forward and in one isolated section in a bill, which deals with many, many other topics, remove this small protection which a large number of people in the city of Toronto have at the present time, which in most cases is not being abused. If there are abuses, enforcement could remove those abuses, particularly in a riding such as Riverdale where the standard of general services throughout that area is not commensurate with the standard which is provided throughout other areas of the city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the House, the fact that since the year 1949, the city of Toronto has had authority to repeal the bylaw, and I thought I was being very honest by indicating in this amendment that the city of Toronto could do this. I was not very smart. I should not have mentioned that in this amendment, because you would never have realized that there was any intention that the city of Toronto might, under this amendment, prepare to repeal the bylaw.

However, what I have done is to give an option. Because of the fact that now the other municipality, New Toronto, which has a graded exemption bylaw, will become part of Etobicoke, it is only fair that the new consolidated municipality of Etobicoke should deal with this matter. Therefore, they may deal with it either on the basis of repealing

the bylaw, or abolishing it over a period of years, and the city of Toronto will have the same option.

But you must realize that Toronto has had this authority since 1949.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And they can do it now.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: And they can do it tomorrow morning, if they wish.

Mr. Bryden: They have been afraid to exercise it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They can do it all in the one year, as it is now.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is right. Whereas in the Act as now before the House, it may be provided for the abolition of the exemptions over a five-year period, which would ease the whole situation.

I thank the hon. member for Bracondale and the hon. member for Downsview, for their support of this, and ask that the other hon. members of the House not support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour, will please say "aye."

Those opposed, will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is defeated.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment, will please rise.

All those opposed, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are six, the "nays" 64.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 10, subsections 1-13, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 11 agreed to.

On section 12:

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, before discussing part VII on education, I have a few comments.

Most of the members of the House have heard that the teachers as a group are quite concerned about what they consider to be the dangerous concentration of power in the Metro board and the severe weakening of the area boards. This morning I got a telegram—I think that just about everybody in the House got the same telegram—from J. D. MacNab, president of the Ontario secondary school teachers federation. It says:

> We are deeply concerned with the implications of Bill 81 in its present form. It will affect adversely the total education system in this province. We request a reasonable delay in this matter for adequate public examination.

I have some comments Mr. Chairman, in connection with subsection 5 of section 127, but prior to that I thought I would ask the government if any consideration has been given to the request of the Ontario secondary school teachers federation.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I would reply to this. I guess we all got telegrams from the OSSTF. I should point out that the bill was made available and certain discussions held with the OTF which is the parent, shall we say, organization. This telegram came to some of us yesterday and some of us today. The concern, as I understand it, of the OSSTF really is an area that has been discussed. The hon. member has indicated that it is a question of an increase of power for the Metro board. I think, quite frankly, to a degree that this is true. It does have a bearing on the question of whether or not the employees of the borough or local boards should be eligible for election on some other board within the Metro area. The question as I understand it, and I discussed it with two or three of the members this afternoon, relates to the general area, the question of power to the metropolitan school board. I think, quite frankly Mr. Chairman, this is one of the principles within the Act.

That is, the Metro board is to have jurisdiction over current operations as far as expenditure is concerned, and at the same time we have built into the framework of this legislation sufficient flexibility to give the individual or the local borough board sufficient responsibility to carry on the actual administration of the board within the boroughs themselves. I think really the concern that is being expressed by the OSSTF is the result of a meeting of their executive on Saturday of last week. I feel, Mr. Chairman, there would be no purpose really in delaying consideration of the legislation because these same problems will exist after our discussions as exist right now.

Mr. Chairman: Are proposed sections 124 and 125 agreed to?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I withheld my remarks on the comment raised by

the hon. member for Etobicoke and the hon. Minister's reply because I want to make an amendment on this section dealing with what I think is the substance, the main point, of the telegram that we received from the OSSTF, but concerning which there is much broader concern and worry.

I think we have moved into a period with regard to education where there is a great preoccupation as to whether or not our methods and our procedures are as effective in education as they might otherwise be. There is a great deal of research being devoted to this, there is a great deal of experimentation being devoted to it. In some areas, inevitably, certain school boards have taken the lead in trying to pioneer. The worry that has emerged and has been given considerable expression in the press is whether or not these educational pace-setters are going to be throttled by a levelling out process in the metropolitan area as a result of the kind of bill that we now have before us. Indeed, the chairman of the Toronto board of education has expressed the fear that either there would be a levelling-out process, or alternatively that they would have to mark time while the rest of them caught up.

A few days ago the Toronto *Telegram* carried an article by Larry Collins quoting Trustee Barrie Coutts, who doubles as chairman of the Metro school board, who told his colleagues that Metro will have life-and-death financial powers over area programmes, and that means academic power as well. To which the reply of Mr. Lowes, who is chairman of the Toronto board was: "I am worried about our new-Canadian programme, I am worried about our downtown schools. I intend to push for a bonus for teachers in the downtown area. There must be a reduction in class sizes in schools. Teaching children in districts where there are social problems is not the same as teaching 35 children from upper middle class."

Now, within that comment for example, Mr. Chairman, is the nub of difference in problems. I think we would be doing a very grave disservice here if, in the bill, we gave any support at all to the proposition that the kind of experimentation that is going on will come to a halt.

Perhaps I can illustrate it best by two experiments in two different parts of the city. In both areas they are regarded with considerable enthusiasm and favour by educational powers-that-be, and in both instances they are wondering what is going to happen.

In the city of Toronto, for example, as is implied in the comments of Mr. Barry Lowes, we have experiments such as that going on in the Duke of York school—a school in a low income area with generally underprivileged families, underprivileged children, a school area where the parents have not the most enthusiastic reaction to education.

As is explained by the sociologists, this is a psychological reaction to the fact that they themselves, in many instances, did not have a fortunate educational experience. At all events, efforts to plead with their children to take an interest in education usually do not ring a bell with the children because the children can sense that their parents do not really believe in it.

A very good article was carried by Barrie Zwicker in the *Globe and Mail* in which he detailed the kind of thing that is going on in this school where, by a new approach, they have transformed a school where obviously education was not effective—they have made it an exciting thing for most of the children involved.

Now, how did they do it, Mr. Chairman? They did it by facing the fact that you must have teachers who have an opportunity to establish a personal relationship with the children instead of acting purely as educational policemen in a class that is so big that they have no chance to establish that personal relationship. The ratio of teacher to pupil in this school is one to twenty. This is one of the main reasons why they have been able to transform the whole atmosphere in the school and the prospects.

Obviously there are going to be greater costs involved. Indeed at the moment they cannot actually separate out the costs involved. They estimate that the average per pupil cost in the public school system in the city of Toronto is $529. In this experiment, with the one to twenty ratio of teacher to pupil, plus a range of specialists who are also ready to meet all of the special needs, it is estimated that the costs may even go to as much as twice the average per capita in the city of Toronto.

But, Mr. Chairman, the thing that I am pointing out is that when we tried a few years ago to grapple with the problem of dropouts, the kind of thing that is now going on in the Duke of York school is the result of the best brains of those who studied this problem. Tackle some of the problems in the deficiencies of our system at an earlier stage and it may well be, as I shall want to discuss at a great length when we get to the education estimates, it may well be that this is

going to become one of our top priorities and that we will have to spend more money. By spending more money here we will save money later.

Let me take a converse circumstance. I happened to be talking just this morning with a high school principal, or with a junior high school principal, in North York—

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are discussing section 126, and I cannot understand what point the hon. member is trying to make.

Mr. MacDonald: You will find out in one moment. I was silent when your colleague raised it on the first one and maybe you wondered why I was silent. You will find why I am raising it here because I will submit an amendment before I sit down.

I was going to draw attention to the fact that in North York where they have a system of junior high schools and where they are convinced that this increases the effectiveness of teaching in those middle years of grades 7 and 8. Indeed once again they are not exactly certain as to how much greater is the cost, but it is estimated that it is 30 to 40 per cent. But if by an increase of 30 to 40 per cent in these grades you can get double your effectiveness, then this may be money well spent in the long run.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be not only serious—in terms of the improvement of our educational system in an area where a great deal of the pioneering and experimenting has gone on, it might be disastrous for the whole province if anything is done that will destroy the possibility of curtailing this experiment. When I received this telegram yesterday I was somewhat mystified. Quite frankly, I was mystified for two reasons—I wondered exactly what they meant, and I wondered even more why I got it at this late stage when the Goldenberg report a year ago gave a very clear indication of what was likely to be done in the educational field.

But in discussing it with one or two people since then I found that the reason for their concern, whether it is belated or not, is once again that you are going to have this levelling out to a dull mediocrity; the curtailing of the pace-setters; in the long run a disservice to education both in the metropolitan area, and conceivably, of benefits that can be applied more widely across the whole province of Ontario.

I do not think the hon. Minister wants to do this and, frankly, I think it is possible that we can avoid doing it. I would, therefore, like to move that subsection 3 of the proposed new section 126 be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> That no standards established by a former board shall be reduced, and no special facilities, services or classes established by such boards shall be abolished in the area in which they previously existed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never heard anything so impractical in my life.

Mr. MacDonald: Why is it impractical?

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to speak to this proposed amendment for one moment. I think the hon. member has very clearly indicated that it is not the intention or desire of the government to inhibit, or in any way alter, the existing programmes as far as the individual boards are concerned. This is why we took a somewhat different approach and provided for the one-and-a-half and the one mill differential for programmes if the local boards felt the necessity to go beyond what the Metro board had suggested. I think it is self-evident that if there are peaks and valleys, say, in the Metro system here no one wants to cut off the peaks to fill the valleys. We want to bring everyone up to a quality level as far as education is concerned.

But I suggest very sincerely that I doubt that you can in fact legislate this. I think that a lot of this legislation, the effect of which will be based on the implementation given to it by participating groups—the trustees, and the teachers—will be in the spirit of good will and they will see that the proper type of educational programme is either continued or developed in those areas where it presently perhaps does not exist. There is nothing in this legislation that will in any way inhibit the boards from carrying on their existing programmes or developing new programmes. But it is very difficult to define, as the hon. member is suggesting, how you provide what might be termed an adequate programme of instruction, or at the same time guarantee that existing programmes will continue.

It is quite conceivable that there are some existing programmes that maybe should not continue. It may be found over a period of time that certain alterations or changes should take place. I think, Mr. Chairman, speaking generally on this whole problem,

it is the basic problem, as I see it, or the question of the whole amendment to the educational portion of the Metro Act. I do not care how elaborate the framework is that you develop, the implementation of it will depend on the effort that is made; the genuine effort that is made by the Metro board, the local boards and the profession to see that the quality of education is properly developed.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that you can adequately spell this out in the Act without perhaps causing more complications than you are attempting to solve.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, basically I must agree with the hon. Minister and his comments, but I think that all of us in this House are in favour of motherhood, the flag and everything that is good—

An hon. member: What flag?

Mr. Braithwaite: The flag of Canada. But just for the purposes of clarification, it would do no harm to put the amendment into the Act to allay the fears of the people to whom the hon. member for York South referred. If they speak for the teaching profession as a whole, I see nothing wrong with the amendment being supported. I am sure I speak for other members of this party when I say that we will support the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: I am a bit puzzled by two things. One, the interjection which the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions did not see fit to pursue to the effect that this is not practical. Why is it not practical? It says: "No standards established by a former board shall be reduced"—now, this may be a matter of judgment—"but no special facility, services or classes established by such a board—"

Let us face it. The heart and core of the problem in education today is that our educational system has been established by people who are middle class oriented, or upper class oriented, and who only now have a glimmering of the problem of providing an effective education for the culturally disadvantaged child, if I may use that horrible sociologist's description.

But when you get into the downtown area of Toronto, Barry Zwicker has a wonderful paragraph about teachers who come down the Don valley from the middle class areas of northern suburbs into these schools, and how it takes them months to get accustomed, for example, to the swearing they will hear from the kids. But the basic approach of the people in the Duke of York school is that you accept the child as he is, and you try to lead him to a more enriching educational experience. Do not let us for one moment in this House underestimate the built-in inhibitions, indeed the opposition, of a society that is dominated by middle-class thinking on pioneering and pace-setting in this field. Until we do it, we are going to have kids growing up in that area and the possibilities of them developing their native talents are simply going to be denied them because they are not getting an effective education. Now, why are they not? We need not go into that in this particular bill at the moment, we can deal with that when we get to the educational estimate. But there is no disputing that this is a fact, and I submit that the views of Mr. Barry Lowes, the chairman of the Toronto board of education, are very valid when he expresses a fear that when Toronto seeks to continue classes to deal with the problems of new Canadians; or with the problems of the culturally disadvantaged child from the lower income homes, you will get at best an apathy, and at worst an opposition from other areas in the metropolitan and the suburban areas where they simply do not face this kind of a problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where they are pace-setting in some other areas.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do not downgrade what some of the suburban boards themselves are doing.

Mr. MacDonald: I was not downgrading them. As a matter of fact, just to make certain that I was not downgrading them, I cited the experiments and the enthusiasm which North York has for its junior high school programme. So I am not downgrading it. It seems to me that here is your real area of getting an effective educational programme today. Why can't you stipulate in a bill that in this overall effort to establish an equality of educational services and an equalization of the burden—which is the objective, an objective that we have agreed with—that we should give some protection that these pace-setting elements of the programme here in Toronto and elsewhere in the metropolitan area, will be protected? I think this can be done by the kind of phraseology that I have expressed here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the leadership in educational research that has been referred to in the Toronto area is a very real and

valuable asset that we have experienced all across the province. And because of this, I feel that the amendment is a valuable one, because it emphasizes the need for careful approach to an amalgamation of these education services so that every opportunity for these individual differences and the resulting research that comes from them will be maintained. Personally, I can see some difficulty existing in legislation that present special classes be maintained in perpetuity.

It may very well be that in the months that lie ahead something better will come along and they would be replaced with some entirely different approach and a different effort. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this particular amendment, the fact that it emphasizes the need for freedom of action among the boards of education across Toronto, we in this party will support the amendment, recognizing that there are some serious practical difficulties that would arise when it is applied.

Mr. MacDonald: There will be serious difficulties if you leave it as it is.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, I think the point here is that the last speaker made a good point: It is very difficult to insist on legislation that certain things be continued in perpetuity. Just to allay the fears of the members, as a former member of the metropolitan school board I have kept very close to their actions in this regard and I might tell you that even though we are still considering this bill, they have had a group meeting to consider the implications and the implementation of this new system in Metro. This group has had well over ten meetings. It is made up of Mr. W. J. McCordick, the executive secretary of the present metropolitan school board, and the directors of education in the new boroughs. This group presented a report to the metropolitan school board which was received at its meeting either last week or the week before and was approved at that meeting.

Part of this report, Mr. Chairman, stated something to the effect that:

> The metropolitan school board will accept the existing programmes in all the area boards as having been fashioned in good faith and will build from there.

So that we need have no fears. All the programmes that now exist in the six boroughs will be accepted and the building will start from there.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment, please stand.

All those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 21, the "nays" 53.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 126 agreed to.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, where do all the backbenchers go after the vote is taken, do you know?

An hon. member: Where do the flies go in the winter time?

Mr. Chairman: On section 127.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in respect to 127, No. 5, I am moving an amendment.

Where the section now reads:

> —an employee of a board of education in the metropolitan area or of the school board is not eligible to be a member of any board of education in the metropolitan area.

It was felt that this was implicit in the legislation, but some question was raised so we are making this amendment to make it clear that no employee of the Metro board as well as the local boards may be a member of the board of education in the Metro area.

It is not the amendment that you thought.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I had intended to have a few comments in connection with section 5, but it occurs to me that perhaps the hon. member for Riverdale might have some comments in connection with subsections 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my comment is on section 5.

Mr. Braithwaite: In that case, Mr. Chairman; I listened to the hon. Minister of Education and I can only conclude that he has made the section not better, but worse.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I have endeavoured to make it consistent. I do not think it is a question of better or worse. The amendment very simply makes it consistent, that is all.

Mr. Braithwaite: To our way of thinking, Mr. Chairman, it is worse.

If we go back, Mr. Chairman, to the late 1940's and early 50's there is the case in the city of Belleville where a trustee ran for council. Now, I believe his name was Bleas, but it does not really matter. The point is that up until that time there had been some doubt as to whether a trustee had the right to run for municipal office. This man was elected. After his election his seat was contested, and I understand that the lower court and the court of appeal said that a trustee was not eligible to run for municipal office.

After that the Ontario teachers federation put pressure on the government, together with other groups. Subsequently we found that under The Schools Administration Act a trustee was allowed to sit on a board as long as the board did not employ him. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if under subsection 5 and the amendment as put forward by the hon. Minister of Education, a school trustee and the group of people who are teachers, are being relegated to the second-class position that they had years ago, back in the 1940's when Mr. Bleas ran as a teacher.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, just why this section was put in.

The hon. Minister of Education has mentioned the fact that his amendment and the section in general are supposed to make it quite clear that a teacher cannot be a trustee. I wonder if there is not something more to this section and to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, boards such as Etobicoke and North York where we have teachers sitting have always shown a great deal of leadership; and when it came to salary matters they have been criticized many times. Perhaps this whole question of their leadership, not only in education but in their ability to get better teachers and end up with school systems which are the best in Ontario, may be the reason they are being penalized. This particular section 5 and the amendment seem to be aimed at a small group of people and just a few boards. I know when I speak I speak for the citizens of Etobicoke when I say that this section—and I will include the amendment as well—is unwarranted and contains some suggestion of vindictiveness.

As for the teachers as a group in Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Chairman, the amendment and the section give the appearance that teachers are being put into the same category as those who are insane and those who are criminal. These are two groups who are ineligible to enjoy their full rights as citizens and this particular section is going to deprive teachers of the very same rights.

To my way of thinking, if a teacher—and that is any teacher—who is highly trained and who we feel is a person of high standing in the community, is good enough to take my child and your child for about eight hours a day and to guide them and mould them and bring them along in this world, then it escapes me as to why any teacher should not be looked upon as a person who could sit on a school board, any school board, and make rational decisions with impartiality. There is something wrong here, Mr. Chairman, and this is why I am speaking against the section and against the amendment.

As for the voters of Metropolitan Toronto, the government seems to infer that these people—and I mean you and I and everybody else who pays taxes and who has a right to vote in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto—the government seems to infer that they are incapable of making wise decisions when it comes to electing somebody to represent them.

As far as I am concerned, if a person who is a voter, wants to vote for a teacher when he gets behind the curtain in the ballot box, then he should have the right to do so. And if he does not want to, then he should also have the right not to do so, but the fact is that he should have the inalienable right to make the decision; the decision should not be made for him by the government.

I listened the other night to the remarks of the hon. Provincial Secretary and I am wondering how, if he speaks for the government, the government can reconcile the statements he made the other night about democracy and about the vote and about all those sort of things—how they could reconcile that sort of talk with subsection 5 of section 127, and with the amendment as proposed by the hon. Minister of Education.

To my way of thinking, Mr. Chairman, this part of the bill deprives the voter of his right to choose for himself. In a most pernicious way, it deprives the teacher of his civil rights. If it passes, I will not be at all surprised if we find a teacher making a test case of the section and going to the human rights commission of The Department of Labour, and demanding that his rights as a citizen be restored to him.

If this section of the bill, and the amendment bar teachers in Metro from being members of the new Metro school board, that might be justifiable in the minds of some. I do not agree, but some feel that might be

justifiable. However, to bar a teacher from sitting on any board of education which does not employ him, is out-and-out discrimination. As far as this side of the House is concerned, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister of Education had not moved the amendment, I was prepared on behalf of this party to move an amendment striking out subsection 5 of section 127 under paragraph 12.

Since the Minister has moved the amendment, I will say that this party is not in favour of it and will vote against it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we will oppose the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister to this section of the bill and whether it is carried or defeated, we intend then to move our own amendment to this particular section.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Etobicoke, I also represent part of Etobicoke and I do not know what is his parallel, in the first part of his discussion, relevant to trustees running for council. But I would like to inform him that in 1942 when I ran for council, first of all, before being nominated, I had to resign as a trustee.

Mr. Braithwaite: I would like to interrupt, Mr. Chairman. The same applies to myself.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: All right, that point is clear.

Now then, in denial of the hon. member for Etobicoke I have felt very keen about this particular section. As he probably knows, the one municipality that has a majority of teachers on the board of education is Etobicoke. I have canvassed the people and made it my business to talk to the teachers and they do not think it is in their best interest to have teachers sitting on the board of education. They said that there was a conflict of interest as far as the taxpayer is concerned and, frankly, I think we should think about that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, may I answer the hon. member for Humber? On the point of his comments—if I said "trustee," I was referring to teachers in the early part of my comment. Also, I should say, Mr. Chairman, that I canvassed quite a few teachers in the part of Etobicoke that I represent and I must say that the results that I got from my canvass were in direct opposition to what the hon. member has said. I do not know, but there could possibly be a division among teachers. As far as I am concerned, I think I spoke for the majority of the people in Etobicoke when I made my comments.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit a question?

Probably we are talking on two different levels. May I ask the member for Etobicoke how many teachers on the board of education live in his riding?

Mr. Braithwaite: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that I have not the slightest idea exactly how many.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I know.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, could I finish my comments?

There is another point I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman. I stated in my comments that I had been prepared to move an amendment to section 5 but it was my understanding that if the hon. Minister moved an amendment and it was passed, then it would be impossible for me to move my amendment. I wonder if the Chairman could give a ruling on that?

Mr. Chairman: I would be inclined to say that once the House has decided by its vote what words are to stand, they cannot be amended, but words may be added.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the only thing that would stand would be the new words that the hon. Minister proposed should be added. We have an amendment, I may say, that would not affect those words but would alter other words in the section.

Now, if the hon. Minister's amendment is defeated I believe that would automatically carry the section, but if it should be carried, then it is quite in order to amend other words in the clause, is it not? That is our understanding. It was our intention to bring in such an amendment.

Mr. Chairman: The understanding of the chair is that the only way you could amend the section is by addition of other words.

Mr. Bryden: Or by substitution for words that are now there. If they are not affected by this amendment. All that is carried, if this amendment carries, are the specific words that the hon. Minister wants to add.

We could delete words that are here and substitute others, but we could not affect the words that the Minister has put in.

Mr. Chairman: I am inclined to say that the words that would carry would be the words of the whole section, as amended.

Mr. Bryden: No, it is just the words added by the amendment—

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, to clarify for me: I am wondering if a motion moved after the hon. Minister's motion, striking out the whole of section 5, would be in order?

Mr. Chairman: No!

Mr. Braithwaite: It would not be? Thank you.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, surely an amendment which would alter words other than those added by the hon. Minister would be in order?

Mr. Chairman: Only in the form of additions. The amendment would then carry for that particular section as amended, all words would carry.

Mr. S. Lewis: Just the amended words would carry.

Mr. Chairman: Not just the amended words, I should judge that the whole clause then would carry.

Mr. Bryden: Surely the words that are added are all that carry. If the whole section carries there would be no possibility of further amendments.

Mr. Chairman: That is right, and it is my understanding that the whole section would carry.

Mr. Bryden: But the hon. Minister—may I just suggest, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has proposed an amendment that in effect adds about five words. Now, that surely is all the House is voting on at this time, whether or not those five words will be added?

Mr. Chairman: No, what the House will be voting on will be the whole section as amended.

Mr. Bryden: But that would mean then that only one amendment to a section is ever possible, and that surely defies commonsense as well as the rules of the House. Surely a number of amendments to a section are possible.

Some hon. members: No, no!

Mr. Bryden: They are, under the rules of this House and under any other rules.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Even though I think I understand what the rule is, if the rule is what I understand it to be then it does in fact defy commonsense. It would leave it open to the government to get up on each section and say, let us change the period at the end of the sentence to a semi-colon and that would mean that no one is then able to move any other amendment. I am sure the hon. member for St. George is seriously considering that, but surely that cannot be what the government intends in this thing.

Now, there are a series of amendments that we propose to this and merely because the Minister happened to catch the Chairman's eye first and put in a few new words which makes his section worse instead of better, surely this should not be allowed to prevent the Opposition from moving an amendment of substance to this section.

Mr. Chairman: When the amendment is put, we will come to that particular section—

Mr. Singer: We are at it right now, this is the point.

Mr. Chairman: When we are ready to deal with the amendment I shall rule on it.

Mr. Singer: And you will then accept a further amendment, is that correct?

Mr. Chairman: That is correct.

Mr. Singer: You will accept—

Mr. Chairman: Is there further discussion?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this section.

The obvious intent of this section is to prevent any teacher employed by any metropolitan board, any borough board or the city of Toronto board from being a trustee on any other borough board or the city board or the Metro board. In other words, if you are a teacher—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Employee, it does not say teacher.

Mr. Singer: All right, a teacher or an employee of a board—well, a teacher is an employee, amongst the employees are teachers—and those employees who are teachers are barred, as well as all other employees,

from serving on any elected board in the Metro area, no matter where they live. That is what the Minister is getting at. Am I right on that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: On any elected school board.

Mr. Singer: All right, any elected school board.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You said any elected board.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Chairman, we are picking and choosing as between teachers, this is the point.

On the Etobicoke board, for instance, there is a university professor, there is a teacher who teaches at the University of Toronto schools. On the North York board there is a teacher who teaches at the University of Toronto schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That part is accurate.

Mr. Singer: These people are not affected by this section.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is correct.

Mr. Singer: They can continue.

How do you pick? Make fish of one and fowl of the other. How do you pick between these? Certain teachers are bad and certain teachers are good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some are employees and some are not. It is very simple.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister is getting very legalistic. He is avoiding the principle. He is far too intelligent a man to avoid the principle with the legalisms he is throwing out, he is far too intelligent to miss this.

Let me give the Minister another example. A teacher teaches in the township of North York, but lives just across Steeles avenue in the township of Vaughan.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They can run in the township of Vaughan.

Mr. Singer: He can run. Or he teaches in the township of Vaughan and he can run a few hundred yards south of him, in the township of North York.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And you miss the point.

Mr. Singer: Now, what sense does that make? Whereas a teacher who teaches in Etobicoke could not run in the city of Toronto or in Scarborough, which is 25 miles away.

Now, what sense does that make?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It has nothing to do with his qualifications.

Mr. Singer: Certainly it does.

The people of Etobicoke, whether wise or not in their choice, have decided that they want on their board of education a number of teachers. That is what the voters decided. Now, what my friend from Humber is saying is that they were very stupid in their approach, we think it the wrong thing, so we are going to stop them from doing that from here on in.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I did not say that.

Mr. Singer: That is exactly right, that is exactly what you are saying.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I said no such thing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Humber wants to reply a little later, he can do it.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I am replying to you now because you are putting words in my mouth.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am sure I will satisfy him that what he is saying, if not specifically at least figuratively in casting his vote, this is what he means.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: In your mind.

Mr. Singer: Yes. We are going to fix those people in Etobicoke who were foolish enough to put teachers on our board of education. We are going to stop them from doing that.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: We are not only dealing with Etobicoke.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, an argument perhaps could be made that the voters have exercised their wisdom well or badly in choosing educators to be on the board of education, but that is not the argument. The government has removed this from the field of political judgment. The government is replacing its policial judgment for that of the voters. What sense can it possibly make to have a man who is employed by the township of Scarborough prohibited from running for the board of education in the city of Toronto or in the township of North York?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Could he now run for a municipal council? Can a municipal employee run for municipal council in some other borough in Metro? No.

Mr. Singer: There was a gentleman named Tidy who served on the Toronto hydro-electric system and he ran and was elected and was a very efficient alderman in the city of Toronto. I did not hear anyone on the government benches getting up and saying this was a terrible thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No one is saying it is a terrible thing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Tidy served well and nobly as long as the people chose to elect him, as a matter of fact I do not think he was defeated, he retired voluntarily.

What was wrong with that? Did the government rush into the breach and say, "Tidy, you cannot run any more because you are employed by the Toronto Hydro?"

Why then, sir, can a teacher who lives in Vaughan and teaches for Etobicoke serve on the Vaughan township school board? Why is that not wrong? He could be a few hundred yards away. His place of residence from his place of employment are just a few hundred yards separate.

Now, is it distance; or what are you getting at? Are you concerned, Mr. Minister of Education, with a bloc by the teachers to increase their salaries out of hand, is that your concern? If that is your concern, then say so. Are you afraid that the teachers are going to gang up on you, by sitting on the local boards?

It is your amendment, it is your section so it is you that we are talking to. Are you concerned of some talk that the teachers have had that is going to be carried out unless this section goes in?

If the teachers are interested, if the people want to vote for them—I agree they should not serve on the board that is paying them —but if they want to run and get elected for another board what is wrong with that?

What is the difference between a university professor and a teacher in a high school board? Why is it all right for a university professor to serve; or a teacher from a private school to serve; but not a teacher from one of the public schools?

When the Minister begins to make some sense in that perhaps we can understand it. At the same time I suggest to you, sir, that the government is afraid of teachers serving on the boards of education; and I say that even though their fear may have some basis in fact, surely they should have sufficient faith in the electorate of Metropolitan Toronto to let the electorate decide whether they want teachers on the boards of education, and not have the Minister decide.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I assume we may be going through part of this discussion again, depending on what procedure the chair adopts.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I could clarify that now, Mr. Minister. I understand that your amendment before us is to add the words after metropolitan area "or of the school board"—five words. It would be the opinion of the chair that once the House has decided by its vote what the amendment is going to be and it has carried, then there would be no amendment to the words that have been added. Now, if the House decided that it wants to make some amendment, or to add other words, or to change other words, I would accept an amendment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What you are saying then, Mr. Chairman, is that if we discuss this, and this amendment is carried, you will entertain a further amendment. I do not want to cover the same ground twice. I gather that the member from—

Mr. Bryden: I think we should take a vote on the amendment.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Let us vote on the amendment if we have one.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, in the unlikely event that the amendment does not carry, does that mean that the section itself would carry?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, if it did not carry. In other words, if the amendment was defeated, this has been the practice of this House in cases where amendments have been defeated.

The amendment by the Minister of Education is before us now.

All those in favour of the amendment, will please say "aye."

All those opposed, will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment carries.

Call in the members.

All in favour of the amendment will please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 49, the "nays" 20.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment is carried.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would move an amendment to section 5.

Mr. Chairman: It looks like one of those tie deals.

Mr. Singer: Well then, the official Opposition has to get the—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would move a further amendment to section 5.

The intent of the amendment is along the lines I put forward before, and the amendment is this. That the word "any," which is the last word in the second line, be changed to "the"; and that after the words "metropolitan area," the words "which employ him" be added. So the section as amended would read: "That an employee of a board of education in the metropolitan area," then incorporating the hon. Minister's words which I do not have before me.

Mr. Chairman: "Or the school board."

Mr. Singer: "Or the school board, is not elegible to be a member of the board of education in the metropolitan area board," I suppose I have to put in another word, "board which employs him."

Mr. Chairman the intent and the purpose of that amendment is obvious. It would mean then that the bar would apply only to an employee being elected for the board which employs him. This makes abundant good sense for the reasons which I put forward before, and should be the extent of the prohibition.

I see no reason at all why a teacher who is employed by Scarborough, who lives in Toronto, if the voters want to support him, should not be available to be elected by the Toronto board of education. He should not be allowed to be elected by the Scarborough board, because then, in effect he would be passing on his own pay or his own working conditions. But if he lives in Toronto, and can get the support of the voters in Toronto, why should he not be able to serve on the Toronto board? It is as simple as that.

Mr. Chairman: I have an amendment before me. I will see if I can clarify this.

Mr. Singer moves that section 5, as amended, be further amended, by changing the word "any" in line two, to the word "the," and by adding at the end thereof the words "which employs him."

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this amendment, I would like to get away from the geographical game that my friend, the member from Downsview is playing on this problem. It is a much more fundamental problem, that is whether or not a person who is a qualified teacher is entitled to sit on one of the governing boards within the metropolitan area. I would only point out to the member, and also to the hon. Minister of University Affairs, that this is exactly the kind of problem which they are headed into in the universities throughout the province of Ontario; this question that in some way or another the governing boards of institutions must not have on them any person who is a member of the faculty or of the teaching staff of a university. A number of the statutes, as I understand it, which incorporated the universities contain this same provision.

It is obvious that this same philosophy is motivating the hon. Minister when he produces an amendment which states that in a large area such as the Metropolitan Toronto area any person who happens to be a teacher, and sit on one of the schools within the metropolitan area, is thereby prevented from taking part in any governing body of the educational system within the metropolitan area.

I do not think it needs any further statement that this is fundamentally an incorrect principle. Indeed, there is very much to be said for not eliminating his qualification for the board for which he is employed. It is not such a departure from the principle to be entitled to be an elected representative of a board of which you are an employee. But we are quite prepared to go along with this amendment to provide that of all the other boards within the metropolitan area that any teacher, being a qualified person, not only is entitled to be on the board, but in a very real sense the quality of the direction of the educational system in the metropolitan area would be vastly improved by having persons who are closely in contact with and participating in the actual operation of the educational system. For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, we will support the amendment.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. Minister realizes that the acceptance of this

amendment will keep him and his supporters from making a seriously retrograde step. He knows, as do most of the members of this House, that The School Administration Act already prevents a teacher or a board employee of some other category from sitting on the same board, so that really the thing that would be most reasonable here, if the rules would permit it following the trivial amendment which was carried a few moments ago, would simply be the elimination of the section in its entirety because the difficulty—if there is a difficulty there—is dealt with in another statute.

There is no doubt that if this amendment carries, and believe me there is still time for some careful reconsideration before this change is made, it will obviously have to be extended across the province so that people who are professionally trained in education will have the opportunity to serve on a board. According to the Minister and his supporters, this would be construed as a conflict of interests. I submit that it is not a conflict of interest.

But if they are permitted to serve on school boards in the communities in which they live, it does give them an opportunity to apply some of their specialized knowledge to where it must surely be most advantageous.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: If you will look at the situation in Etobicoke—and the Minister would agree with me as well as at least some of the members of the House, that they have a very excellent educational system there indeed—they are leading in many of the more useful experiments, and surely the responsibility is with the electorate. If they feel that for some reason there are too many professionals operating the education system, this is something that we should leave up to the hallowed local autonomy that we hear referred to so frequently in this House.

I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is still time for some careful reconsideration. I said the step is a retrograde one and this is the time to prevent it, because if it is carried by the House at this time there is every reason to believe that the consistency that the Minister has referred to in his opening remarks will be extended into other areas of the province. It is not beyond the imagination of anybody sitting in this House to see that the time may come when the Minister's regionalized administration of education will itself take on a more important, and perhaps even a responsible connotation. And if we are setting up the Metro system in this particular way, then surely these same improper regulations, improper ideas, carried out in this section of the statute would have to be applied right across the province. So I urge him to consider this carefully, and even consider the possibility of supporting this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, speaking to this for a moment, I think, with great respect, the hon. members have lost sight of one fact. The legislation very specifically refers to an employee of a board; it does not specify teachers, it includes all employees of a board. I think this is somewhat relevant.

I have listened on other occasions to discussions from both the official Opposition and the members of the NDP group when we were discussing responsibilities for those who should be qualified or disqualified from municipal office. I recall the hon. member for Downsview elaborating on this subject on several occasions. I have also discussed this, perhaps even more recently than the hon. member for Etobicoke, with one or two of the people who were directly affected, or they feel they are, by this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should point out, and I am sure the hon. member for Downsview is quite familiar with it, the disqualification that exists in The Municipal Act as far as running for council is concerned. As I read The Municipal Act and, of course, my own interpretation would be subject to the experts, my own interpretation is that if you are employee of a municipal council in the Metro area you cannot run for the council of another borough within the metropolitan system. In fact I think if you read the Act carefully you will find that if you are a municipal employee that you in fact cannot run for a municipal council elsewhere in the province of Ontario. We have not extended it this far on teachers or employees of boards of education.

As I explained to one or two people who are involved, this is a grey area. This does not prevent a teacher from serving on a school board in this province, but I think it is rather obvious that what we are attempting to do is establish some financial equality across the Metro area, and when we extend to the Metro board the right to determine current operating expenses and to make a Metro-wide levy, that it is rather obvious that an employee of a borough board who can conceivably move up and be on the Metro board and, in fact, be chairman of

the board, surely creates something of a grey area as to whether he should or should not be on the board. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, when it is something of a grey area, surely, as a matter of principle, we should resolve it and see that there is in fact no doubt.

This is not—and I emphasize this—this amendment does not discriminate against the teaching profession. It says very clearly that an employee of a board within the Metro area, where the Metro board—and you cannot draw a parallel elsewhere in the province, it does not exist—where this person is an employee of a board within Metro where the Metro board is being given these powers. Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is quite a different situation. I make it very clear that this legislation does not in fact discriminate in any way against the teaching profession.

I think it is rather clear, as far as the Minister is concerned, that we have been something of a supporter of the teaching profession in this province. I think I should also suggest to you that there is a difference between being employed by the North York board and living in Markham or Vaughan townships when the two administrations are completely separate. You cannot draw a parallel, I suggest, Mr. Chairman. I think, on a matter of principle, that the Legislature would be very wise to accept the legislation as it has been amended and to reject the suggested amendment, because I think that really we are resolving a grey area which could come into some discussion at some future date. I think, as a matter of principle, the legislation here is eminently sound.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first of all that I was very happy that we were able to sort the thing out for the Liberals so that they finally managed to struggle in with an amendment. Apparently they were completely thrown by the fact that the Minister had brought in his own amendment. However, we got that sorted out—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which does not make sense.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, it took quite a while. Actually they were scrambling even while the bell was ringing to try to figure out how they could do what we were suggesting was possible, which was to change some of the words. So they have come in with an amendment which, if they had failed, we would have proposed in any case. It would restrict the restriction simply to a person running for a board by which he is employed.

As the hon. Minister has pointed out, the restriction that he is proposing does not apply only to teachers. I am glad he made that point, because I think it is worth making. It applies to all employees of boards of education anywhere in the Metro area. The hon. Minister is quite right when he says that he is not discriminating against teachers, what he is doing is discriminating against board of education employees, teachers and others, in the Metro Toronto area; that is what he is doing.

He talks about a grey area. Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, if we keep worrying about areas that have a very faint tinge of grey in them, we could end up with having practically nobody elegible to run for public office. A person who is employed by a Metro area board in one municipality and lives in another municipality can, I would suggest, quite properly serve on the board of education of the municipality in which he resides without any conflict of interest at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But not on the Metro board.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, make the restriction at that point then.

Mr. Bryden: We have a couple of amendments which are before us but not in writing and I am just trying to grasp them, but I am not sure that follows from the clause as amended by the hon. Minister, which the hon. member for Downsview now poses to amend further.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It does under the amendment of the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Bryden: Would the hon. Minister be prepared to go this far and say that they could not serve on the Metro board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In other words, you can be half a trustee.

Mr. Bryden: A lot of them are anyway. If the hon. Minister means by being half a trustee, that they do not serve on the Metro board, then most trustees are going to be half trustees anyway. I think it is valuable to have some of these people with experience in education serving on the area boards. I can see that the Minister regards the area board as rather meaningless. They do not matter apparently, but I do not think that is true at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Neither do we.

Mr. Bryden: I am afraid it may be under your system. What the hon. Minister has come up with is not conducive to local participation because the local areas are too big. But I would hope that there would be a considerable degree of initiative exercised at the local board level, and this is where some of the people, whether they are teachers or other employees of boards of education, could be very useful. After all, there is a great deal more to what the boards of education do than to set the salaries of teachers. I think it would be useful at the area board level to have experienced people.

If the electors decide to choose them—after all, the electors do not have to vote for them if they do not think they are proper people to serve—I can see that they can make a contribution. Some have already been making a contribution in this area. I have not heard of any terrible calamities that have arisen. I realize that the setup is not identical with what it is now, but it is still enough of a parallel that I would say we could go on the basis of experience up until now and agree that there have been no deleterious effects. In fact there have undoubtedly been beneficial effects from the fact that some employees of school boards have served on boards other than those for which they worked.

As a matter of fact, if the hon. Minister is talking about grey areas, then I would suggest there is another grey area. If a teacher teaching in Toronto lives in Vaughan and runs for the board of education in Vaughan, you could easily argue that there is a remote relationship between his service in Vaughan and the salary he gets as a teacher in Toronto. We all know that the salaries that one board pays have an influence on the salaries that another board pays.

I can see the hon. Minister has his mind made up. He is not even prepared to consider any other argument. But I suggest to him that he is creating a problem that does not exist; he is trying to solve a problem that has never arisen; and there is no danger that it ever will arise. He is just keeping a group of people from serving their communities in an important area of democratic government, and he is doing it out of an absolutely doctrinaire, dogmatic, inflexible approach to a problem. He has found a difficulty which does not exist, for he has created the difficulty. He is now going to solve the difficulty that exists only in his own mind. It does not exist anywhere else, just in his mind, and it is too bad that a substantial number of people should be disqualified from public service just because of the inflexibility of the Minister's mind on this matter.

Mr. Nixon: I have just a question or two about the hon. Minister's comments of a few moments ago. I understood that he had more or less polled the teachers who are presently serving on some of these boards—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I made no such suggestion. I said I had discussed it with one or two teachers who were presently serving on boards. There was no poll.

Mr. Nixon: Surely the teachers as a profession feel that their rights are being infringed by this legislation. I was particularly interested in the Minister's comments when he was talking about the fact that this amendment does not meet all of the difficulties that would be possible where a member of an area board might become chairman of the Metro school board itself. Certainly, I would hope that he would be ready to consider his own amendment; that would do away with this possibility that I suppose does exist.

But the chance surely is now before the House to make this considerably fairer than it is in the way the Minister has presented it, even with his own amendment that was given us just a few minutes ago. I tell the hon. Minister that the time will come when he will want to change this back. We are going to lose the services of a good number of people who might very well be serving the community in a capacity well beyond what we are hiring them for.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's argument that we are getting into a grey area is nothing more than a specious argument. The Minister is trying to confuse the issue with a play on words. He refers to The Municipal Act, and then he says: "We in Education have never been that narrow-minded as they have been in Municipal Affairs." But in effect he is now saying: "Now, we are going to be narrow-minded too. If Municipal Affairs can be narrow-minded, why can't we be in Education?"

So that overcomes the grey area. Then he says: "We are not talking about teachers, we are talking about employees." Well, let the Minister be frank and let him be honest and let him call a spade a spade.

This only concerns those teachers—there are no other employees who have ever raised this—those teachers in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto who serve on area boards. He wants to remove them, and this is the way he is doing it. He can talk about the ward employees as long as he wants; he is directing the legislation against teachers and against nobody else, because no one else at the moment is concerned with this. He wants those teachers removed.

As my friend, the hon. member for Brant says, having removed the teachers who teach in the metropolitan school system, the obvious thing to do is to remove all educators. If he is going to be consistent—grey, black or white—let him be consistent, let him say: "I do not want any educators on boards of education."

Let him, in fact, say—let him carry it through to its ultimate—let him say: "I do not want any educators on boards of education, because they confuse us with their logic; they know something about it."

The hon. Minister is afraid of this, and I make that charge and I make it deliberately. He can interrupt and explain away or play with words or call it grey, black or white, but this is still the fact. The Minister is afraid of the situation, and this is why he put in a piece of legislation that thoroughly bars these educators from serving on boards of education.

Let him be consistent. If he means what he says, and bars all educators, by the same token, let his government bring in legislation to bar all lawyers from the Legislature because—

Some hon. members: A good idea.

Mr. Singer: —because they deal with The Law Society Act; they deal with judges and that is a conflict of interest. Certainly, let him do that; let this government do that!

Let the Minister be consistent; let him say what he means; let him no longer play with words; let him be honest to the teachers and to the people of the province of Ontario.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I make my position very clear, there is nothing in my legislation or in my statement that would indicate that we do not support the principle of having teachers as teachers, serving as trustees, anywhere in the province of Ontario.

As the hon member for Brant has pointed out to you, the legislation presently exists which prevents a teacher serving on a board by which he is employed.

This is an extension in the Metro area which I say is unique in its concept because the Metro board is determining current expenditures and I think, with great respect to the hon. member for Downsview, that the principle here is sound. It is in no way to be considered as a reflection, as far as the teachers are concerned, serving on any board of education in an area other than that in which they are employed.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think we could talk about this for a long time because there is no "grey" area such as the hon. Minister is talking about at all. What he is talking about is that no teacher can sit on any board because there is going to be a conflict of interest between himself and the board and his personal interests, as opposed to the interests of the group which he serves.

Now, this just does not constitute a grey area at all because he is immediately subjected, as all members of this Legislature are, to the corrective influences of any democratically elected organization. The hon. Minister knows as well as I do that that kind of conflict of interest, so long as it is known, works in its own way within a democratic organization to provide a corrective against the abuses of that conflict of interest.

The Minister carries on and tries to trap us by suggesting: "What if one of these teachers becomes chairman of the metropolitan board?" The whole world is not going to collapse if a teacher becomes chairman of the metropolitan board. He would be able to exert only the influence which he, as chairman, has. His conflict of interest would be well known to all the other members that sat on that metropolitan board, and in the course of the negotiations, in the debate about them, any self-serving activity on the part of any individual member of the board would be spotted immediately and counteracted by the influence of other members on the board.

This is what the democratic system is all about; this is how it works and functions. You do not take people who live in a vacuum and put them in to legislate on matters. What you try to do is to get, through your elected representatives, balanced representatives who know what is involved in education. I do not think it is

necessarily correct to say that every board of education because it has no teachers on it is therefore the best board.

Indeed, in many ways the kind of board which would fulfil the service that we want in the community is a properly balanced board which may have teachers and people from a large number of other professions. But to now take the view and say that the hon. Minister is not excluding teachers from the boards throughout the province when by this section he is excluding teachers from the boards of an area which is occupied by about one-third or more of the population of Ontario, means in fact that he favours the exclusion of teachers from these boards.

Surely the Minister is not going to say that this grey area that he talks about is anything other than the fact that he thinks that a teacher in some way or other will be able to get himself a salary grab, or some other self-serving purpose on that board. This is completely ridiculous in a democratically elected body. I think it is about time that the hon. Minister recognized the fact that the so-called principle he is talking about simply runs contrary to the whole theory of the democratic process within which we live.

If he wants to perpetuate a bureaucratic system in the educational system in this province, all I can say is he will be fought from now until the time he resigns from the portfolio, because you have to have educators and teachers on the boards of education and on the boards of governors of the universities; you just have to have them. Come what may, he is eventually going to have to give way and admit this principle.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for Riverdale permit an interruption?

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 110



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 16, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 16, 1966

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, reported 3507

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3531

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Just one moment, Mr. Minister, if you will.

I know that hon. members of the House would like me to say a word of welcome on behalf of the Thistletown collegiate students from Rexdale who are with us tonight; the hon. member for Etobicoke has told me that they are in the east gallery.

THE MUNCIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

(*continued*)

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the indulgence of the House in order to make a short statement with reference to a remark I passed this afternoon regarding the city of Toronto sick leave bylaw. I have been advised that this bylaw was not quite in accordance with the present authority contained within The Municipal Act. I am now advised, although I have not had time to examine this legislation myself, that there was some private legislation obtained some years ago. Therefore, I would not want to be in the position of having misled the House in this respect.

I have made only one error so far today. Pretty good!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I commend the hon. Minister for his frank admission in bringing the matter to the attention of the House so quickly; but I wonder if, in view of that, he would not be prepared to reconsider his point of view on the amendment that my colleague, the hon. member for Bracondale, offered, and support it—because I think this backs up the hon. member's argument.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale was on the floor when we adjourned for supper.

Mr. Singer: Does the hon. Minister not want to reconsider it?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, if I may say just one word following my friend the hon. member for Downsview. On the basis of what the hon. Minister now tells us, surely the amendment that I proposed this afternoon is essential if the benefits these people have been led to believe up to now they will enjoy will, in fact, be available to them. I take it from what he said that it would be illegal for the Metro council to make such benefits available to them. Therefore, all of the argument that the hon. Minister advanced this afternoon against my amendment falls to the ground.

His argument then was that he would leave it to Metro council to work it out with the unions of the employees, but I judge from what he says that that is impossible. Therefore, it is imperative to pass either my amendment, or something like it, and I would plead with the hon. Minister to reconsider this matter and not let the bill go through committee stage until something is done to make it possible to protect these people.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the member for Woodbine that the House has passed on this and it is not before us at the moment? Whatever consideration the Minister wishes to make before the House concludes is up to him.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on the other hand if I may—I do not wish to dispute your ruling, but the hon. Minister has given us information that now throws an entirely new light on this matter and I would hope that he would do more than simply give us the bald information.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale now has the floor on subsection 5, section 127.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, you will recall that, when the committee rose at 6 o'clock, we were discussing the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Downsview to make certain that employees of a board of education within the metropolitan area would be eligible to sit on boards of education other than the one by which he was employed.

I was in the process of trying to answer and to establish, with the hon. Minister of

Education in particular, that the so-called grey area to which he referred is not a grey area at all—it is perfectly clear—and that the point which is of concern is that there may well be a conflict of interest between a person who is on the teaching staff of one of the boards, sitting on the board in an elected capacity in another area. But this is not a problem and never has been a problem, as long as the nature of that conflict of interest is known to the other members of the board and so long as, if there is a direct conflict, the member who is in conflict either refrains from voting on the transaction or absents himself during the course of the discussion of the matter in which there is a conflict. But, for practical purposes, in boards where you are relying on the collective judgment of a number of people, and where there is a conflict in one member of the board between his duty to the board and his own personal interests, in most cases without any difficulty whatsoever, under the rules of disclosure of the interest and the rule of refraining from voting on it, it is quite possible for that board to come to a collective decision by discounting the self-serving interest of any particular member.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the way in which the democratic process, in fact, operates. And for the Minister to take the position that, on principle, a teacher or other employee of a board within the metropolitan area is precluded from serving on any other board within that area, including the one by which he is employed, is not in fact a principle at all, and to the extent that there may be some principle in the view which the hon. Minister put forward, it must be, in the opinion of this assembly, overridden by the prevailing principle that persons should be entitled to run for elected office, to hold elected office, and to take part in the functions of a board of education within the metropolitan area.

I conclude my remarks by simply saying: What could be better for the boards of education than to have qualified teachers on those boards to act in concert with other elected representatives and in that way to contribute to the development of an adequate educational system throughout the metropolitan area?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough North.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Do the amendments carry?

Mr. Chairman: There is an amendment before me by the member for Downsview, all those in favour of the amendment, will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say, "nay."

In the opinion of the chair the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the amendment by the member for Downsview will please rise.

As many as are opposed to the amendment please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 18, the "nays" 39.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Sections 129 to 132, inclusive, agreed to.

An hon. member: Are we doing it section by section?

Mr. Chairman: If the members want to call individual subsections, I certainly will. These are shorter sections and I have been calling the longer ones by subsection. If there is any suggestion, I will gladly consider it.

An hon. member: You are doing well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Section 133, carried? The member for Bracondale.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I understood the hon. member for Downsview had an amendment with reference to clause 5 of section 134.

Mr. Chairman: Section 134. The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, in subsection 5 of 134—

Mr. Chairman: Was there anything before subsection 5 on 134?

Mr. Singer: In subsection 5 of 134, it says: "That the seat of a member of the school board shall become vacant if he absents himself from the meetings of the school board for three consecutive months without being authorized so to do by resolution." The similar provision, insofar as council members are concerned, is for one consecutive month. It would seem to me there is some minor virtue and consistency there, and therefore I would move that subsection 5 of section 134 be amended by deleting the word "three"

in the third line thereof and inserting the word "one."

Mr. Bryden: What is one consecutive—

Mr. Singer: One month. All right, by deleting the words "three consecutive" and inserting the word "one." I stand corrected.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the amendment, I would say to the hon. member for Downsview and he will readily understand what I am talking about, the school board does not meet as often as a municipal council, therefore I think the comparison one to three is quite fair.

Mr. Singer: No, but my hon. friend from Humber, as has been usual through this bill, has again missed the point.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: How?

Mr. Singer: With leave, the absence can be permitted. It would seem to me that the same thing should apply for the school board.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: No, I think the hon. member is wrong. May I say to him that he is breaking his own point?

Mr. Singer: If the excuse is legitimate, I am sure the colleagues on the school board will be as generous as his colleagues on council and will give him permission to absent himself. But why three months?

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Why does the member bring this point up? He and I know quite well that leave is being granted without—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. I am sorry the hon. member for Humber is quite so fractious tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Oh now, now!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would have thought that the hon. member for Humber, amongst all the members in this House, would have been one to try to tidy up this Act, and to make it consistent as it goes through its various phases. I cannot understand his peculiar objection to this. It would seem to me that if the good voters of Etobicoke decide to send him to the board of education, they would expect him to be there. If he absents himself for three months, he should not be allowed to be there. One month makes some sense, and if it is going to be over one month then he can get the resolution. You have done the same thing for members of council and I would have thought the hon. member for Humber would have been anxious and eager to support me in this amendment.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor now?

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you have considered what might happen in July and August, when they do not meet at all perhaps? He would be absent for a month—

Mr. Singer: There are no meetings, so he cannot be absent.

Mr. Knox: It would take June plus July and August or September plus July and August to even make three.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is my good friend, the former reeve of North York, knows the fallacy of his statement as well as I. I will have no more to say about it.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment by the member for Downsview will please say "aye."

Those opposed, will please say "nay."

I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Subsection 5 agreed to.

Section 134 agreed to.

On section 135:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): On 135f. I assume there is nothing before subsection f.

Mr. Chairman: Nothing before subsection f of section 135? The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the duty of the school board and it has the power under f, if deemed expedient, to pay to each member a mileage allowance not exceeding 10 cents for each mile necessarily travelled by him in going to the meetings of the school board from his home and returning to home, and to pay to each member who is a member of a board of education, an allowance not exceeding $2,400 per annum and to each member appointed by the metropolitan

separate school board an allowance not exceeding $1,200 per annum.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think this is really a bit of petty prejudice that has carried down through the years and I think this will be a good time to eliminate it.

If a member is appointed to a school board by the metropolitan separate school board, he becomes a full member, not a half member —and he usually take his responsibilities, certainly in terms of my own township, seriously, on the same basis as other members. I do not see why there should be this continuing discrimination, which I agree has been in our legislation in the past. I think the case stands without any great amount of argument. Therefore, I would like to move that subsection 135f of section 12 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended by striking out all the words after "an allowance not exceeding $2,400 per annum."

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South has moved an amendment striking out all the words after "an allowance not exceeding $2,400 per annum."

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, I am not saying there is anything necessarily wrong with this amendment, but it has certainly been my experience on most of the school boards in Metropolitan Toronto, and certainly the metropolitan school board, that the members appointed by the separate school boards leave after the consideration of part one.

In other words, they are not really, in effect, complete trustees on the board. They sit only for those matters not affecting public schools, and most of them go home halfway through. Therefore, in the general legislation, when it was proposed to pay an honorarium, it was proposed that they should have their honorarium based on the secondary school enrolment, which is the criterion for them sitting on the public school board, to represent the secondary school people who do not have separate secondary schools. This has been a principle that has been generally adhered to and I have never heard any particular complaint from the separate school people in this matter. They are, in fact, not sitting in the board meetings for the complete meetings; and that is why you have this type of thing.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): If I might just speak on this. My experience on the school board has been that the separate school representative, even though he might not vote on these matters, is usually there, and I cannot recall any evening when he would go home. As a matter of fact, I think that the separate school representative at times was chairman of the board. I cannot see how we could justify paying whoever the representative might be, a lesser amount than the ordinary trustee, whether or not he be allowed to vote. I must say that I support the amendment, because it seems only fair.

The legislation, as it stands really does seem petty; we are only talking about peanuts, to begin with, so I cannot see why the government should be in opposition to the motion.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, surely this is one instance where the government can have the commonsense to back down on the legislation they have proposed? To accept the amendment as suggested by the hon. member for York South is not really backing down, it is stepping forward. The time has come when we have to stop trying to draw the line between what is Protestant and what is Roman Catholic, and I think it is high time we made it equal across the board, particularly in instances like this.

I would certainly urge the House to accept the amendment. It is high time that we made changes that are very necessary in this year of 1966. This section is really outdated in this country.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member for Etobicoke: Is he suggesting that the separate school representative should vote on public school matters? Is he in favour of that?

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, that is not at all what I said. I made it quite clear that he spent as much time at the meetings as any other member; and at times, as I recall, we have had the separate school representative as chairman of the board, and I said nothing about him voting. All that I said was that he was there, and his duties were as onerous as any other trustee. I think the hon. member is verging on the point of being inane.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is hinting that perhaps they should have a vote. I am asking him a simple question. Is he in favour of the members having a vote on public school matters, or not?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I could not hear what the member for Scarborough North was saying.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but I think there is a question of principle. I think, first of all, I would like to say that I support the amendment in this instance, but I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister.

Why is there a difference in this instance? What is the idea behind this section? I think this House deserves an answer from the hon. Minister, as to why this should exist in this type of legislation.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): The answer is really very simple. It is not a question, as one or two of the hon. members have suggested, of some form of discrimination. I will try to make it as simple as I can. The fact is that the submissions from the area boards to the Metro board, as you will see if you have read the early part of the legislation, were represented really in two parts, for the public school purposes—this is elementary—or for the secondary purposes. The separate school representatives are not required to sit and discuss the budget, or the submissions from the elementary or public school section; and this would take up, one might estimate, 50 or 60 per cent of their time. It is just a straight time factor.

The hon. member for Etobicoke suggested his own personal experience, and we can all draw on personal experience to find one or two situations to fit our own arguments, but the fact is that the separate school appointees to the board will not be required to devote as much time as the other members of the Metro board.

One could legitimately argue, I guess, whether it is 50-50. I think some would say that the public school, or the elementary section, might take more than 50 per cent of the time—and that perhaps $2,400-$1,200 is not an appropriate proportion—but I think, for our purposes here, it would be difficult to get into a 60-40 ratio, or 65-35. It is very hard to determine, and this is very simply the answer. The separate school appointees to the Metro board will not be required, and are not presently required, to devote the same length of time to their service on the Metro board. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the hon. Minister of Education, of all people, would put forward an argument of that kind.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I had been under the impression that he, of all people, was aiming at eliminating the artificial distinctions between various levels of school development. It is true that we have an artificial distinction that exists by long tradition between so-called public and separate schools. At the same time, I do not think that a separate school member of the Metro board can do his job adequately, if he considers only the secondary school phase of that board's work. On the Minister's own statements, repeated over and over again in this House, the secondary school activity is intimately related to the elementary school activity; the two cannot be separated.

The hon. Minister suggested that the example given by the hon. member for Etobicoke was an unusual example.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say unusual.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I did not say what you said, I just said you suggested it; that was the implication of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I did not suggest it.

Mr. Bryden: You said—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said I am sure we can all draw on personal situations or experiences to illustrate the point we are trying to make. I did not say it was unusual or otherwise.

Mr. Bryden: I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I inferred, from what the hon. Minister said, he thought that was an unusual circumstance. If any other person can intelligently draw any other inference, I would like to hear it; but I think that that is a fair inference to draw from what he said.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: Whether or not the incidents, as cited by the hon. member for Etobicoke, are unusual or special cases is not what I am getting at. All I want to propose to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, is that separate school board members should be encouraged to follow the example set by the school board members referred to by the member for Etobicoke. To do their job properly they should look at the educational system in its totality; they should see secondary school education as flowing out of elementary school education, both in their own system and in the public school system.

I think that this is just a form of discrimination. It is not really based on a logical distinction or one that we should, at this time, be supporting. I had rather hoped that the Minister would accept the amendment; however, I can see that he has dug his heels in, just as the Minister of Municipal Affairs has, and after the Minister of Municipal Affairs' first effort in accepting an amendment proposed from this side of the House, it would appear that no others are to be accepted. However, I still think that the principle proposed in the amendment is a sound one, and one worth voting for.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I might point out to the hon. Minister that, first of all, the allowances provided in this section are permissive allowances and are not mandatory allowances. This section reads that each board may pay to each member who is a member of a board of education an allowance not exceeding $4,400 per annum. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Education that both these figures should be $2,400. As a matter of fact, one might suggest that they should be both higher. I think it should be left up to the electors to determine what is the value of the services being supplied to them by the persons they elect to the board of education. If it were increased to $2,400, it would be up to the board to set their stipend. If the electors think they are not earning it, they can always replace them—that would be the democratic way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member must realize that it is not quite that simple in that the separate school appointees are, in fact, not elected to the Metro board situation and, secondly, the per diem or their salaries or honorariums are determined not by the electors but by the board members themselves. This is why it has been set out in this fashion. They make the determination, not the electors.

Mr. Ben: I stand to be corrected, Mr. Chairman, but I was under the impression that in the city of Toronto separate school representatives were elected, although I grant you there are a lot of acclamations.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. I am saying that they are appointed to the Metro board, and electors do not determine the amount of salaries, whether it is the public school or the separate school boards. These are determined by the board members themselves.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, that was the point I made. If the electors are not satisfied there is an election every three years.

Mr. Chairman: There is an amendment before the House by Mr. MacDonald—subsection 5 of section 135. Those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is lost.

There has been a change in the members in the House; we will have the vote.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the amendment will please rise.

As many as are opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 18, the "nays" 44.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

On section 136, the member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order, seeking information. Being a new member in this House, I am not as familiar with the rules as other members are, but I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the bill given first reading by this House is, in fact, the original bill—the bill that should come up for discussion in this House. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs had inserted in our books an amended bill and informed this House that each amendment had stamped next to it a black pointing finger to inform the House of the changes that he proposed to make or the amendment he proposed to bring to the original bill. But I was always under the impression that the bill which was given first reading was the official bill that was before this House.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There was a motion passed.

Mr. Ben: Even on second reading the bill that was before the House—

Mr. Chairman: Earlier when we discussed this matter, the Minister of Municipal Affairs moved that the reprinted bill be considered by the committee of the whole House and this motion was accepted unanimously.

Mr. Ben: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister also stated that wherever there was a change there was this black

stamp. I would point out that there has been a deletion in section 135, the section under discussion. There is no stamp indicating that this section had been deleted. Section e is not in the amended bill, and no comment has been made by the hon. Minister of this deletion. I would point out that there are other deletions in this second bill and there are no notations that there have been deletions.

Would the hon. Minister care to comment why this particular section e was deleted and no notice was given to this House that there would be this particular deletion? I want to know where the black hand is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I assume that the hon. members had read the previous bill and the reprint, and that when we discussed it initially we had agreed to discuss the reprint bill. There were two deletions—one referring to fees for nonresident students, and transportation. These have been taken out at the suggestion of the local boards and the Metro board because both these items are apparently already included as a matter of practice in the local boards' submission for current operation. So there was no need to have either of those portions in the bill.

Mr. Ben: Is that the only deletion, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that is the only deletion up to this point, although if the hon. member will look closely, there is a line drawn on page 17, 132 (1). Here, once again, representations were made as to the question of the numbers for quorum. These two figures were altered somewhat to meet the requests of those who made these representations.

Mr. Ben. Is that the only change, Mr. Chairman? Or deletion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe so, Mr. Chairman, up to this point.

Mr. Ben: Will the hon. Minister please indicate what other deletions have been made subsequently and have not been brought to the attention of the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As we go through it section by section, if I find others that the hon. member does not recognize that have been changed from the original bill, I will certainly bring these to his attention.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be disrespectful, but the fact remains that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs brought to our attention in this House that an amended bill has been inserted into our binders and that the amendments had been marked by means of this black hand. I suggest that there are deletions in this amended bill which have not been brought to the—

An hon. member: They were marked.

Mr. Ben: They were marked; that is right. They would be called.

An hon. member: Is the hon. member not following it?

Mr. Ben: I have been following it, but it is obvious that other hon. members have not and I am asking why not? Is this intentional on the part of the hon. Minister to inform us, first of all, that these black hands, as the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has indicated, should be marking these changes?

Mr. Chairman: I should point out to the member that the black hands to which he makes reference and the black mark indicate amendments; there is no indication as far as deletions are concerned.

Mr. Ben: Why did the hon. Minister not inform us that this new bill was going to have deletions in it?

Mr. Bryden: I would remind you, Mr. Chairman, that when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs moved his motion that we consider the revised bill, he did undertake that wherever deletions had occurred, since they are not specifically noted in the bill, attention would be called to them. I am sure that it is just an oversight on the part of the hon. Minister of Education; but perhaps, from here on in, the undertaking of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs could be carried out.

Mr. Ben: If it will give the hon. Minister some assistance, I would point out that clause (e) which provides for a reserve for working funds, in section 139 (1) has also been—

Mr. Chairman: We have not come to that yet.

Mr. Ben: I will just say that the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I said, Mr. Chairman, as we come to the next questions, I would be delighted to inform the hon. member of any deletions.

Mr. Ben: If the hon. Minister is aware of them.

Mr. Chairman: Number 136 is before us now.

Sections 136 to 138, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 139:

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bracondale will be fully conversant with the section with respect to the five per cent of the previous year's expenditures as a reserve for working funds. It was felt, after consultation with the various boards, that this was unnecessary; and a portion has been deleted from that section.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With reference to section 139, the hon. member for Woodbine had previously moved an amendment to section 7 with reference to the sick leave credits of certain employees of certain municipalities. Now section 139 contains a similar—I am sorry that was 136 (4).

Sections 139 to 145, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 145a:

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with respect to section 145a, from the original Act we have deleted subparagraphs 1, 2 and 3, to make it consistent with subsection 144 (1). There is no necessity to limit because of the previous subsection.

Section 145a agreed to.

On section 146:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a deletion in section 146.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, we have deleted this subsection, Mr. Chairman, because of the recent decision of the supreme court which provides that land owned by the school boards are not liable to taxation; therefore, the section has been deleted.

Sections 146 and 147 agreed to.

On section 148:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: One correction should be brought to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and that is 148 (2), where we have used a slightly different wording:

(a) who is a ward—

and we have added the words:

—in the care of—

Mr. Bryden: I just got up, Mr. Chairman, to ask one of the hon. Ministers to explain the significance of the change.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this was suggested by the metropolitan school board because, apparently, in the definition the words:

—in the care of the Metropolitan Toronto children's aid society—

must be shown. This was a request made by them for purposes of clarification.

Mr. Ben: I should like to ask a question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman. What if the child is a ward of the metropolitan children's aid society, but is in the care of foster parents?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is something that I do not think is really related to this legislation; that is something that has to be determined by the children's aid society. The child who was a ward of the children's aid society is a ward of the Crown, that is if I understand the hon. member's question correctly.

Mr. Ben: It is a little more complex than that, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman. A child could be a ward of the Metropolitan Toronto children's aid society and still not be in the care of the metropolitan children's aid society; it could be in the care of foster parents, and still be a ward of the children's aid. These are not adoptive parents, but where these foster parents are obtained to more or less board the children, what is the circumstances—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That does not change the status of the ward; that ward is still in the care of the particular children's aid society to whom the child has been—

Mr. Ben: Is the hon. Minister suggesting that a child that is not in the actual custody of the Metropolitan Toronto children's aid society is still, as he puts it, "in the care of the children's aid" and not the foster parents? Talk about stretching the law!

Sections 148 and 149 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, you might mention 149a, at the bottom of page 29. I want to make sure that every section is approved.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you; 149a at the bottom of page 29.

Section 149a agreed to.

On section 13:

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with respect to this part, we have, for purposes of clarification, as you see, underlined and are using the term "regional library board" so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Sections 149b and 149c, agreed to.

Subsections 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 149d, subsections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 14:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if you recall, this afternoon at the time of the amendment on clause 7 proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, we gave notice that we would move an amendment at this time to make certain that the stated intention of the Goldenberg report and of the hon. Prime Minister, in his statement of January 10 about the consolidation of municipal staffs, would be carried out. And in this connection I draw the attention of the House to the statement made by the Prime Minister on January 10, in which he stated that, in consolidating municipal staffs, every effort must be made by the municipalities to offer comparable employment and wages to all employees, and that existing standards of wages and employment should be protected so far as possible.

Well, to make absolutely certain, Mr. Chairman, we would like to move, and I so move, that subsection 1 of the proposed new section 150 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> And in integrating the staffs of the boroughs and of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, employment shall be offered to all employees who had permanent status on the first day of April, 1966 and existing wage and employment standards shall be protected.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member suggesting that this amendment be placed under 150, subsection 1, added to "on the first day of January, 1967"?

Mr. Renwick: No, Mr. Chairman. It would come out to the margin again, it would follow immediately after item f of section 150.

Mr. Chairman: This would be an item g?

Mr. Renwick: No, it would qualify the whole of the clause.

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment by Mr. Renwick that subsection 1 of the proposed new section 150 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> And in integrating the staffs of the boroughs and of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, employment shall be offered to all employees who had permanent status on the first day of April, 1966, and existing wage and employment standards shall be protected.

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Minister have any comments on the proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman? This, I think, is merely an attempt to implement undertakings that have been made. Is it not the position of the government that the undertakings should be implemented?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat pretty well what I said this afternoon on a relevant subject. That is that there is protection under The Labour Relations Act where there are agreements in effect between the representatives of labour and the municipalities. These labour agreements will remain in full force and effect until new agreements are negotiated. I think what we should do is to leave the bill as is and leave the parties involved in the position where they can use all of the facilities and the advantages of The Labour Relations Act and let them deal with these matters. I have a long report here from the department officials; it is not necessary to read it, I have given you the main points of it.

The statement made by the hon. Prime Minister regarding the consolidation of staffs and the question of the maintenance of the benefits and working conditions is a serious indication to the metropolitan corporation and the new consolidated municipalities as to what the government wishes in this regard. I think that more than likely you will find all those people who come into the consolidated administration will probably find themselves with better jobs than the ones they had.

I do not mean by that that the clerk of one of the small municipalities will expect to be the clerk of a large municipality all of a sudden, but he will be employed in comparable work with comparable working conditions and salary schedules and benefits and so on. Certainly the municipal employees by and large have reasonably good or much better working conditions now than they had some years ago. There has been great progress made in that respect.

I would suggest we leave the matter as it now is in Bill 81 and let the forces of present legislation take care of the situation. If it should happen that there are areas where there has been some drastic change made and that some person has found himself in the position of losing either funds or benefits, then I think we would be in a position next year to correct it, if a serious situation were to arise.

Mr. Bryden: This gives rise to—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in support of the hon. Minister's statments which I could not hear too well, I would like to tell my friend, the hon. member for Riverdale, that many of the small municipalities that are being amalgamated to larger municipalities do not enjoy the high wage schedule or working conditions of the larger municipalities. For the hon. member to suggest an amendment that they remain at their status quo would certainly cause a problem. I can tell you Etobicoke's working conditions, wages and fringe benefits are far greater than those of the Lakeshore. You would not want to put an amendment through like that, I hope.

Mr. Bryden: Well, this amendment would not do that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder, if "X" has reason to complain about the pious hopes of the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs not being carried out, how much of a hearing is he going to get a year from now when this Legislature brings forward an amendment on his behalf to Bill 81? If the government is at all serious about what the Prime Minister has said in his statement, and about what the Minister of Municipal Affairs has said, why not put it in legislation?

The hon. member for Humber is a constant amazement to me as this bill progresses. He misses the point completely. Either he misses the point or he deliberately hides his head in the sand. The amendment did not say at all what the member for Humber read into it. The amendment merely suggests in legal language what the Prime Minister has said in his speech. Surely the member for Humber would want to support the words of his own leader. Surely the member for Humber would be among the foremost to rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would hope I would not be too facetious but the problem is there is too much legal language and not enough common sense.

Mr. Singer: The member is facetious at any time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said that he had a memorandum from his departmental officials. He further indicated that he was not going to read it because he had given the gist of it. I think it is rather important that he should read it, because the gist of it as he gave it made absolute nonsense. His interpretation of the effect of The Labour Relations Act is plain nonsense and no such thing will happen.

The Labour Relations Act will not guarantee that when an employee who has been under a contract with the city of Toronto—a collective agreement with the city of Toronto —moves over to Metro he will continue to enjoy any benefits that may have been provided by the contract with the city of Toronto. When he moves over to Metro and becomes an employee of Metro, he will be covered by the collective agreement for Metro. Surely the hon. Minister is not trying to suggest that he will receive any benefits that may previously have been applicable to him by virtue of his employment with the city of Toronto and yet that was the clear implication of what he said.

I suggest to him that the answer he has given is no answer at all. It is particularly inadequate in relation to the specific point that we discussed this afternoon, namely, the matter of sick benefits. The Minister has told us that it will be illegal for Metro to give these people the sick benefits that they have enjoyed and have anticipated upon retirement from their employment with the city of Toronto. He tells us that out of one side of his mouth, and out of the other side of his mouth he tells us, just leave all this alone and we are sure that Metro will get it settled with the employees. I presume he is taking us to be idiots but he is completely mistaken if he is.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, I never suggested at any time that I was taking anybody to be an idiot. The hon. member is the one who is talking nonsense.

Mr. Bryden: I am just presuming from what the Minister has said that he must assume that we are idiots because he has told us something that is impossible. He has told us this is a matter which could be left to Metro, and on the other side of the coin he has told us that it is legally impossible

for Metro to take care of it. Something is wrong somewhere—either he takes us to be idiots or there is something wrong with his own reasoning.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, on the question of sick benefits the Minister ought to be prepared to come forward and say that in view of the new information he has got from his departmental officials, he is willing on that point at least to give these people, who are being shifted over from the city of Toronto, a guarantee that they will, in fact, receive the benefits that they have been led to believe for all these years they would receive. I just cannot understand the Minister's unwillingness to accept this and it clearly cannot be done unless we put it in this legislation on the basis of what he himself has told us.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I get a great pleasure out of watching the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the hon. member for Humber. I am reminded of the two comedians who enjoyed such success in the early part of the war. Certainly the Minister of Municipal Affairs is the straight man in this act.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ben: I am reminded that during the war the navigators used to have a saying—they were never lost, they were only temporarily uncertain of their position. It would appear that the Minister is never mistaken, he is merely uncertain. I would draw his attention to the statement of the Prime Minister of this province, which is captioned "A statement by the Honourable John Robarts, Prime Minister of Ontario." On page 16—consolidation of staff. With a very small alteration, the amendment which was submitted by the member for Riverdale is almost identical to the statement that was made by the Prime Minister in this report. Quote:

> In consolidating municipal staffs every effort must be made by the municipalities to offer comparable employment and wages to all employees and existing standards of wages and employment should be protected so far as possible.

This is the statement of the Prime Minister of this province.

I ask you this, Mr. Chairman: If every effort must be made by the municipalities to offer comparable employment and wages, why should not every effort be made by this Legislature to ensure that the municipalities do offer comparable employment and wages to all employees? Why are they suggesting that the municipalities do something which they themselves are not prepared to do? If the hon. Prime Minister was right in his statement, if he sincerely believes this statement, and he thought it was an equitable way to carry on the amalgamation of the services in this area, then I suggest that it is the right and honourable thing for every member of the government side to get up and support this motion. Otherwise they are just being absolute cynics.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one brief comment. Let us face the facts—the government is welching on its commitments. It is as simple as that—nothing more, nothing less. The hon. Prime Minister gave a commitment that this would be lived up to and on behalf of the government, the hon. Minister is now coming in and giving us a series of reasons as to why it can be met otherwise. There will be new negotiations with the new Metro council, he points out. They have the protection of The Labour Relations Act, he argues. I honestly believe that the Minister is not so ignorant of the operation of The Labour Relations Act to suggest that there is any protection in it. Under The Labour Relations Act, when you get into negotiations there is no guarantee that some of these benefits will not go down the drain. Indeed, you might get into a tight negotiation session in which some of the specific items on which there is a commitment will have to be sacrificed as part of getting a settlement. And to cap it off, you have the proposition, that has now been explained by my colleague from Woodbine, that it is simply going to be impossible, it will be illegal, for the metropolitan council to live up to this commitment. Because they will then be in violation of The Municipal Act. The only way that this commitment can be lived up to, unless this government deliberately wants to welch on it, is to put it in here. So if you will not accept this amendment, there is no other way to construe the situation than you are welching on the commitment.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not welching on any commitment at all.

Mr. MacDonald: You are just not doing it, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Wait a minute, now. Just a minute. When I introduced this last bill—I think it was at that time I made the statement, or when we began to debate this bill; as a matter of fact, I made the statement that when we examine this bill we should look at two other documents: The Municipal Act and also Bill 80, The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

I may refer you to section 19 of The Municipal Act which deals with this matter also. The point is that all of the assets and liabilities of the annexed or amalgamated municipality, all of the agreements that are in effect, will remain in effect until they have been renegotiated. The Metro corporation, or the new consolidated city and the five boroughs, will have to deal with these matters itself and will negotiate with the employees' representatives or the employees direct.

Section 19—I am not going to read the whole thing but I will read the pertinent section, which says:

> Section 19(1). Where two or more municipalities are amalgamated all the assets and liabilities of the annexed or former municipality or municipalities and its or their local boards are—

Let me read this again:

> Where two or more municipalities are amalgamated, all the assets and liabilities of the annexed or former municipality or municipalities and its or their local boards are assets and liabilities of the annexing or new municipality and its local boards, and the annexing or new municipality for all purposes stand in the place and stead of the annexed or former municipality or municipalities.

So that all the agreements that are now in effect, dealing with employment, standards of working conditions, and so on and so forth, will be in effect until such time as these are renegotiated with the new employer.

Let us hope that the new employers are, and I am sure they will be, reasonable people to deal with; and that the employees' representatives will get as good working conditions as they had. But I do not think in this area, where you are also involved in the continuation of a labour agreement, and how it can be dealt and negotiated with under The Labour Relations Act, we should interfere in this method, sir. We should leave these protections that are there for the employees as they are, and let them use those protections. That is the point I make. We are not welching on anything. The Prime Minister's statement is just as good today as it was the day it was made.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the Minister just cannot see the point; but he gets up and reads from the Act, and what he reads confirms just what I said—not what he said! All the Minister has indicated is that the contracts that are in effect now are going to carry on until there is another negotiation.

Let us suppose for a moment that in these negotiations, in some way or another, the standards they now have are lowered.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: No, but the Prime Minister's commitment was that the standards that they now have will be met.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): The standards could always be renegotiated.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. Now in the negotiation the standards may be lowered. That was not the Prime Minister's commitment; the Prime Minister's commitment said that they would be maintained.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: As long as the contract runs, the standards will be maintained.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, is this the kind of commitment he gave?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Certainly! What other kind could he give?

Mr. W. B. Lewis: What would you give?

Mr. MacDonald: The commitment that he gave surely was that, in the amalgamation of these municipalities, they would not have lower standards; and now you are interpreting his comment that they would not have lower standards for the two or three months between the time of the amalgamation, and then they could negotiate another contract.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: No, no!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I think a member has the right to ask for the amendment to be read at any time. Would you mind reading the amendment?

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Mr. Renwick that subsection 1 of the proposed new sec-

tion 150 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> And in integrating the staffs of the boroughs and of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto employment shall be offered to all employees who had permanent status on the 1st day of April, 1966 and existing wage and employment standards shall be protected.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, and now suppose two months from now they finally get around to negotiating a new contract—and for whatever reason—you cannot give me any guarantee that it would not happen—in some instances they renegotiate lower standards or lower wages.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: It could still happen if there was not a Metro.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course it could happen if there was not a Metro, but that is not the point. The point, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. Prime Minister's commitment was that in the integrating of the staff there would be no lowering of the wages and standards.

Now, this was his commitment, or certainly what it was understood to be. If you want to word it differently and come up with some other conclusion at the moment, it certainly is not what has been accepted, or what the hon. Prime Minister assured Reeve Kurata and others when they inquired as to what was going to happen to their employees. I heard it on radio and I heard it on TV, and surely that commitment was a commitment that cannot be welched upon. If you do then you are going to be put on the spot. You are going to be embarrassed, because if two months after the amalgamation takes place there is a negotiation and they come out with lower standards, then the hon. Prime Minister's commitment will have been welched upon. The only way you can avoid that, the only way you can protect yourself, is to put that amendment in.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister's statement is "in consolidating municipal staffs every effort must be made by the municipalities to offer comparable employment and wages to all employees and existing standards of wages and employment should be protected so far as possible."

Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not hear a jeer from across the way as we usually do when we give some arguments from this side of the floor, that they are specious arguments, because all the arguments from this side apparently are, in the view of the Opposition specious, and theirs are logical.

Let us say that the metropolitan corporation in the past has, in negotiating a contract, said to the employees: "Now you have asked for benefit c. We are prepared to give you a and b, or c," and the employees said: "Well, we would much rather have benefits a and b, because both combined are better than c." Now then, you are bringing in another municipality which may have accepted c, and you are bringing them in, and according to the amendment, you would then be required to give them, and carry on in perpetuity their benefit c, as well as a and b.

In other words, they would get the best of both possible worlds, and you would never be able to renegotiate it. I do not think that is fair, either. I think you have to be in a position to allow the municipalities to sit down and see that justice is done—that you are not, in fact, freezing some benefit, and giving them other benefits in addition to that, which they may have foregone in place of the benefit that they did accept originally. I think that is a good argument.

Mr. MacDonald: We have seen how quickly you had justice done.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I was in Metro when we had to do these things, and we saw that justice was done and in practically 100 per cent of the cases. In some instances, it was most difficult in very few cases to give them exactly the same benefits they had.

I have read what the hon. Prime Minister said, and I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the honourable people who are going to make up metropolitan council will do the honourable thing, so far as is humanly possible. I do not think we need have any fear about that at all, because they have to do these things within the eyes of the public and under the white light of publicity; they will see that no injustice is carried on.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions a question?

We were talking this afternoon of the 500 people who are affected regarding their sick pay credits. These people have

built up, over the years, what they look upon as a credit to them—a bank account, if you will, of those credits. They have every right to look upon those as assets which they have, and which they have every right to have.

Eventually, when they retire, if they have not used them up in sickness, they are going to get them back in cash. This is an asset. Would the hon. Minister say that this is a matter to be bartered in the future, in return for something else which other people might want?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I would have to find out what the other benefits are that they are going to receive when they come in, if they have to give some of that up. That is in the position of, I think, the example I gave of benefit c. There may be other benefits in Metropolitan Toronto which they will get, which will offset some of the benefits they may have to forego. I am not saying they do; I do not know if they may have to forego anything in this respect. You would have to look at the total picture, the total package that they are going to get when they come in. I am sure that in the final analysis if they give something up, they will get something in lieu thereof.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions there are a number of points I want to raise here, but I will just follow up on the one he was talking about. His reasoning is quite specious—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Use another word.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute. When we are talking about sick leave benefits, these are not benefits negotiated from year to year. Admittedly they are covered by annual contract, but they are long-term, lifetime benefits. They are like pension benefits, and what you are going to do is cut their benefits in half by the stroke of a pen. It is not only that that is possible, the fact is it is inevitable on the basis of the explanation the hon. Minister gave us at the opening of the session tonight. Here are benefits these people have been accumulating for years. They had every reasonable expectation that they would carry them forward to retirement. They would indeed carry them forward to retirement if they happened to be employed in the works department rather than in the welfare department. But because they are in the welfare department, and because we, in our wisdom—or lack of it—decide for totally unrelated reasons that the welfare department should be shifted from the city to Metro, their benefits are to be cut in half by a stroke of a pen. I say that is totally and absolutely unjust.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have said that there may be some other benefits which they may get in lieu thereof. In view of that, I think the hon. member's arguments are specious.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. They have no bargaining power left because these are cut out on what the hon. Minister said. Metro cannot give them the benefits that they have. So they are bargaining with nothing. They may have lost something on the basis of some unknown bargain. I submit that accrued benefits should not become subject to bargaining. I can see that I am treated with disdain across there, but I still think it is a fundamental principle that accrued benefits should be honoured.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the hon. member tell the House who has been treating him with disdain? I think we could argue that. You have been pooh-poohing everybody's argument, and been very insulting about everybody's argument. Who has treated the hon. member with disdain? I have sat here and listened to him, day after day, more than he has listened to me. It sounded like year after year, but it has been day after day and week after week.

Mr. Bryden: I have the floor. I thought he was going to say something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, do not be insulting.

Mr. Bryden: I have suggested to the hon. Minister that accrued benefits should be honoured, and they are not going to be honoured if something is not done in this bill with regard to the sick leave benefits.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: May I answer that now?

Mr. Bryden: I would happy if you answered it now.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Accrued benefits will not be disturbed by one particle of a day.

Mr. Bryden: On what authority do you say that?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I quoted The Municipal Act. That is a liability of the municipality that is being absorbed.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that what is in The Municipal Act is most uncertain in dealing with this point. You say The Municipal Act. I do not have the precise words in my mind, but I listened to what the hon. Minister read, and what the Act said is that the municipality of Metro Toronto has to honour contractual obligations taken over from the city of Toronto. It is a matter of real doubt, I would suggest to him, as to whether or not a collective agreement applicable to all of the employees of the city of Toronto has to be honoured by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto with respect to a small segment of them who are taken over. This, I would suggest to him, is a matter that could be subject to real doubt. I am appealing to him to remove the doubt. He cannot possibly do any harm by making it doubly clear. I do not pretend to be a lawyer, but I have seen enough people doubleshuffled by that type of a legal provision that I do not place any reliance in it at all. I would say to the hon. Minister that he can do no harm, if it is the intention that these people will not lose these benefits, he cannot do any harm by making it abundantly clear.

There is one other point I would like to stress that is covered by the amendment, and that is the guarantee of employment, that the people should be offered jobs. I think that should be written into the Act, so there will be no doubt about it that they are going to continue in employment.

As for further points that may be negotiable from year to year—for example, wages, hours of work, that sort of thing—I would place less stress on that. I would be happy to see that left to future negotiations. But there are two points that I do not think should be left to future negotiations: One is the guarantee that these people will be offered a job, and the second is that they will not sacrifice accrued benefits, apart altogether from day-to-day benefits.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member does not mind, I hope he does not get insulted again. How would you guarantee a man his present job? Is he entitled to any more guarantee than he has now? If you put that into the bill, you are, in fact, telling this man he is guaranteed for life and you would have difficulty with him later on.

Mr. Bryden: All that the amendment says, I think, is that he will be offered employment. That is all it says.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It says more than that. Do you know that, on January 1, 1967, every employee of the 13 municipalities now comprising Metropolitan Toronto will have a job with the miunicipality that is consolidating his municipality? That is the way the law is now.

Mr. Bryden: I am sorry, what did the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs just say? That—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: More than being offered a job, he has a job—on January 1, 1967. That is the law now. I just got through—

Mr. Bryden: Where is it in the law? The Minister is not relying on that clause in The Municipal Act?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, now, what can I rely upon?

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am suggesting that clause was written in relation to a totally different type of situation.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not at all.

Mr. Bryden: It was indeed. It was written in relation to the ordinary commercial contract and it is a matter of considerable doubt, I would say of serious doubt, if it applies to matters covered by collective agreements. And it is a matter of some doubt if it applies to a guarantee of employment for these people. At any rate, I come back to my point, Mr. Chairman: If it is the Minister's intention that these people will all be offered jobs, that they will have their sick benefits protected, then why in heaven's name is he not willing to write that right into the Act?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I heard some derogatory remark over there; but I have had too much experience with this sort of thing where people were told that they had nothing to worry about, their benefits were protected, and then when they came to cash in on the guarantee it was found that they had no legal basis to go on at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, did the hon. member find that the case when Bill 80 went into effect? Did he find this situation when Metro took over all of these other—

Mr. Bryden: I am talking about more recent history. I have particularly in mind The Crown Agency Act of this province, which deprived large numbers of employees

of rights that they had under the law; and the government flatly refuses to move to change that Act. I am afraid here that we will find employees who have lost benefits to which they were clearly and morally entitled. The hon. Minister makes airy generalizations to the effect that if anybody suffers at all, they can come back and we will look after them.

Well, I do not think they should have to rely on that; it is a very flimsy guarantee indeed. I think it should be right in this bill, particularly on this sick leave benefit, because I do not think—I am putting forward my legal interpretation as against the hon. Minister's—but I do not think that Metro Toronto can honour the—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: How many lawyers has the hon. member on his staff?

Mr. Bryden: We have quite a few lawyers around, and I am suggesting I have had quite a lot of experience in dealing with matters of this kind. On the basis of my experience, I would say that Metro Toronto will not be able to honour the sick leave benefits that these people have been led to believe they have had up to now. That section the hon. Minister quoted from The Muncipal Act is far from a guarantee for them.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before this debate concludes, I cannot conceive why the introduction of these words into the bill is going to cause the hon. Minister all this much trouble. If, in fact, they are protected, then the words do no harm whatsoever. If they are not protected, then I would like to know why the Royal comissioner saw fit to put them into his list of recommendations, and why the hon. Prime Minister saw fit to enunciate it as one of the principles on which this bill would be carried through.

It seems to me just very strange to note all the elaborate provisions that have gone into this bill in order to protect the position of elected representatives, and yet one simple single provision which is designed to cover and protect the rights of a large number of civic employees of the various municipalities in the metropolitan area leads us into intricate and minute discussions about their collective bargaining agreements, about The Labour Relations Act, about The Municipal Act, and about all sorts of other technical and difficult problems to resolve.

Surely, if the hon. Prime Minister meant what he said, if the hon. Minister means what he said, it cannot possibly hurt to put these provisions in this Act? There is no indication in here that anybody is attempting to get a guarantee of lifetime employment for any person at all. All that has been done in this amendment is to attempt to use the very carefully phrased and very carefully thought-out recommendation of the Royal commission—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not true. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the hon. member just to read what the commissioner said? He said exactly the same as the hon. Prime Minister did, and it is not included in the amendment. It states, just as the Prime Minister said, "existing wage and employment standards should as far as possible be protected." Now, if you put this in the amendment there may be situations where it is not possible, and you would be forcing them to do something which may make life difficult for the metropolitan corporation in respect of carrying this out. The hon. member is suggesting, and so is the other member, that Mr. Goldenberg said something he did not say; he said "as far as possible"! That is precisely what the hon. Prime Minister said and I am sure that is precisely what the metropolitan council will do.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the point. We want to make sure that the civic employees are protected, period. Not "so far as possible," not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what Mr. Goldenberg said; he said "as far as possible."

Mr. Renwick: Well, all right then. Mr. Chairman, what are we going to deal with now? We have dealt with The Labour Relations Act, we have dealt with The Municipal Act, we have dealt with the collective bargaining agreement. All right. Let me accept exactly what the hon. Minister has said—we want to make certain that they are protected. Now, is that too much to ask for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, you make certain because you are dealing with public men in metropolitan council who have already publicly declared themselves in favour of this policy. They have spoken up that they will do this. There is no reason to presume that they will not.

Mr. Bryden: They have no legal authority to do it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, they have legal authority.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is passed, and is in the statute, it will mean that they will have to do it. It will not be up to them to decide one way or the other, and this is the purpose of the bill—to provide for certain changes with respect to the Metropolitan Toronto area, not to leave certain things up to other people to do.

Now, to provide for these changes, sir, the least we could do in this Legislature is to pass a simple four-or five-line amendment which will ensure to the civic employees a minimum amount of protection in their employment, and in the standards and conditions under which they are employed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled as to why the government throws so many roadblocks in the way of what should be a very simply established principle, a principle that has been important enough to have the hon. Prime Minister mention it in his remarks and to have the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs repeat it. I would ask the members of the House to cast their minds back to 1956, when The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act contained certain sections about the amendment of police forces; exactly the same concern was expressed, but at that time the government did something about it.

And I refer the members, I refer you, Mr. Chairman, to section 175 h of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act of that year. It says this—and this surely is all the amendment is intended to say. It says:

> Every person who is a member of a police force in an area municipality, including any chief constable, police officer and assistant on the 15th day of March, 1956, and is continuously so employed until immediately before this section comes into force, hereby becomes a member of the metropolitan police force on the 1st day of January, 1957 and shall be subject to the government of Metropolitan Toronto board to the same extent—

and so on.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the principle is exactly the same; and if the government wanted to do this, it could do it. It wanted to ensure the employment of all of the police officers in the 13 amalgamated forces, and it did it by this section in 1956. If it wanted to do it by statute, it could do it tonight; but obviously it does not want to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was quite a different thing. Mr. Chairman, I suggest, sir, that that was an entirely different thing. We were dealing then—

Mr. Singer: It dealt with policemen.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We were dealing then with one particular class. That was the police. We knew exactly what the situation was in all the area municipalities. We knew exactly how many police we needed. We knew exactly what the conditions of their employment were. We knew exactly whether they could be co-ordinated into the amalgamated police force, and therefore it was a clearer picture. Here, the suggestion is that we saddle metropolitan council with a situation which is, in some respects, not definable, because you are taking every department, practically, of the municipal government. Now, you do not know how many you are going to—

Mr. Bryden: We are not talking about every department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is more than welfare. There are other things involved here, and you do not know precisely what the situation will be in respect of the man in one department or in an area municipality whom you may wish to take into another department in the metropolitan corporation, and I do not think we should hamstring Metro this way. I think we should give them a certain amount of leeway so they will be able to carry out a reorganization without being hamstrung, as I say, by a fixed and frozen rule.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I regret that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is not properly informed on this, because when the amalgamation of police forces did in fact take place, there were 13 different gradations, categories and levels of police.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All in police.

Mr. Singer: There were some places where it was felt that there had been sudden promotions. There were people holding the rank of inspector who, some people believed, in the city of Toronto force would not have held the rank any higher than a corporal, perhaps. Some of the municipalities were well staffed, some were very poorly staffed. Some had high grades of pay, some had low grades of pay. There was no knowledge of how many policemen were needed for the whole

of Metro, any more than there was a knowledge of how many policemen—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Were all the chiefs of police made chiefs of police?

Mr. Singer: If my friend will let me finish, he can have the floor after I am through.

Mr. Chairman: I would like the members, if they will, to stay with this particular amendment that is before us.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was there and I know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So was I.

Mr. Singer: You were not on the metropolitan council. You did not know, at that time, what was going on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What year?

Mr. Singer: You did not know at that time that the city of Toronto, for instance, allowed its whole fleet to run down and did not spend more than $250 on the whole fleet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I happened to be there.

Mr. Singer: Yes, you happened to be there. Mr. Chairman, I say that there was as much difference in standards and levels, and in employment, training and wages, on the police force at that time, as there is today, and if it was simple enough to be done by an appropriate section in 1956, then it should be simple enough to be done today, if the government means what it says. This is the test. If the hon. Prime Minister means what he said, if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs means what he said, if both of those gentlemen mean what they have said, then they will put a section in this Act that was similar to what was in the 1956 Act.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did all the members of the police staffs get the same positions in Metro? Did we guarantee that they would do that? We did not guarantee it. They did not get the same positions. An arrangement was made by Metro to see to it that they were all, generally speaking, satisfied, and they all knew that they could not all retain the same positions. There was some switching around and they did everything possible to keep everyone as happy as possible.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, nobody has suggested that the identical positions should be given. The amendment before us does not suggest that. It suggests that the people should be offered employment, and that they should not lose any benefits relating to their employment. That is all. It does not say that if a person was a director of welfare in Leaside, shall we say, he should continue to be a director of welfare. Obviously not. He would get some comparable employment, but he would not be director of welfare.

I think there is only one conclusion that can be arrived at, after we have argued this matter for some time, both this afternoon and this evening. The government has uttered a lot of airy generalities about protecting the employees, and it really has not any serious intention of protecting them at all. This is the only conclusion that we can arrive at.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has come forward with his legal interpretation of The Municipal Act. I suggest to him that even though he has the best legal advisers in the world, the advice of legal advisers does not really guarantee anything to employees, and that the advice of a legal adviser is really just a guess. It is a reasoned guess. That is what the courts might say. On the basis of the section the hon. Minister read, I could readily envisage the court saying something entirely different.

Why is the hon. Minister not prepared to do what he says is the intention in any case? I can only conclude that it is because it is not really the intention. I think it is particularly regrettable with regard to the sick leave benefits. On the basis of what has come out tonight, I do not think there is any doubt in the world that we are passing a law which will cut in half the sick leave benefits, the accumulated benefits, of the employees of the city of Toronto. We are doing that by the stroke of a pen, unilaterally, arbitrarily, without any consultation with them, and over their protests. I think this is a most shameful act, and I hate to feel that this Legislature would condone such action on the part of anybody.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of Mr. Renwick's motion will please rise.

All those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 20, the "nays," 45.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and subsection 1 agreed to.

Subsections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, subsection 4 is an addition. Any comments to make on that?

Mr. Chairman: It has a black hand indicating an amendment.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I just wanted to make sure.

Subsections 4 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 151, subsections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 152, subsections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 153:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 153, it is our view here that welfare and health are inextricably intertwined and that this section of the bill should be amended to provide that it include not only the listed statutes—which are The Anatomy Act, The Day Nurseries Act, The Homemakers and Nurses Services Act, The Mental Hospitals Act and The War Veterans Burial Act—but it should also include The Public Health Act. I, therefore move:

That,

clause 15 of Bill 81 be amended with respect to the proposed new section 153 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act by adding thereto the following words: The Public Health Act.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale moves that The Public Health Act be added to the list on number 153.

All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed, will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is lost.

Is it agreeable to the members of the House that we take the former vote?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): It depends on which way the official Opposition votes.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Herewith we are "ayes" to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. The same vote?

An hon. member: There is one missing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: We will accept the same vote.

Mr. Chairman: The same count? Carried, with the same count.

Section 153, subsections 1 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

Subsections 16 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

On subsection 20:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to get my notes straightened out here. We, in this group, as we have stated before, are in favour of handing over the welfare function from the constituent municipalities to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto; there is no argument about that. We are, however, more than a little concerned with regard to the quite significant variation of standards that exist in the Metro Toronto area at the present time. Our worry is that there will be a tendency not to bring the whole municipality up to standards that are now in effect in the city of Toronto, where the highest standards are in effect, but there will be a tendency to average them out over the whole area. We think that this would be most regrettable. Toronto, I think, can claim that it has done a great deal of pioneering in the welfare field. There are many areas in which I would criticize the city of Toronto, but I think as far as welfare is concerned it has set an example for all municipalities. Unfortunately, there have been some municipalities in Metro, which I will not name, which have shown themselves far from disposed to follow the example.

We certainly do not think that the standards, services, facilities and the benefits available in Toronto are too high. I would doubt if anyone would claim that. They are still just welfare standards, and on a pretty low scale. The unfortunate thing is that there are other municipalities in this area that could afford to do better, and for which the standards are even worse. We certainly do not want their standards to come into effect for the whole area, so I would like to move, Mr. Chairman that clause 20 of Bill 81 be amended with regard to the proposed new section 166, by adding thereto the following words:

—but no standards in effect or services or facilities provided in any area municipality or part thereof immediately before

the coming into force of this section, shall be reduced or abolished in such area municipality or part thereof.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the same category as the other amendment. The hon. member is attempting to tie Metro down to the situation where changes cannot be made where it may be deemed advisable, even to improve a situation. The hon. member has said that any service that is provided in some areas should not be reduced or eliminated. It may well be that because Metro wants to put in an equivalent and/or better type of service other than the one existing, it would be so frozen in this amendment that it could not be done.

Mr. Chairman, there is an implication that Metro would lower the standards, and there is no evidence of this at all. I cannot recall any place in Metro where the standards were ever reduced, that were in existence before the operation of Metro, in any of the area municipalities. The standards have always come up. It is not showing any faith at all in the public-spirited Metro councillors to suggest that they would reduce the standards in any part of Metropolitan Toronto.

I think this would only be the means of making it difficult for them to carry out a proper reorganization on a proper basis.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister only reveals his own niggling attitude toward welfare. There is absolutely no suggestion here that they cannot improve services; we are suggesting that they cannot reduce any services or standards now in effect, and every one of them is absolutely essential, so there is no reason why this cannot go in. The hon. Minister says that I have no faith in the Metro council. I have as much faith in the Metro council as anyone else, but I also believe in having insurance where one can have it. If the Metro council has no intention of reducing services, and if there is no possibility that they will do it, the section will do no harm. But it will be there in case there might be some sort of log-rolling session at which a few of the pioneering services undertaken by the city of Toronto will go down the drain; this is the very thing I want to prevent. I think we are away behind what is required in our welfare services already, and I would hate to see any reduction at all of anything that is now done.

As I say, there is no harm if Metro is going to retain them all; the amendment does no harm.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Woodbine, I would like to ask him if he can recall since the advent of Metropolitan Toronto every service that has been "metropolitanized," when there has been anything but progress and rising standards.

Mr. Bryden: Okay, let us say that is true—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Just a moment. The hon. member had his say; let me talk for a moment, please. I am fully in accord with the concept of this bill. I believe Toronto for too many years has had to carry an unjust burden of welfare. This is the greatest thing that has happened to Toronto, of all the departments. I think you have to have some faith in your elected representatives. Look at their past performance on all other services. Why do you doubt that there will be a lowering of standards in welfare? I would say the standards will rise and we will have a more uniform and better standard of welfare right across Metropolitan Toronto, including the city of Toronto, than we ever had before.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, what alarms me is just looking at what some of the suburban municipalities have done about welfare. That is why I am concerned, and that is why I would like to see this clause in here.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the amendment by the member for Woodbine—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that we will support this amendment. The principle behind it is to say that there are certain standards which must be maintained. We have faith as well in Metro that they want to achieve higher aims and goals, and that with a basic platform which they have now and which we are saying that they cannot fall short on, I know all of them will be working to try to develop new and progressive approaches. There will be lots of flexibility. But we certainly do not want to see them fall back. Accepting good faith from them, I think they will appreciate it if this is put into the Act.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye." Those opposed will please say "nay."

I declare the amendment lost.

Are the members agreeable to using the same count we had formerly?

Section 20 agreed to.

Sections 21 to 25, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 26, 172(b), 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 27 agreed to.

On section 28:

Mr. Young: On section 28, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the official plan of Metropolitan Toronto, the problem arises here of getting an official plan in the first place. Metropolitan Toronto tried a good many years ago to bring in an official plan.

In January, 1960, I think, the first plan was outlined but for some reason over the years that plan was never adopted. There was some opposition to it from municipalities because some of the municipalities felt it did not give them enough high assessment land. There was also some feeling that there were defects within the plan itself.

In any case, those who originated it, the planning board and the councils of the various municipalities showed very little enthusiasm and so over the years we have been operating within Metropolitan Toronto without an official metropolitan plan. Each one of the municipalities has tried to carry on as best it could under these circumstances but always they were under the handicap that there was no overall plan for the whole metropolitan area.

As we face the new Metro, this is a situation which must not exist in the days ahead. We must have a plan for Metropolitan Toronto. This plan has already been adopted by the planning board. On February 16, 1966, it was passed on to metropolitan council and Metro has established a special committee to deal with it. But after this period of time we have heard very little of what it means and what is going to come of it.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister in this regard about the section at the top of page 45, section 4:

> On or after the first day of January, 1967, subject to The Planning Act, each area municipality is a subsidiary planning area within the Metropolitan Toronto planning area, and the subsidiary planning areas within the Metropolitan Toronto planning area but outside the metropolitan area are continued.

I would like to know if this affects in any way section 11 of The Planning Act, which deals with the implementation of the official plan. It is page 9 of The Planning Act, section 11. This section outlines the procedure as follows:

> The plan as finally prepared and recommended by the planning board shall be submitted to the council of a designated municipality and the council of the designated municipality may adopt the plan by bylaw, but in the case of a joint planning area the council of any other municipality within or partly within the planning area may adopt the plan by bylaw (a) after the expiration of 90 days from the day that the plan was recommended to the council of the designated municipality by the planning board if the council of the designated municipality has not in the meantime adopted the plan.

I would ask the hon. Minister if there is any change in this.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: What was the hon. member reading from? Would he give me the quotation again he is reading from?

Mr. Young: The quotation is page 9 of The Planning Act, section 11.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, the metropolitan planning board has prepared an official plan and it is now being studied at the Metro level, at the council level. I had occasion within the last several weeks to make some inquiries and I am advised by a high official of the planning board that the plan is being studied. It is felt that some time, perhaps by another two or three months, the matter will then be before the council for adoption by bylaw and then it will go to the Minister after that.

Mr. Young: The question I wanted to ask of the hon. Minister was whether or not the indication that the new boroughs are subsidiary planning areas means that their status as regards section 11 has changed in any way. I take it that it has not or does not change.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: My legal training was very limited, you know; I just glanced at Osgoode Hall, so I really could not answer that question. But I will find out and if anything has been changed in that respect I will see that the hon. member is informed.

Mr. Young: I suppose in that respect it does not make a great deal of difference insofar as the present is concerned, because my interpretation of section a of sub-clause 3 of clause 11, is that any municipality within Metropolitan Toronto, after 90 days of inactivity on the part of the Metro council, can recommend or designate the plan.

In other words, tonight, May 16, 1966, is exactly 90 days after February 16, 1966,

when the plan was referred to metropolitan council. So today, for the first time, any of the area municipalities can in effect call the plan to the attention of the Minister and initiate the action so that the Minister then would have to refer this plan to all the area municipalities. In other words, lacking action on the part of Metro, this day, May 16, any area municipalities – Swansea, North York, Scarborough, or any one of them—can immediately take action to have that plan adopted, refer it to the Minister and the Minister must take the appropriate action. This is perhaps a historic day in the history of the Metro plan if any municipality wants to take action.

In that regard, there is a problem. I admit it would be a difficult step for these municipalities to take, particularly in view of the change which is now taking place. But in any case, these municipalities have that power today, they can exercise it, and while perhaps there would be a little ill-feeling engendered and a little difficulty within the staff structure of the municipalities, this can be done. It seems to me that if Metropolitan Toronto does not take appropriate action to get this plan underway, then one of the municipalities should take that kind of action to push it along.

If this fails, the time may come when the new Act is in force and Metro still drags its feet. I suppose this could still hold, but it seems to me that an easier way that this could be accomplished would be for us to set a deadline for the implementation of the plan, and if that deadline passes, then the Ontario municipal board would have power to step in to do the job.

I offer this amendment, that clause 28 of Bill 81 be amended by adding thereto the following as subsection 5 of section 219 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act:

> 5. If within six months after the coming into force of this section the official plan heretofore submitted by the Metropolitan Toronto planning board has not been adopted, the Ontario municipal board shall have power to order its adoption with such modifications and after such public hearings and other inquiries as appear to it to be desirable and expedient.

In other words, the Ontario municipal board would move in at the end of the six-month period, which seems to me to be a reasonable period. It could hold whatever hearings are necessary, and it has the power at that point to hold those hearings and to take whatever steps it deems expedient in order to expedite the plan.

After ten years, or all these years, of delay in this field, it seems to me that we should not take a chance on further delay—that we should move forward to have this plan implemented at the earliest possible time.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in answer to my hon. friend from Yorkview, and a former member of the North York council, I am surprised that he would try to hamstring the metropolitan government with such an amendment. He must realize that the—

Mr. Bryden: It has had itself hamstrung for ten years.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: —ultimate is a master plan for Metropolitan Toronto. He must also realize with the alignment and boundaries of the new boroughs that there are many things to be considered relative to boundary lines of industry—on one side residential, on the other, recreation parks, and so forth. I think he is not being very fair in suggesting that in a comparably short period of six months you give as a deadline for the Metropolitan Toronto planning board, in conjunction and co-operation with the five boroughs and the city, to set up a master plan that we will be proud of. I think it is most unfair.

Mr. Young: But, Mr. Chairman, the master plan is already in the hands of council. The planning board has done its job. The master plan has little to do with the borough lines. It is a land use plan for designating the land use within the metropolitan area. That work is done, but unfortunately it is still in the realm of the problematical and the results are not apparent.

I do not think there is a job at the Ontario municipal board level of cleaning-up boundaries and doing this sort of thing prior to the implementation of this plan. This other job can be done along with this, or even after it, and it seems to me that a six-month period is reasonable. This gives nine months altogether—more than that, it gives a good year, as a matter of fact; possibly more.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: You said six months.

Mr. Young: Well, six months. I think you will find it says six months after the coming into force of this section, that is, after it is the plan. Whatever time it is proclaimed, I have no knowledge of at this moment. But this does give very adequate time and with the delay that has happened in the past, with the dilly-dallying that has taken place over

the Metro plan, I think that we ought to put a deadline here. We ought to put teeth into this Act so that we know that in the days to come we are going to have an official plan which is official, and which the new boroughs can operate within.

Already, my own municipality has moved forward to lay out the details of two of the districts in that plan. Other municipalities may be doing the same thing; I have not heard. But we find ourselves handicapped because we have not an official plan, and even the detail we are filling in is on the proposed Metro plan, not on the plan itself. So I think this matter is urgent, and we ought to move on it, and move immediately.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Yorkview knows as well as I that the plan, or the new metropolitan system, will come into effect on January 1, 1967. Then you must figure six months from there. I must argue or debate with him that the plan is already laid down on paper and effective. There is going to be a vast change of thinking on the Metropolitan Toronto planning board with the five boroughs and the city and their planning. The municipality which I represent happened to be the first planned municipality in Canada; we take a back seat to no one, so we want to take a good look at this before we say "yes" and decide this is the proper plan for Metropolitan Toronto.

There are many, many problems in this great area, this great metropolis, that we have to decide, change and figure out. Industry has to be relocated in our future planning; it must not all remain in one area. We have to have a composite plan all the way through. You will find that North York and Etobicoke already have their plans. But if you will agree with me and admit the adjoining municipalities plan is entirely different, and you have a hazard in the short space of one street, you will have industry on one side, you will have residential on the other.

Despite your statement that the plan has all been laid out, do not believe it. There are many changes yet and I think six months is far too short.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the situation that we are trying to avoid. The hon. member for Humber has said we are going to now have a battle joined between these various boroughs as to industrial and other assessments. This is exactly the thing that has delayed the plan up to this point. If we are going to have another battle joined of larger proportions, then we can look forward to a long period of struggle, and perhaps never an official plan.

This is the kind of attitude we are going to bring to it. Already we have the plan on paper. I admit that when it comes to the hearings before metropolitan council, there may be some changes, but I think there should be a deadline placed so that those changes have to be done within a period of time. We cannot have this prolonged struggle over assessment which we have had now for six or seven years.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how this amendment can reasonably be supported. The hon. member for Yorkview talks about a plan now being before the Metro council. There has been a series of plans down through the years before the metropolitan council, and I would venture to guess that before Metro has any official plan, there will be yet another series—maybe one, two, three, half-a-dozen different versions.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what we are afraid of.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for York South makes my point. He says that is what we are afraid of. Really what they are talking about is planning gone rampant. They talked about creative decentralization.

Really, when you get down to the nub of their thinking, they are creatively planning away from the elected persons. They know, and the hon. member for Yorkview knows as well as anyone, that a six-month deadline is not going to produce an official plan. So really what is epitomized in this amendment is that the official plan for Metro is taken from the hands of the elected persons and given to an unelected body.

Now for planning gone rampant. They want the planning done by persons other than the elected people, and if this amendment should carry, this is exactly the effect that it is going to have. It may be a while—it may be a considerable time—until Metro has an official plan applying over the whole of the Metro area, but, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the planning decision should finally be made on the best advice available. Yes, the planning decision should eventually be made by the elected persons, and if this amendment is adopted, you are certainly taking it completely out of the hands of the elected persons and giving it to people who are going to impose their will without having any elected responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has convinced me. I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. member for Downsview is essentially talking through his hat. He is obviously determined that he will not comprehend the quite simple proposal that we have put forward with regard to the reorganization of this area, otherwise he would not have made the asinine statements he has just made about it.

However, we are not dealing with that type of proposal. We are now working within the framework of this legislation, and notwithstanding all the praise that has been heaped upon the Metro system of government until now, in this area, the hard fact remains that this government has never been able to cope with the problem of planning. In all the years of its existence, it has not been able to arrive at a plan.

This is unfortunate. I think it arises out of the system of government which entrenches particular vested interests and makes action almost impossible. It is unfortunate that that is the kind of system that the government insists on perpetuating, but in our opinion it is still imperative that we get some action in regard to a Metro plan. We have been going along for a long time now. The hon. member for Downsview suggested that we would probably go on for another decade or two without any plan.

Well, I am suggesting to this House that we cannot do that. The distortion of growth in this city will be incredible if we do not have some sort of overall plan that we can work to. The amendment that my hon. friend has proposed is unfortunately far from an ideal solution to the problem, but it is a critical problem and it is the only possible solution within the framework that the government has laid down as to the future government in this area.

We think that some heat has to be put on this Metro council to take action on a plan, and this is the way that I think it could be done. Failing something like this, I think my friend the hon. member for Downsview will be entirely right; Metro will go through plan after plan and never arrive at anything. In the meantime, there will be no co-ordination at all of the overall development of the area.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman. I think that the explanation that was so ably presented by the hon. member for Downsview completely explains the whole situation, based on his experience. I have already made the statement that there was an official plan before the authorities, and in due course of time I hope that it will come to my office. I will do my best to examine it and to approve it as quickly as I possibly can.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion by the member for Yorkview will please rise.

All those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 6, the "nays," 56.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 28 agreed to.

Sections 29 to 37, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 38:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some explanation on section 38, which relates to section 258 of the Metropolitan Toronto Act. There has always been a limitation of $250,000 in the Act for the purposes provided by this section. We have amended that to provide that the amount shall be up to one-tenth of a mill, feeling that this is a more realistic figure than to use a definite dollar figure.

Section 38 agreed to.

Sections 39 to 47, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 81 reported.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report a certain bill with amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a certain bill with amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to proceed

with the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development; that will be followed by the estimates of The Department of Transport, the provincial auditor, the Lieutenant-Governor, the Provincial Treasurer; and by the end of the week I hope to be able to give hon. members the next major department after that. That should, I think, take us through the balance of this week.

There are second readings which, perhaps, we could deal with, and there is also the Budget debate. I will arrange that with the Whips, because we did not get through too many speakers on Friday morning in the Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.20 o'clock, p.m.

No. 111

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Question of Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Thompson 3535

Questions of Mr. Wishart re Cornell aeronautical laboratory, Mr. Young 3535

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall 3535

On notice of motion No. 10, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Young, Mr. Boyer 3568

Recess, 6 o'clock 3577

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests in the east gallery, students from St. Patrick's elementary school, Lucan, Kitchener-Waterloo collegiate girls' club, Kitchener, and from Runnymede public school, Toronto. In the west gallery, students from Gananoque secondary school, and the ladies of the Bracebridge women's institute.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. Could the Minister inform the House whether his department would consider drafting air pollution control standards governing the proximity of industrial plants to residential areas?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): No, Mr. Speaker, we have not given consideration to this; or rather we have decided that on superficial consideration it would not add anything to the control programme. We believe that our methods are far more effective if we seek to control the emissions, without trying to control the location of the industries with respect to the residences.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General, notice of which has been given him.

Has the Cornell aeronautical laboratory requested assistance from the hon. Attorney General's department in its research particularly in respect to accidents involving small cars? And if so, has any progress been made towards such co-operation?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the study done by the Cornell aeronautical laboratory. I believe that study was concluded. We have not received any request for assistance; and I would just assure the hon. member that, should we receive any request, we would be very glad to co-operate. We have not been asked to assist at the study level.

Mr. Young: Thank you very much. I wonder if the Minister would consider another question, a supplementary question? Does the Attorney General know whether or not this approach may have been made through the Ontario medical association acting as intermediary, whether that area might have been explored?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not aware, Mr. Speaker; it has not come to us at all, that is all I can say. We would be glad to assist if we were asked to.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): In my estimates speech last year, I reviewed the objectives which were set out by the economic council of Canada for the period 1965-1970 and adapted them to the province of Ontario.

Canada's growth rate last year, which was slightly higher than Ontario's, was the highest of any of the world's industrialized countries. In Ontario, with the 9.5 per cent increase in gross provincial product surpassing that of 1964, we are well along the road toward the fulfilment of our goals.

However, we recognize that our objectives will not be reached, as surely as night follows day. In a complex, modern economy, economic growth is the product of many forces and the outcome of a delicate balance between the public and the private sector.

The task for government must be the conditioning of the business climate within which growth will flourish.

In that sense, our first responsibility must be to identify the obstacles to continued economic growth and to meet directly the challenges facing the government.

The government's contribution is not without its price; the cost of effective government was made quite clear to all in the province's 1966 Budget. It is more important then, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer stressed in the Budget, for us to plan our activities carefully and judiciously to make the greatest contribution to the private sector.

The fundamental objective of this department is fulfilment of our economic goals, through the planning and research function of the office of the chief economist and the promotional and assistance functions of the trade and industry branch, the Ontario development agency, and other agencies in the department.

In measuring our performance in Ontario last year against our target rates, we find substantial grounds for satisfaction. Let me illustrate through a comparison of various economic yardsticks.

We set a target to 1970 of an average annual increase in gross provincial product —in constant dollars—of 5.5 per cent. By achieving a rate of growth of approximately 6.2 per cent in real terms, we surpassed this goal last year.

Our goal for unemployment was a reduction of the rate in Ontario to no more than 2 per cent by 1970. Last year, the rate was reduced from 3.2 per cent in 1964 to an average of 2.5 per cent; in fact, for the six months ending in March, 1966, the seasonally adjusted rate has been running at about 2.2. per cent. We expect this rate to continue for the balance of the year, but this will depend to some extent on developments in monetary and fiscal policy.

Our goal is an increase in the size of our labour force by a compound annual rate of 2.8 per cent to 1970. With the rate of increase running at 3.2 per cent in 1964 and 2.3 per cent last year, we are close to our schedule for the average of the two years.

In the course of the year, the total labour force passed the 2.6 million mark. The increase in size of the labour force this year will depend not only on the increase resulting from immigration and the number of people leaving school, but also upon the extent to which rising wages and job opportunities will attract women and students into the labour force.

We had set the goal for new jobs at an average of 75,000 a year to 1970. In fact, we were right on target, with a net increase of 75,000 jobs in the province last year.

Putting this another way, the goal for employment growth to 1970 is a compound annual rate of three per cent. In 1964, the rise was 3.8 per cent, and last year it was three per cent, with the net result that we have moved ahead of schedule, largely as a result of the rapid reduction in the unemployment rate.

In March, 1966, employment in Ontario was 97,000 higher than March, 1965, and, for the year as a whole, we expect that the target of 75,000 new jobs in 1966 will again be reached.

The goal for productivity improvement is a compound annual rate of 2.5 per cent, whereas rate of improvement in 1964 was about three per cent; in 1965, productivity increased by slightly more than three per cent, a significant and important advance.

The economic council of Canada established a target of an annual average increase in Canadian exports of fully manufactured goods of at least ten per cent. The actual achievement in 1965 was 15 per cent in volume, due almost entirely to exports from this province. Exports of motor vehicles and parts, for example, doubled last year.

The targets for growth to 1970 implied an average annual increase in prices of two per cent. In 1965, the composite of prices in the Canadian economy increased by 2.9 per cent, with the sharpest rises occurring in construction activities and certain foods and services. The question of rising prices is one which must concern any responsible official in 1966.

I believe, however, that the danger of severe inflation this year has been overstressed. Prices have actually been declining steadily for durable manufactured consumer goods and have risen quite slowly for nondurables excluding food. Increases in prices of exports and machinery and equipment have been modest, particularly in comparison with 1964 price rise. It is principally the surge in prices of construction goods and foods during the past six months that has brought us to a high level over the last year. As a result, the aggregate rise for the year will exceed our target level, even though we expect price pressures to relax as we go through the year.

Our total growth rate in 1966 will be a

combination of increase in employment and improvement in productivity. Since we expect an employment increase of close to three per cent, we require a further productivity increase of 2.5 per cent to reach our target growth of 5.5 per cent. Therefore, in all of these comparisons, the factor which is presently of critical importance is productivity. I would like to devote particular attention to its role.

One of the most important sources of our productivity achievement last year was manufacturing. In 1965, factory shipments per paid worker in Ontario rose by five per cent compared with 2.9 per cent in the rest of Canada. Furthermore, our productivity improvement in manufacturing made a larger impact on the Ontario economy, because manufacturing employment contributes 30 per cent of total employment in this province compared to about 20 per cent in the rest of Canada.

In both Ontario and other areas of Canada, there was a substantial movement of the labour force out of agriculture into industries with higher productivity potential. In Ontario there was a decline of 8,000 in agricultural employment, and this movement was important to the overall productivity gain. Indeed, if it had not been for this source of productivity gain in the rest of Canada, the productivity in the other provinces collectively would have been less than one per cent.

Ontario's impressive gain in productivity last year belies a current opinion that the operation of an economy under high pressure combined with a labour shortage automatically reduces the rate of productivity gain. This province's ability to achieve impressive productivity gains in these circumstances reflects the high degree of mobility in Ontario towards high-productivity occupations, industries and areas. Management in Ontario is highly skilled, and labour and capital in this province are very mobile. With adequate market opportunities, Ontario can therefore secure a good rate of productivity improvement.

Notwithstanding these achievements, I believe we should be fully aware of the problems emerging from our very success. I also believe we should be willing to confront these problems as economic challenges.

Our principal problem now is the maintenance of a high rate of economic growth, and with the unemployment rate reduced to such a low level, it is obvious that large increases in employment cannot be achieved through reductions in unemployment. In such conditions, our rate of growth will be determined largely by the extent to which two forces can be mustered.

In the first place, we must seek an expansion in the employed labour force, and in the second place, we must all seek measures to improve the rate of productivity of that labour force.

This means that we not only need more skilled labour, but we require people who possess the talent and training for a wide variety of new occupations as the economy develops in complexity. The Ontario government has been working aggressively to accelerate growth in the labour force through a vigorous immigration policy, but it is obviously difficult to meet all our requirements where the competitive demand for skilled labour is so severe. Accordingly, if our rate of growth is to exceed the increase in the size of the labour force, then we must encourage means of achieving higher productivity from that labour force.

Perhaps there is no term in economic analysis more vulnerable to misuse and abuse than the word "productivity." At a time, however, when productivity must be the principal ingredient in a higher rate of growth, I want to describe the full meaning of that term. Dr. John Deutsch, the chairman of the economic council of Canada, stated recently:

> Raising productivity is not just a matter of "working harder" or taking shorter coffee breaks. The level of productivity depends on a number of complex factors—economic, political, geographic, scientific, sociological, and educational.

Productivity may be measured by the rate of output per worker in the labour force, but improvements in productivity are a consequence of various forces in the public and private sectors of the economy. In the last century, and indeed until quite recently, attention was focused almost exclusively on private investment and the mobility of capital and labour towards occupations of potentially greater productiveness. These factors continue to play a vital role in economic progress, but today they must be viewed in a much broader context.

Few people now fail to realize the contribution of public investment and public expenditure to the productivity of the economy. Without road, highway, sewerage and water systems, and power facilities, the modern economy could not exist. The main problem in this area today is to plan

public investments so they make the greatest contribution to the overall productivity of the economy. Errors in the planning of these investments would mean that they are absorbing manpower, materials, and capital that could be used more effectively in other ways, such as in the production of goods for our export markets. Both public and private expenditures must be directed toward efficient use of our resources.

Planning to obtain the optimum productivity from public investments is one of the greatest challenges facing modern government. And there is an added degree of importance to the wise use of public investment and expenditure. You know from the Budget presentation that the government is facing a shortage of tax revenues. Increased taxation can only be avoided through increased productivity and economic growth or by reduced government expenditures. To the extent that wise and judicious public expenditure contributes to the economic growth, government revenues will be enlarged.

And so the wheel swings full circle, because increased revenues will enable the government to provide further social capital, to implement social programmes, and to invest in the further development of the province's resources and people. The public and private sectors must be partners in progress; they must be complementary and not competitive.

Productivity improvement is also the result of the quality of our available labour, materials, and investment capital. The quality of the labour force, where the term labour has a very broad application, is fundamental to all other variables impinging on productivity potential.

The labour force comprises our scientists and industrial managers; the managers of our political, financial, transportation, educational, and health institutions; the inventors; the entrepreneurs and the traders; the electricians and the prospectors, and all others who are engaged in the process of production in the economy. Members of the labour force find, develop, and mine our mineral resources, and discover new alloys, new ways of using minerals, and new products for business and consumers.

The improvement of available materials and investment capital, both of which are basic to our standard of living, is dependent upon the quality of the labour force. The economy needs more people for the research, design, and planning functions, and more people skilled in working with modern technology.

My department, in planning for the overall and regional development of the province, is supporting all efforts to provide the education, training, and retraining required to obtain a greater supply of such people. This is evident from the fact that 45 per cent of the provincial Budget is directed towards education in one form or other.

Another factor bearing on productivity is the quality of management. The educational institutions have made large strides recently in training people in the ways of managing, but there is enormous room for improvement in the present supply of skilled managers. The Ontario development agency is assuming a growing role in this field and its efforts will be expanded.

It is clear that there has been a major change in the role of government in recent years. The government today is regarded as an instrument for providing the social capital and the climate required by business and households, the educational and health institutions required for a high-quality population, and the planning and development leading to the further improvement in productivity. The efforts of our trade and industry branch, for example, are being directed to accelerate industrial expansion throughout the province and to develop domestic and foreign markets whereby our commodities will be assured increasing demand.

It is obvious that a province which can provide virtually full employment for its people and a per capita earned personal income of 33 per cent higher than the average for the other nine provinces has an efficient and productive economy. Our educational achievements are high, our economy is diversified, and our people and capital are quite mobile. All in all, we have performed relatively well in the past. But the competition is becoming fiercer, particularly in the international sector. As we survey our present wants and resources, we see on the economic horizon greater challenges arising to confront us.

Ontario's economic goals, as set out last year, imply a set of growth priorities. They signify our intention to capitalize on our potential rather than dissipating our strength like an overextended business. The sectors of the economy which provide the greatest potential for additional gains in incomes and productivity should be granted priority, if we are to have the maximum standard of living and achieve our social objectives. For example, while improving productivity through raising the quality and mobility of

labour, materials, and capital, we must also encourage the structural shift towards high-earning, high-productivity sectors.

The strenuous efforts in The Department of Economics and Development to assist in the accelerated development of the motor vehicle and parts industry are evidence of our firm intention. But, in the process, we recognize that we are passing through a transitional period in which we will confront numerous problems. These will only be solved in the best interest of those involved through effective co-operation among business and the provincial and federal governments. I shall describe this in greater detail when I discuss the trade and industry branch.

One of the most important avenues along which to encourage improvement in the overall productivity of our economy and its resources is to be found in our international relationships. There are several matters in Canada on which discussion often generates more heat than light and one of these is the subject of our international economic relations. I do not intend to discuss the theory of international economics now, but it is necessary to mention a few facts relevant to my theme.

In the high prosperity of the postwar period, Canada entered the stage of becoming a mature industrial economy; for many reasons, Ontario was the first province to enter this stage. Much of the rest of the country is still at the threshold in its preparation of the groundwork for the industrial and technological age. Since the transition has been so recent in Ontario, we are still involved in the rush of adaptation in the Ontario economy. The main danger in such a period is that so many people want to run before they have the strength, co-ordination, or even the know-how for crawling.

We are preparing strong foundations and accumulating the know-how and co-ordination for participating in a fiercely competitive international economy founded on science and technology. Science and technology are key factors in this competitive age, and this government has recognized that fact in the creation of the Sheridan Park corporation.

The real danger to be avoided is the overloading of the economy with non-competitive firms. It is obvious that the more labour and capital we employ in non-competitive activities, the less labour and capital is available for activities and areas where there are opportunities to meet competition from foreign producers. What we want to encourage is firms which can inject new methods and technology into some of our more traditional industries. An example of this kind of operation is Stancor—a firm which has recently located a modern furniture plant in Hanover, Ontario, after having purchased several small companies in the furniture industry.

Therefore, operating within the national economic framework, our policy is to import what we cannot produce competitively and, at the same time, to work deliberately towards improving our position in the domestic and foreign markets.

We seek to develop industry that has the capacity to sustain itself in the face of competition in the domestic and international marketplace. This is the continuing objective of the Ontario trade crusade, and I should like to reaffirm our policies here and the practical approach we have been taking to this problem.

In setting out Ontario's goals last year, I mentioned some of the major factors which belong principally to federal jurisdiction, yet which greatly influence our prospects for success. Two of these factors were: First, favourable conditions in international trading and finance; second, favourable monetary, fiscal, trade, and debt management policies at the federal level.

In recent months, renewed public attention has been focused on one particular facet of international economic policy—our economic relationships with the United States. Everyone recognizes both the intimacy and the complexity of this relationship. We are familiar with the interdependence of the two economies.

Although international trade and financial policy are federal prerogatives, the provinces have an important stake in the consequences. Accordingly, in our own external relationships, for example, through the use of trade missions, we have collaborated closely with the federal government.

The degree of American investment and business involvement in our economy has quite naturally been a contentious issue. Whereas American firms have behaved as good corporate citizens generally and we have indeed welcomed them, there have been periodic issues raised concerning Canada's interest in the face of American government policy. More often than not, these issues are merely the symptom rather than the cause. We believe that the provincial interest is in attacking the causes of our difficulties which lie squarely at our own doorstep: the structure of Canadian industry and

the need to become competitive within our own market. Let me review the most recent issue.

The United States has been seeking ways to protect its gold reserves against attack, particularly from France, while expending enormous sums abroad for military commitments and economic assistance. Under the general designation of "guidelines policy," the question has been raised as to whether some of the measures that have been taken endanger Canada's interests. In the general debates, I believe that inadequate attention has been devoted to the fact that we have continued access to the United States money market to finance our current account deficit as long as our foreign exchange reserves do not drift over $2.6 billion. This may present certain technical problems, but they are not insurmountable, and certainly we have confidence in the ability of the Minister of Finance and the governor of the Bank of Canada to act in Canada's best interest in the area of international financial relationships for which they have responsibility.

However, the issue extends beyond international financial matters to a second area: the operations of U.S. manufacturing corporations in Canada, most of which are found in Ontario. It has been suggested that U.S. subsidiaries in Canada are often used as vehicles for the importation of goods from their U.S. parents, at an unduly high profit to those parent firms.

Meanwhile, the multitude of small Canadian-owned firms find it is difficult to compete with the giant competitors even as some American subsidiaries in Canada find it difficult to compete with their parents. On this point, I would like to state clearly that we have had excellent co-operation from U.S. subsidiaries in the various aspects of our Ontario trade crusade.

Although recent arguments have been based on small, rather unrepresentative samples, Ontario has been well aware of this structural problem and has been pursuing consistently positive policies. We do not believe that restrictive measures are appropriate or suitable in dealing with unequal competition; rather, we believe that the basic attitudes and the environment of Canadian industry and Canadian consumers should be changed. Let me illustrate our approach.

First, we have noted the competitive handicap of many Canadian firms. Let us remember that a substantial proportion of the imports from parent companies represents components or joint products that cannot yet be produced competitively in Canada. In such circumstances, we are fortunate in having obtained the plants to produce those products which can be produced competitively here. Meanwhile the major activity of the Ontario development agency is directed towards assisting firms in Ontario to make adjustments which will allow them to become efficient, productive, and competitive. We must continue to work towards these objectives for Canadian industry.

The second method is related to the first and that is a deliberate extension of the market by encouraging the consumption of Canadian goods and the production of commodities which can be competitive with present imports. The encouragement of Canadian production and consumption is not a restrictive matter. It is merely a recognition that the economic world is an imperfect one —that Canadians need to be shown Canadian products which are competitive in price and quality, and there is where we can be import-competitive.

In fact, a large proportion of the activities of the trade and industry branch of this department is directed to arranging the production in Ontario of products that can be produced here on a competitive basis. We have organized a number of manufacturing opportunity shows for the express purpose of bringing together firms which import components and Canadian suppliers or potential suppliers. These shows have been instrumental in a great deal of competitive, import replacement.

At the same time, the facilities for encouraging exports have been added to the scale of operations of Ontario firms and have helped them to become competitive. Such is the spirit and purpose of the Ontario trade crusade, which I will discuss in more detail when I come to the trade and industry branch.

These objectives, raised recently in public discussions by others, have been applauded. Is it possible that the Ontario hippopotamus, so recently a figure of fun, has now earned respectability and recognition? If the Ontario trade crusade was ahead of its time, we are encouraged to have pioneered and to have demonstrated such foresight. We believe in planning and looking ahead and attacking our challenges with all the wisdom and energy we can muster. For this, we depend in large measure on our research function and I would now like to describe our plans in that area.

Last year, I decribed the first phase in the

reorganization of our economic research and statistical services. At that time, the office of the chief economist had begun to make provision for new responsibilities, to hire new staff, and to intensify its research activity. However, much further study was required to adapt the existing organization to a form that could provide even more effective advice.

Meanwhile, the government announced its intention to establish clear policy priorities in order to assure that expenditures will make the greatest contribution to the development of the province, to plan its financial and economic activity to achieve maximum effectiveness, and to co-ordinate government policies and programmes such as those designed to contribute to the economic development of all regions of the province. To support these objectives, research in key economic and federal-provincial matters will be largely undertaken in the office of the chief economist.

The new organization reflects the emphasis on planning and co-ordination. However, much is yet to be done in hiring key personnel, in developing more extended scope for research, particularly in the statistical area, and in making provision for research which will meet the requirements of other departments. During the summer, the various branches comprising the office of the chief economist will be moved into the Treasury building; such a transfer should make the central service more readily available.

The formal structure of the office of the chief economist now includes six units, of which the first two reflect the central planning function and the need for an overview of government activity. First is the economic planning branch. This branch fills the need for long-range planning of government economic activity and investment. It also provides a source of co-ordination and planning for the office of the chief economist in assuring that all aspects of the provincial economy are reviewed in the context of future requirements.

As part of its role in studying the long-run requirements of the provincial economy on an overall basis, the branch is charged with the work of building up long-run knowledge of the economy, identifying bottlenecks and obstacles to economic growth and development, and studying the long-term public investment requirements. As such, this branch will provide a core of research and study for the broad economic and financial considerations of the new Cabinet committee.

Second is the federal-provincial affairs secretariat. The secretariat has the dual function of undertaking research and study within the area of federal-provincial affairs, and co-ordinating the activities of Ontario government departments and agencies in the federal-provincial area, including the preparation and co-ordination of material for federal-provincial conferences. In this process, the secretariat provides the necessary overview of federal-provincial affairs to assist the development of consistent government policy. The secretariat is also undertaking much of the staff work for the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation in its advisory function to the hon. Prime Minister.

Two of the other branches provide the basic analytical support required in the overall research operation. First is the economic analysis branch. The function of this branch is to carry out economic research work directed to keeping abreast of current developments, and to provide a central core of economic intelligence. In this process, the branch provides significant information on current and past economic phenomena as well as detailed study of economic variables affecting the provincial economy. It also carries out research into fiscal arrangements and federal-provincial economic and fiscal problems in support of the work of the tax structure committee and its required analysis. Finally, the responsibility for providing the public with economic information on the Ontario economy is an added service provided by this branch.

Next is the applied economics branch. The function of this branch is to conduct economic investigations and studies of a feasibility or implication-analyzing nature. These studies serve The Department of Economics and Development in working out a programme for trade and industry, the Ontario housing corporation, and the Ontario development agency. However, an even greater service is rendered to other departments such as Energy and Resources Management, Lands and Forests, Mines, Agriculture, and Highways, which request particular studies with implications beyond their own boundaries.

Finally, the remaining two branches will have responsibility for activities of central importance to the whole government operation. The regional development branch is one. This branch is now composed of two sections. A new regional research section will undertake research and prepare reports concerning the financial and economic position of the regional areas of Ontario. This research will provide the basis required for the

preparation and implementation of the "design for development" programme and provide the basic research establishment in support of the regional development work of the Cabinet committee. The research section will also provide field research officers as a liaison with the government's field work and co-ordinate the research that is undertaken in the regional universities.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister to clarify this statement:

> The function of this branch is to conduct economic investigations and studies of a feasibility or implication-analyzing nature.

What exactly does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Randall: What page is the hon. leader of the Opposition quoting from—applied economics?

Mr. Thompson: Yes—page 21. I thought that might refer to regional development—the second study. It is kind of a highfaultin sound which does not—the hon. Minister is a man who speaks distinctly and clearly—I somehow suspect that someone else has written that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the leader of the Opposition will let me finish, I shall be glad to explain any department.

Mr. Thompson: I am interested, really, in what that implies concretely.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I shall be delighted.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The regional development services section will continue to provide practical advice and assistance to the regional development associations, to co-ordinate their programmes and activities, and to provide for liaison between government agencies and the associations, soon to be named regional development councils. The pioneer work of the regional development services section has been recognized across the province. Now that it is to be reinforced by a research staff, specializing in regional economics and planning, we are preparing to undertake a comprehensive examination of the problems and potential of the province's ten economic regions.

The Ontario statistical centre is the final one. The key to the effective and efficient operation of a central economic research service is the existence of a functional economic statistics centre. A nucleus for such an operation was gathered together at the end of 1964, and this branch is now becoming a core of basic information and data to the other branches as well as to the whole government, and for these reasons, it has been designated the Ontario statistical centre.

The centre administers The Ontario Statistics Act, 1962-1963, and will eventually undertake input-output studies upon which long-run financial planning may be based. In addition, it will collect, analyze, present, or store information which has a statistical value, and process and publish statistics required by the province. It will design samples and conduct surveys for Ontario government departments, as well as serve as a liaison among federal, provincial, and municipal governments. It will also attempt to develop statistical standards, including a common coding and classification system, and will provide computer and programming services to Ontario government departments.

Another part of its work will be concerned with research requiring analysis and statistical theories. These activities will include plans to establish a general-purpose information system which will integrate available administrative data for development of statistical information, thus providing information for governments and industries of the province. This general-purpose information system will improve timeliness of statistics, cost of production, and will reduce duplication in collection, processing, and storage of data. The common information stored in the system will be made accessible to all departments and industries in a usable form as far as it is permitted by disclosure rules.

The Dominion bureau of statistics has welcomed the Ontario statistical centre, particularly since it should be a vehicle through which the gap in a total statistical information system for Canada, represented by the potential of administrative data, can be filled.

In embarking upon these exciting new ventures, we trust that we are not falling prey to the quantitative theory of quality. Our objective is to maintain a high-quality research team. At the same time, we will be undertaking policies to ensure more effective co-ordination of research and policy advice between the departments of the government. Just as regional development requires the active collaboration of all departments, effective research demands a united effort. Now that our house is in order internally, we shall move on to that phase this year.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on the trade and industry branch. In matters of producing and marketing Ontario products, the department's action arm is the trade and industry branch. Just as the provincial economy climbed to new heights last year, the trade and industry branch and supporting offices in the department achieved major new successes both at home and abroad.

The 18 sales missions we organized and despatched in 1965 sold Ontario-made products valued at some $26 million. This figure does not take into account the repeat orders many of the salesmen got when they went back on their own, without the aid of the government. This 1965 sales figure, added to what we already had, brought the total received from these sales missions abroad to more than $100 million.

Our sales opportunity mission programme is being continued this year in both old and new territory. We plan to send Ontario businessmen on six sales missions to the United States; four to the United Kingdom; five to Germany, and three to Italy. For the first time, we will send a trade mission into Switzerland, Austria, Yugoslavia, Norway and Sweden. Only recently two of our sales missions returned from South America and Malaysia. These 21 sales missions will represent nearly 210 companies and will bring Ontario products within the reach of millions of new consumers.

To supplement this programme, we recently issued an export directory, listing some 10,000 products from 2,000 Ontario firms. The directory is now being sent to foreign distributors, agencies, governments and banks outside of Canada. It will also be used by our own foreign offices. The products listed range from raw materials and agricultural products to consumer goods, appliances, aircraft, and sophisticated electronic equipment.

Another successful area of trade promotion is international fairs. The department organizes groups of Ontario manufacturers and helps them set up product displays in the leading trade fairs around the world. Last year our manufacurers appeared in nine international fairs, displaying and selling Ontario-made products ranging from toys and sports equipment to oil and gas heating equipment. At one fair, the international building exhibit, in London, England, orders were received for over $500,000.

This year, the department will sponsor Ontario manufacturers in ten international trade fairs in Europe.

The Department of Economics and Development also has an incoming buyers' programme under which we bring foreign buyers to Ontario to meet our manufacturers, see our products, and visit our industrial complexes. This year we plan to bring in groups of foreign buyers from South America, the Caribbean, the United Kingdom, and continental Europe. We will also bring in manufacturers' agents from various countries in order to introduce our products into new markets. As an innovation to this programme, we plan to bring in special buyers' groups to attend some of Canada's more famous annual trade shows, such as the Canadian national business show, the grocery and supermarket show, the packaging show, and the construction show.

Another group of foreign buyers from 15 countries will be brought in to attend our annual "Eedee" awards presentation later this month. This affair honours Ontario's leading clothing designers and manufacturers, who will receive awards for excellence of design.

In total, we will be bringing in about 170 foreign buyers to see—and buy—Ontario-made products.

In 1965, the department, under its incoming buyers' programme brought to Ontario more than 100 foreign representatives. We estimate that our incoming buyers' programme resulted in sales of some $3 million worth of Ontario-manufactured goods last year. Many of these representatives, sponsored by the department in the first instance, have returned to Canada on their own and placed repeat orders.

A major part of our efforts in trade and industry is educational. Through films, printed material, export forums, a speakers' bureau, and other means, the department works with industry in planning export programmes — converting the reluctant, encouraging the exporter to do more.

For instance, the department last year held a series of seven export forums across the province, which were attended by nearly 900 interested manufacturers, industrial commissioners and municipal officials. The success of this programme has encouraged us to repeat it. We will hold export forums in many other cities in the province of Ontario.

Our speakers' bureau, comprising staff members of the trade and industry branch and manufacturers who participated in our sales mission programme in foreign markets, spoke to 123 groups across the province last year for a total audience of 12,000 people. With the further co-operation of Ontario businessmen, who wish to share their success with

others not yet experienced in the export market, we are going to continue this educational programme throughout 1966.

Last year was particularly gratifying to The Department of Economics and Development for the recognition it received in the field of industrial promotion. Five of our publications won awards.

Marketing Abroad, Plant Location Services, and *Manufacturing Opportunities* were "excellent award winners" in the literature award competition of the American Industrial Development Council Incorporated. There were 290 entries in this contest, ranging from Canadian and U.S. government submissions, to banks, railroads, and other development agency entries. Only one "excellent award" is selected in each of seven categories—and Ontario's publications won three out of seven of these awards.

Two other department publications – *Ontario Industrial Review* and a brochure about the women's advisory committee—won Canada's best "public service value" citations in a competition sponsored by the Canadian public relations society.

I also had the pleasure of going to Washington, D.C., to accept the 1965 professional trophy award citation from the United States society of industrial realtors. Ontario's industrial development submission placed among the top three in North America. The citation was awarded for the scope and balance of Ontario's industrial development programme and the efficiency of Ontario's industrial development effort in relation to financial resources. Our programme won the award for successfullly coping with diverse economic, geographic, and social problems, and concentrating on regional economic development and foreign trade.

Recently, the department, in co-operation with the staff of the educational broadcasting station of Ryerson polytechnical institute, created a 15-minute radio programme entitled "Ontario Business Review." This weekly radio programme is designed to present Ontario businessmen with a true, up-to-date picture of the Ontario economy, with information about the assistance available to Ontario businessmen through government.

The programme is distributed by the Canadian association of broadcasters to nine radio stations in Ontario at their own request. As time goes by we expect the list of participating stations to grow, as more of the business community recognizes the need to keep informed of current trends and changes in the economy.

Last year, the department aimed a specific advertising programme at architects, industrial designers, consulting engineers, specification writers, and purchasing agents, with the message: "Specify Canadian – help create jobs." In other words, we asked the people involved in the business of ordering components and materials to shop for Canadian products whenever they can.

As part of this programme we instituted a comprehensive index of manufacturers and products made in Ontario. When inquiries come in from our advertisements in the trade press, asking how the individual can help, we are then able to look in our product index and find the equivalent components or material made right here in Ontario.

This product index now comprises 78 volumes, containing 9,600 manufactured products made by more than 11,000 Ontario firms. The index will be continuously revised and updated to conform with changes in product lines and product development.

The success of our five "manufacturing opportunity shows" as part of the Ontario trade crusade has led the department to plan another show this year. Ontario manufacturers will be asked to display the parts and components they normally import and Canadian suppliers will be asked to bid for their production. This import replacement show will be held in Toronto possibly in November of this year.

Another aspect of the Ontario government's "Shop Canadian" campaign is our engineering services programme. To ensure that more Canadian goods are used in construction projects in foreign lands, my department assists engineering firms to seek out opportunities in other countries. We know that the engineering firm awarded the contract will usually specify for the job the products with which it is most familiar—in this case, Canadian products.

In 1965, the first year of our engineering services programme, we assisted nine Ontario engineering firms in seeking contracts for foreign development, which ranged from feasibility studies for a wire and cable plant to geophysical surveys. The countries involved are: Nigeria, Ghana, Iraq, San Salvador, India, Libya, Finland, and the Persian Gulf.

While it must be recognized by the hon. members that the time lapse between an engineering study and a contract can be of long duration, I am happy to be able to report that one firm to which we gave encouragement and assistance has been awarded

a contract to oversee the expansion of iron-ore export facilities in three ports in India. This year we have set a target of 20 contracts which we believe can be reached by Ontario engineering firms.

On the domestic scene, the department held seven "Shop Canadian" campaigns last year. Nearly 3,000 local retailers participated in the programme by featuring Canadian-made products in store promotions. This year we will again hold "Shop Canadian" promotions in many Ontario towns.

During the past year, the department sent its travelling exhibit to eight summer and fall fairs across Ontario. This exhibit has a two-fold purpose: to describe the government services available to industry, and to illustrate the importance to the provincial economy of shopping Canadian when price and quality are equal to imports. This year we will appear in eight fairs across Ontario.

As the hon. members know, The Department of Economics and Development is charged with the responsibility of finding new industry and investment for the province. This past year, our industrial development officers visited nine U.S. cities to talk to American businessmen about establishing branch plants, joint ventures, and manufacturing arrangements in Ontario and to find agents and distributors for Ontario-made products.

The trade and industry branch will also hold small business opportunity workshops in Providence, Toledo, Hartford, and Akron. We tried this workshop idea for the first time in 1965 in North Carolina where we worked with a small group of 21 local businessmen. The meeting was conducted by staff from the New York office and we had a direct-line telephone hookup to the director of the trade and industry branch in Toronto.

After we had presented the Ontario story to them, we found we had seven new prospects on our hands—five who wanted to negotiate joint ventures with an Ontario manufacturer, one who wanted to represent Ontario products in the USA, and one who wanted to locate a branch plant in Ontario.

Present indications are that before the end of 1966, the branch plant inquiry will result in a new industry for the province, and that two joint ventures will be finalized.

In 1965, a total of 114 manufacturing arrangements were completed between Ontario and foreign interests in the province. This is an increase of ten over 1964. Of these arrangements, 88 were with U.S. companies and 26 were with foreign firms.

Ontario gained 178 new manufacturing establishments last year, compared with 163 new branch plants in 1964. These provided more than 17,500 people with employment and increased plant capacity by more than eight million square feet. These companies purchased 2,300 acres of land and invested $68.5 million in buildings and $134.7 million in machinery and equipment. These figures are based on preliminary estimated value of property, purchases, construction costs, and new equipment installations in the establishing of the new manufacturing companies.

Last year, the department recorded 13 joint ventures, which is the uniting of Ontario industrial or financial interests with foreign associates for the purpose of establishing a completely new business enterprise in Ontario.

I might also point out that my department is vitally interested in establishment of new plants and licensing agreements in foreign countries. There are many instances where the physical export of Ontario products is not economically feasible. In 1965, Ontario businessmen established at least 12 new plants in foreign countries and completed 17 manufacturing arrangements abroad. Profits from these companies and royalties from foreign licensing, when returned to Canada, are another way in which our imbalance of payments situation is improved, by helping to offset the flow of funds leaving Canada in payment of royalties, licence and engineering fees on foreign investments in Canada.

The tremendous impact of manufacturing expansions of existing facilities on the economy of Ontario was also very noticeable. The 494 additions to plants made last year were responsible for over 26,000 additions to the labour force, over 12 million square feet of new manufacturing space, and over $550 million of additional expenditures for building and equipment. This capital expenditure on expansions is double the 1964 total.

The greatest single advance during the past year was shown by the automotive vehicles and parts industry, which accounted for over $150 million of increased investment. Of the 494 companies making plant expansions, 75 companies were involved in or with the automotive industry, adding over 8,000 employees, over three million square feet of new space, and spending over $100 million on capital expenditures.

It is also interesting to note that of the 178 new manufacturing establishments reported in Ontario last year, 35 companies

were affected by the new automotive pact. These companies added about 5,000 employees to the labour force, built over two million square feet of plant, and spent over $50 million for plant equipment.

Although results of the Canada-U.S. automotive trade pact were outstanding in 1965, we in Ontario can expect even greater advances during the next few years. It is interesting to note that since the beginning of the year, Ontario automotive manufacturers have more than doubled their exports of cars and trucks, mainly to the United States.

Any successful industrial development programme must of necessity include Ontario's industrial commissioners, regional development workers, municipal officials, and members of interested local groups.

Again in 1966, my department plans to repeat its successful seminar for industrial commissioners held last year. Some 15 industrial development forums will be conducted across Ontario in co-operation with regional development councils to highlight new techniques and other factors governing industrial development at the community level.

Later in this estimates speech, I will tell the hon. members about the progress we are making in the field of research and inform them of recent developments at Sheridan park, but for the time being I would like to speak about another form of research being carried cut in The Department of Economics and Development. This deals with our industrial research division.

We intend to continue and expand in 1966 our research into potential new industries. Last year, we completed a study of the Ontario chemical industry, which covered 30,000 imported chemical commodities. We are going to segregate those products which we believe can be produced successfully and profitably in Ontario. Industry will be kept informed of our findings, and I anticipate some of these chemical products will soon be manufactured in our province.

The industrial research division will initiate studies of the Canadian electronics industry, the Canadian machine and machine tool industry, and the automotive industry, to determine what products can be competitively produced in the province.

Turning to research, this is an activity which must have continuity if it is to bear fruit. The work of the Ontario research foundation during the past year was largely a continuation of programmes begun in former years. Most of these will be continued, some with support from the Ontario government and some with support from industry or the Canadian and U.S. federal governments. A number of new or expanded projects have been planned.

A continuing requirement is for new equipment to give the highest accuracy required by many of the projects. Modern equipment is becoming increasingly complex and expensive, and it is impossible to charge the equipment costs to the operating budget of any one project or contract. The major equipment for which funds are requested will be used by several departments at Ontario research foundation and several of the research laboratories in the Sheridan Park family, thereby utilizing the cost of highly sophisticated capital research equipment to the fullest.

Through the trade and industry branch, The Department of Economics and Development will continue its support of the field engineering and technical information services provided by the Ontario research foundation to manufacturing industries, particularly to small businesses in the province that have limited or no technical resources of their own and must rely on outside assistance to maintain their competitive technological positions.

The objectives of this field service are to obtain, communicate and assist industrial management in applying scientific and technical knowledge to specific problems in order to achieve economically useful results in the form of new or improved products or processes and increased productivity. These objectives assist the technological well-being of manufacturing industries and complement the extensive business services offered by the trade and industry branch and other sections of The Department of Economics and Development.

Last year, 4,265 technical problems were processed by the field services department of the Ontario research foundation, and its engineers made 736 visits to industry in the course of this work. In addition, the Ontario development agency used the services of the Ontario research foundation engineers and scientists on nearly 40 occasions to make independent short-term feasibility studies and technical evaluations of products and processes associated with proposed new business ventures.

Recognizing that the transfer of information is an essential and inseparable part of research and development, and that modern technology in manufacturing is becoming increasingly complex and important, plans

have been made to continue this field service to industry and to ensure close working co-operation between the Ontario research foundation's field service and the various activities of The Department of Economics and Development.

Turning now to the Sheridan Park research community, progress has been proceeding satisfactorily. At present, the following research facilities are in operation in the community: British American Oil research and development centre; Cominco Limited product research centre; Dunlop research centre; Mallory Battery Company of Canada Limited; Warner-Lambert Research Institute of Canada Limited; and work is in progress on the construction of research and development buildings for: Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited; Atomic Energy of Canada Limited; International Nickel research centre; and the Ontario research foundation.

It is expected that Abitibi, Atomic Energy, and International Nickel will be completed and occupied this year, with the Ontario research foundation planning its move for early 1967.

A considerable portion of the entrance mall landscaping at Sheridan Park will be completed this year, which will add a great deal to the overall development. In addition, architects are developing the working drawings for the first stage of the commercial complex to be located in the community. This will allow banks, a restaurant, drugstore, computer centre, and office space to be integrated to suit the needs of the community.

At Sheridan Park, work was commenced in August 1965 for the construction of a new 180,000 square foot building complex to house the facilities of the Ontario research foundation. A contract signed with Mitchell Construction Company (Canada) for $5,470,-821 covers the erection of the building including the mechanical and electrical subcontracts for heating, air conditioning, and service distribution mains. To date, approximately $715,000 of this contract has been completed and the work in progress is proceeding on schedule, with the completion date forecast for the end of this year.

The Sheridan Park association, formed by the residents of Sheridan Park research community, received its charter on March 18, 1965. While membership is not obligatory, every company with research activities in the community, as well as those with research facilities under construction, are now members of this association. Its object is to promote and project the interest of its members, and to develop the true meaning and understanding of the word community.

What we have at Sheridan Park is a community devoted to research. As the hon. members know, there is a constant need for research and development in order for Canada to maintain a competitive position. Most of the products known to us today are different from those manufactured ten years ago. And ten years from now, the consumer will be buying products that do not exist today.

We are achieving in Sheridan Park, 17 miles west of Toronto, what some have called the community of technical man. Call it what you will—science city or space-age city—Sheridan Park is attracting top Canadian scientists and technicians who are deriving benefit from the cross-pollination of ideas in a scientific community where they are engaged in many different kinds of research.

By the end of this year, about $31 million worth of research buildings will have been constructed in Sheridan Park. Another $25 million is expected to be invested in 1967. When Sheridan Park is fully developed, it will be a scientific community of 6,000 scientists and technicians, with a capital investment of $100 million and, we anticipate, an annual payroll of $42 million.

Of the 340 acres in Sheridan Park research community, only 85 acres remain to be sold at this date. As you recall, we anticipated Sheridan Park, when it was started, would not be completed until 1970. Currently, there are five new firms negotiating now with the corporation to take property out of Sheridan Park.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on some of the activities of the women's committee. Last year, the department's women's advisory committee held 11 conferences across the province, with at least one held in each of the regional development areas. Attendance at these conferences totalled 5,420 women. There have been a number of instances where many people could not be accommodated because of lack of space.

During the Canadian National Exhibition last year, at the booth staffed by members of the women's advisory committee, approximately 300 women each day heard the "Shop Canadian" theme outlined to them through the presentation of a capsule fashion show. At least 15,000 persons were reached directly and in a most personal manner. They were informed of their role in the economy and the urgency for their support of Canadian industry.

The end result has been a new attitude on the part of retailers and their customers for Canadian products because of women's demands.

This year, as the result of numerous verbal and written requests, a pilot programme for young adults will be carried out. It has been agreed by the committee that four conferences be held for grades 12 and 13 students. These will be scheduled for widely separated areas in order to enable the committee to properly assess the value of continuing or extending this type of programme.

A recent survey on spending habits points up the fact that these young adults not only often buy their own clothing, but also cars, stereophonic equipment, cameras, and many other articles which represent substantial sums of money, all of which is spent without too much thought to shopping Canadian. The programme will be planned to show them that their support of Canadian products could mean future job opportunities when they come into the labour force.

I believe the hon. members will agree it is a good thing to have women personally involved in the development of our economy. Unfortunately, many women throughout the province are not able to attend the regular conferences held by the women's advisory committee because they live outside the larger centres. This year the committee will invite the women's organizations in the smaller Ontario communities to participate in the "Shop Canadian" programme. These local organizations will be asked to plan the meetings and guarantee the audiences. The women's advisory committee will provide speakers, a film presentation, and the format for a discussion period. Present plans call for meetings to be held in such places as North Bay, New Liskeard, Kirkland Lake, Dryden, and possibly Kenora.

A number of regular women's conferences will be held this year in conjunction with our "Shop Canadian" campaigns, and additional conferences for women will be held in St. Thomas and Oshawa.

The major women's conference of the year was held in April in Toronto—over 700 attended—where displays of furniture, foods, fashions, and crafts were shown. The Ontario food council, the furniture industry, and the manufacturers of high-fashion accessories co-operated with us in this venture. The advisory committee members sought out the finest crafts in each regional area of the province for display. It is hoped that in this manner greater interest in Ontario souvenir articles will be generated. A special showing of these handicrafts is planned for distributors and buyers of resort and tourist shops.

The objectives of the women's advisory committee is to inform as many women as possible of the fact that Canadian products are of high quality and good design, and are competitively priced to meet the challenge of imported articles. By creating demands for things Canadian, the women of Ontario can help provide new job opportunities for all Canadians, and we suggest that the job saved may be their own.

One of the department's special projects is an international advertising campaign to promote the province of Ontario as an industrial and financial centre. Several months ago, the department commissioned an exhaustive piece of motivational research designed to examine potentials for expanding the market for Canadian products. It took the form of an intense appraisal of the psychological factors which characterize and influence the attitudes of consumers and retailers with respect to products made in Canada.

Results confirmed that a great deal of ignorance and misinformation exist with regard to Canada. Extremely little is known about our province, and that which is known reflects a decided lack of knowledge and a considerable amount of distortion. Much of this is in great part Canada's own fault, and Ontario's advertising campaign is one means by which we have sought to correct these impressions.

Our international advertising campaign is not an area development programme. Its objectives are far broader. The audience we have selected in each country is made up primarily of business people. They are the decision-makers—community leaders, the kind of people who need to know all the facts about Ontario. We are presenting in our advertising campaign those elements within our society which truly reflect progress, sophistication, imagination, complexity, diversity, skill, and a marked concentration of industry and labour. We show why Ontario is the province of opportunity, a province that will attract new industry, provide a vast consumer market for the goods produced, and supply to foreign markets, with few exceptions, the same products available from other highly industrialized countries.

We believe our present international advertising campaign offers an effective promotional umbrella for all of the department's international activities. This year we intend

to extend our international advertising campaign, particularly in the field of immigration.

The hon. members have all received a copy of a multicolor, prestige book called "Ontario 66." Advertising in overseas markets can be extremely expensive in respect to the kind of people we want to reach and develop as industrial prospects. In a country such as Norway, for example, there are probably not more than 2,000 people we would want to contact. The cost of advertising in the usual way would be prohibitive in such cases.

"Ontario 66" has filled this need. Published in English, French and German, it has been mailed to some 72,000 business and professional people throughout the world. In addition, a number of leading Ontario firms have purchased copies of the book to use in advertising and promotional campaigns of their own. Faced with intense competition from dozens of highly advanced countries, the province of Ontario has had to produce high-quality promotional material to tell the Ontario story in the most advantageous way.

On January 26 in *Hansard* page 31, I spoke briefly of the department's activities in immigration. The Ontario government's immigration policy continues to be a major contributor to the provincial economy.

Because of this growing need for specialized workers, the government expanded its immigration activities in 1965. In the past, Ontario's immigration branch concentrated its efforts on the United Kingdom through Ontario House, London; now, it is recruiting in Scandinavia, Holland and Germany. The fullest co-operation is being given by the federal authorities in an endeavour to welcome emigration from these countries. The new Glasgow office in Scotland, opened in 1965, has reported a heavy volume of traffic, helping considerably in total recruitment.

The department's specialized recruitment service seeks immigrants only when positions are available which cannot be filled from the present Canadian labour supply. The immigration branch does not function as a placement agency, but rather as a service through which an employer can secure the workers he requires to ensure the economic operation of his business. This is a free service provided as part of Ontario's economic development programme.

Last year, the department's immigration branch provided information to about 12,000 potential immigrants. Of this number, some 4,500 attended for personal interviews for specific job vacancies in Ontario. Altogether, 1,800 skilled workers were selected for placement with some 140 companies.

In a further effort to attract skilled workers to Ontario, this government recently launched an advertising campaign to interest skilled workers and professional people in coming to this province. The response to date has been excellent—over 23,000 people have contacted the department's immigration branch for further information. All indications are that the department will assist substantially more skilled workers and professional people to settle in Ontario in the coming year. This programme is an important part of Ontario's economic programme. One of the major factors affecting Ontario's economic expansion this year will be the shortage of skilled workers.

Immigrants interested in coming to Ontario ask many and varied questions about the province's economic and social conditions. To provide most of the answers, the department prepared a book, "Ontario Style," which is already in the hands of the hon. members. The book provides information which skilled and professional industrial workers require before making a decision to emigrate. It was not designed nor intended to be used as a general immigration guidebook. The department's research has shown that attempts to cover all regions and occupations in the province is inefficient and costly.

The Ontario economic council continues to meet monthly and to report to government its findings and recommendations.

A word of explanation of the council's role might be in order. While composed of representatives of industry, labour, agriculture, the universities, consumer organizations, government, and other sectors of the economy, it does not attempt to perform a counterpart function to that of the economic council of Canada.

Ontario is not a separate economy, but a part of the national economy—indeed, its largest and most significant segment. While the Ontario economic council works closely with the economic council of Canada in a number of its research programmes, and participates in some on a shared-cost basis with other federal agencies, it leaves very largely to the economic council of Canada the national overview of broad economic problems and potentials.

Nor does the Ontario economic council duplicate economic research functions within

this government. It works closely with and draws on the experience of the office of the chief economist and of other departments and agencies.

The Ontario economic council, however, is not limited by my department, nor by the government as a whole, as to the areas it decides to study, or in which it decides to make recommendations. It is composed of people knowledgeable in many spheres, representative of the various facets of the Ontario economy, and incorporating many shades of political opinion. It might be of interest to note that, despite this diversity of background and belief, the economic council in its recommendations has always reached a consensus. There have been no minority reports.

In accordance with its terms of reference, the Ontario economic council reports directly to government and, in some instances, publishes its findings for broad distribution. It has a small permanent staff and a number of consultants. The bulk of the council's research activities are undertaken through universities. Engaged in such projects currently are staff members of the universities of Windsor, Western Ontario, York, and Toronto. Other institutions have been used in the past.

Of the $211,000 total budget of the council, close to half goes for these research projects and publication expenses related thereto. A significant proportion of these funds, however, has been and will be, recoverable through federal participation. Total expenditures of the Ontario economic council in the year just ended, for example, were under $190,000.

The council has not hesitated to criticize where it felt criticism was due—federally, provincially, and municipally. This was also contemplated when this independent body was established. One need only recall recommendations relating to regional development and to the report on the tourist industry to illustrate this point.

Here are a few of the activities undertaken by the council in the year just ended, and planned for 1966-1967: The conference on productivity through new technology, sponsored in Toronto last summer in association with the economic council of Canada, and in which management and labour participated, was so successful that a similar conference was held in Winnipeg last February. Nine research papers were commissioned and of the conference cost of some $20,000, nearly $6,000 was recovered in registration fees.

The widely discussed report on the tourist industry, the first study of its kind made in Canada, and priced at $2 per copy, has sold out all of its first printing of 3,000 copies and nearly all its second—1,500 copies. It has also won acclaim in many other parts of Canada. For example, the Manitoba travel and convention association recently termed it a "most specific, down-to-earth report on what makes the tourist industry tick" and "a splendid job of analyzing and soundly evaluating the tourist industry."

The council issued last summer a report on immigration and human resource development, copies of which were made available to all hon. members. This study was undertaken through a federal-provincial intergovernmental committee, incorporating representatives of the federal Departments of Citizenship and Immigration, and Labour; and the provincial Departments of Education, Labour, and Citizenship, and the immigration branch of The Department of Economics and Development.

The Ontario economic council also initiated, in co-operation with federal authorities, a province-wide survey of current and projected skill shortages. The council is continuing its work in this field in association with all federal and provincial departments and agencies concerned.

Just released is a study and series of recommendations related to potential improvements in the use of Ontario's marginal and submarginal land. Copies of this report have been made available to the hon. members. This is a joint economic council-ARDA project in which research officers of various provincial departments and universities participated.

The Ontario economic council will publish later this spring the first evaluation undertaken in Canada of federal-provincial-municipal programmes for training and upgrading the skills of the unemployed. Undertaken through a research team from the University of Western Ontario, the report will give us an opportunity to assess the investment in this skill upgrading process and the direction it should take in future.

There are other reports on the way. With the recall of all the Ford engine-plant workers in Windsor, a team of University of Windsor professors is now engaged in an analysis for the council of the experience of those temporarily laid off from this particular facility as the result of modernization and expansion under the Canada-U.S. auto trade agreement. This particular project, which should be com-

pleted later this year, was suggested, as you will recall, during the course of our estimates last year.

There are a number of other activities, reports on which will be made from time to time during the coming year. Some of these deal with barriers to labour mobility, Canada's and Ontario's international competitive position in terms of industrial tax policies, factors which govern industrial location and relocation within Ontario, and a series of case histories on skill acceleration.

While this report touches on only a few of the council's many activities, hon. members will agree, I am sure, that the Ontario economic council is making a most valuable contribution and we will continue to profit from its work.

In 1965 the Ontario development agency greatly expanded its activities, particularly in regard to its programme of advisory services. Some 1,700 companies and individuals were given guidance on a wide variety of technical, financial and managerial problems. To make these services more widely available, the agency's consultants paid visits to 15 Ontario centres. In total, 300 companies availed themselves of these on-the-spot advisory services. These concerns have an annual sales volume exceeding $38 million and employ nearly 2,500 workers.

Special consideration has been given to tourist operators. More than 300 have received advice and guidance to help them operate more efficiently, and this has been provided not only in Toronto but in widely scattered locations in northern and eastern Ontario. Many have been helped to stay in business, operate more efficiently, and obtain financial assistance from the regular lenders.

Intensifying its efforts, ODA has inaugurated special tourist workshops in which the basic principles of finance and management are outlined in simple, practical terms. Special tourist workshops have already been held in Ottawa and North Bay, and several more are planned for other locations in the province.

To supplement the more formal training programmes available to small business, the agency initiated a new management training programme in 1965. One-day pilot workshops were held in Chatham, St. Catharines, and London; and future workshops are planned for other parts of the province. The objective of these workshops is to present management and engineering techniques in a simplified form and to enable small operators, who are unable to attend more formalized courses, to be given intensified instruction at times and in locations suitable to them.

Guarantees of working capital approved during the year raised the total to 48, involving $4.8 million. Including the $14 million which Ontario companies have been able to obtain as a result of the agency's efforts, without any financial participation by the government, the total financing made available to Ontario companies has amounted to almost $19 million.

Good progress was made by the companies in receipt of guarantees and the majority of them substantially increased their efficiency and earnings during the year. Seven companies completely retired their guarantees while a number of others are rapidly approaching that stage. The province's liability in respect of the $4.8 million in guarantees has now been reduced to $1.4 million. No further losses were incurred in 1965 since I reported to the House last year.

Hon. members have all been apprised of the government's intention to convert the ODA into a Crown corporation and widen its scope of activities on behalf of small business. This decision was based on our experiences in operating an aid for small business programme through ODA and also the need to meet present-day challenges and to help industrial decentralization, as outlined by the hon. Prime Minister to the Legislature early this year.

I would like to say a word, Mr. Chairman, on Expo '67. The Department of Economics and Development is in charge of Ontario's participation in the world's fair, as hon. members know. This occasion marks the first time that Canada has participated in this type of a show. This also is the first time that Ontario has had anything to do with a project as large as this one.

Through its participation at the world exhibition, the province will present to the people of Canada a view of Ontario's heritage and accomplishments, with emphasis on the acceleration of social and economic development. The pavilion deals with the province as it was when the first Ontarians—our Indians —inhabited the land and it traces the patterns of settlement and development into the future.

The world fair will have some 73 countries and the 10 Canadian provinces participating. Present indications are that Ontario will rank seventh in size amongst international and provincial participants at Expo.

Many hon. members will recall the department's preview of Ontario's world fair project in February last year. Since that time,

working drawings for the pavilion and exhibits have been completed. Construction was started on the building on November 17, 1965 and the project is on schedule.

Expo '67 is already providing a boost to business in Ontario and Canada. To date, approximately $30 million in direct and indirect business from Expo '67 has accrued to Ontario business and industry, and we have hopes for as much again. In addition, we expect over $150 million in additional tourist traffic through our province in 1967 as a result of Canada's centennial celebration.

I believe hon. members will agree that the scale of Ontario's participation in this universal and international world exhibition is fitting and necessary at this time in our history, and that it presents many opportunities to further Canadian unity, particularly between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

I can assure hon. members that we will have a number of surprises for all who attend the fair, and the Ontario pavilion will be cited as a tribute to all of the people of Ontario, past and present, who have made this province a place of opportunity for all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Are there any more surprises in the cost?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are lots of surprises, but not in the cost.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to close in discussing the housing programme.

During 1965 there was an excellent response by Ontario municipalities, and the corporation completed a total of 28 surveys of need and demand, which resulted in requests for housing developments. A further 25 surveys are either completed and have been presented to municipal councils, are underway, or will be undertaken very shortly.

In response to municipal requests, the present housing programme of the corporation, based on established need and demand, exceeds 10,000 units. Requests were not confined to the larger urban centres. In point of fact, the corporation's programme includes small semi-rural communities where the need is for as few as six units.

Here is a brief summation of the Ontario housing programme as it stands to date; and these figures represent the total programme to date. I will give you a breakdown on Metro and other Ontario areas in a few seconds.

Completed or purchased April 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966, 1,752 houses—these houses are all under management and have been allocated to tenants.

Under construction, 1,634 houses, on which contracts have been awarded and the houses are being built.

This is a total of 3,386 in this last year.

Purchase of existing housing underway, 1,330 houses—these have all been inspected and appraised and completion of the purchase is underway.

Tenders or proposals called for 1966 construction, 3,109 houses—all houses in this category will be under construction in 1966. In the case of tenders, a contract will be awarded within the next few weeks, and in the case of proposals, the builder's schemes have been accepted subject to his obtaining the necessary municipal approval.

Architectural designs underway, 2,516 houses—this is in respect of direct construction by the corporation on its own land. Architectural consultants are hired by the corporation to design the houses, then public tenders are called. Examples are Alexandra park, Napier place, and Thistletown.

Preliminary planning underway, 789 houses —this category includes all houses which have been formally requested by municipalities but have not yet reached the design or proposal stage.

The total is 11,130 houses.

When amendments to The National Housing Act were enacted in 1964, Ontario was the only province which took immediate steps to implement the kind of housing programme made possible by this legislation. During the past year many provinces have shown a tremendous interest in Ontario housing corporation and in the scope of its programme. A number of these inquiries have resulted in the corporation providing other provinces with complete details of its legislation, operating procedures, organizational structure, and so on.

There has been a particularly close liaison with the province of Quebec which, I am advised, will be creating a similar Crown corporation during the present session of the Quebec Legislature. Other provinces which have indicated their interest in proceeding along these lines are Nova Scotia, Alberta and Prince Edward Island.

The corporation was determined at its inception to employ every available technique to produce quickly and at reasonable prices the housing units requested by Ontario municipalities. One of the fundamental factors was a desire to make use of the "know-how"

of private builders and the real estate industry.

This did not mean an automatic discarding of all previous methods, but did require a precise analysis of the methods which had been accepted in the past as standard procedures. Had the Ontario housing corporation relied entirely on the former methods of producing housing, its objectives during the year 1965 could not have been achieved.

Operating within the extremely flexible framework of The National Housing Act, Ontario housing corporation has utilized a variety of techniques to produce housing quickly and at reasonable cost. Existing multiple and single family units have been purchased across Metropolitan Toronto and in other parts of Ontario.

As with any departure from established practices, the corporation's activities in this regard received some criticism. However, these were met with patience and understanding and when all the facts on this approach to providing housing were made known, the objections subsided and a harmonious assimilation of families was achieved.

In addition to purchasing existing property, the corporation has achieved considerable success using the builder proposal technique. This success can be measured not only in terms of time involved from inception to completion of development, but also in terms of economics.

By building houses of a design with which they are familiar, most merchant builders can produce housing costing considerably less than under the conventional method of buildings to fixed designs and specifications. In Metropolitan Toronto, this technique is proving successful, and in many of the smaller communities of Ontario it is perhaps the only way in which housing can be developed within reasonable economic bounds.

In Metropolitan Toronto where the greatest need and demand exists, builders and real estate brokers have played a vital role during the past year. With their help, the Ontario housing corporation's programme in Metro now stands as follows:

Completed or purchased from April 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966, 1,360 houses; under construction, 706 houses; purchase of existing housing under way, 1,303 houses; tenders or proposals called for 1966 construction, 1,974 houses; architectural design under way, 1,533 houses; preliminary planning under way, 380 houses.

Total is 7,256 houses.

Of course, the Ontario housing programme is not by any means confined to Metropolitan Toronto. As I mentioned earlier, many other communities, large and small, across the province have requested housing and in each of these the corporation is at some stage of development or the houses have been completed and occupied. In summary, the present status of the programme is as follows:

Completed or purchased from April 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966, 392 houses; under construction, 928 houses; purchase of existing housing under way, 27 houses; tenders or proposals called for 1966 construction, 1,135 houses; architectural design under way, 983 houses; preliminary planning under way, 409 houses.

Total is 3,874 houses.

Those two figures add up to 11,000 and some odd, as I mentioned before.

In the short time that Ontario housing corporation has been in existence more than 90 Ontario municipalities have requested its assistance under the new housing programme. Just to give hon. members an indication of the cross-section of communities which the housing programme is reaching, included in this report is a list of the many communities in which Ontario housing corporation will be building this year: Metropolitan Toronto, Kingston, Port Arthur, Arnprior, Kitchener, Port Credit, Belleville, Lindsay, Port Elgin, Brantford, Listowel, Prescott, Brockville, London, Richmond Hill, Burlington, Longlac, Riverside, Calvert township, Mattawa, St. Catharines, Chelmsford, Midland, St. Thomas, Cochrane, Niagara Falls, Sarnia, Fort Frances, North Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, Galt, Oakville, Stratford, Gore Bay, Oshawa, Sudbury, Guelph, Ottawa, Teck township, Hamilton, Owen Sound, Toronto township, Harriston, Palmerston, Timmins, Kapuskasing, Penetang, Walkerton, Kenora, Peterborough, Waterloo.

While great strides have been made in resolving the problem of providing housing accommodation for those in need, there is certainly no room for complacency. Much more has to be done, and I am sure the hon. members will appreciate the magnitude of this programme and its many ramifications.

Some weeks ago during his Budget address, my colleague the hon. Provincial Treasurer, in referring to the housing programme, said:

> In addition, other facets of development which appear possible under existing legislation will be carefully explored with central mortgage and housing corporation.

At that time, he was not able to be more specific as we had not then concluded certain discussions with the federal government. I have since been advised of the federal government's willingness to participate in the financing, through central mortgage and housing corporation, of a major student housing programme to be developed by Ontario housing corporation. This programme was announced quite recently by the hon. Minister of University Affairs.

The programme which is intended to supplement, not supersede, the universities' own programmes, will be available at this time to provincially assisted universities only. However, we have expressed to the hon. Mr. Nicholson, in Ottawa, our desire to expand this programme to include a broader range of educational institutions, such as teaching hospitals, community colleges and technical colleges, which face the same serious shortage of accommodation. Mr. Nicholson has indicated his complete sympathy with our objectives and it is expected that The National Housing Act will be amended so that the student housing programme may be widened in its scope.

I do not see this new activity of the corporation as being substantially different from its current housing programme. Its success, however, will largely depend on careful planning and proper co-ordination with universities. For this reason, I do not anticipate the programme will get under way until later in the year.

During the year ahead, Ontario housing corporation will have an opportunity to prove itself in another programme which should be of vital interest to every member of this Legislature. Over the past several months a special committee of senior officials, both provincial and federal, has been working toward the establishment of a community development programme for Ontario residents of Indian descent. Ontario housing corporation is represented on this committee, as the corporation will have a key role to play in this programme.

It is clearly recognized that housing alone is not the answer to the problems facing Indian families any more than is education, employment or welfare. Only collectively do these various services comprise a total community development programme. It is an undeniable fact, however, that housing must be provided as quickly as possible.

Just as in our Ontario housing programme, it was necessary to purchase existing dwellings to meet the immediate critical need, so undoubtedly it will be necessary for the corporation to use a substantial number of prefabricated dwellings to meet the immediate and pressing need in its programme for Indian families.

Again, I do not look upon this as a special programme divorced from the other activities of the corporation. In many areas in which housing for Indian families is needed, there is also a serious deficiency of good housing for other members of the community. I would not wish housing for Indian families to be set apart from the remainder of the community as we will never achieve any degree of assimilation in this way.

What we are developing, therefore, is a housing unit which can be readily erected by local unskilled labour, which can be added to if necessary in the form of additional accommodation or improved facilities when municipal services such as a piped water supply and main sewers are available, and which will meet the needs of both Indian and non-Indian families in the community.

In carrying out this programme, Ontario housing corporation will work in close collaboration with other departments such as Education and Public Welfare to ensure there is no overlapping of responsibilities in working toward the common goal of providing a better way of life for Indian families of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, during his interesting remarks, the hon. Minister at one point said that he hoped that no part of his department would fall prey to the quantitative theory of quality; and I would say offhand, that I hope he himself is not falling prey to it either.

We have come a long time from the day, some years ago, when the former Premier, hon. Mr. Frost, indicated to his Ministers that a brief statement having to do with the affairs of their department would be in order. But, as the Minister would be quick to reply, there has been certain development in the way the estimates are dealt with by the Opposition as well, and I would say that his fulsome report on the work of his department has been well prepared and will serve us for some useful and lengthy study in the days that lie ahead—probably in the year between this occasion and the one that will follow immediately.

In this connection I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. members would be interested to know that, having kept careful count during the Minister's remarks, I would tell them

that there are 20,000 words in this document that he has just read to us. And since he is asking for about $20 million, my quick mind has come to the conclusion that every one of his pearls of wisdom is worth $1,000 itself.

This, more than anything else, might indicate to us, as members, the extent of government costs as we pick up this tome and realize that we are paying $1,000 a word for it, this is a bit more than the cost of printing.

Mr. Chairman, there is one item to which the hon. Minister referred in his closing remarks that is of special interest to me. I would like to comment on it at this point, because there is another person in the House who would be specifically interested in it as well. He made reference to the developing plan for the assistance of Indian communities in this province; and, while I represent the largest Indian reserve in Ontario, as he knows, as I have told him so often, there is a good friend of all of us here in the person of Mr. Gary Montour, one of our pages. He has been listening to these remarks, as well as some others associated with his own community, and I know that if I do not get the word back to the Indians in Brant county then he will when he returns at the end of this session—if that time ever comes up.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we have, as I say, listened with interest to the Minister's remarks; and, with additional interest, when we came in today we found the report of his department sitting on our desks. So we have had these two valuable documents presented to us before we discuss, in what I hope will be an intelligent manner, the voting of $20 million to further the work of Economics and Development in this province for the coming year.

There is a custom in other jurisdictions, where speeches of a certain type are going to be delivered, that they are accepted by the other members of the House—and I refer to the Congress of the United States—that these speeches can more or less be taken as read, put in the record and printed, so that members can peruse them in their own time and before the full debate comes up. I hesitate to recommend such a practice here. Our *Hansard* reports are already bulky enough, and contain sufficient material which is reported directly verbatim from the proceedings of this House without them being larded out with some additional information.

My point, however, is this: We are asked to discuss the workings of this important department and, in fact, to vote $20 million when the facts pertaining to it are presented to us immediately before our opinions have to be expressed publicly. Frankly, I am very glad that the report of the department is before us at this time, There was some rumour, two or three weeks ago, that the departmental estimates would be discussed at that time; in that case, of course, since this report must have been given to us as soon as it was available, we would not have had the information even at this late date.

But surely the hon. Minister, in his ability to convince large groups, could have gone to his people and said, "Not only must I have this on the date my estimates are presented, but I must have it two weeks ahead of time." It would have been even more useful as far as we in the Opposition are concerned—and, I submit, even more useful as far as the people of Ontario are concerned.

I do not want to dwell on this because I realize that it is not possible for all the departmental reports to be available—at least it appears that it is not possible—but I would hope that this Minister might do better in the future so that the information would be more readily available for us when we discuss the work of his department.

Having been somewhat critical of the Minister's lengthy speech and, at the same time, giving him a compliment on its completeness and usefulness, I want to refer myself to some prepared comments having to do with the work of his department.

I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to compare the function of The Department of Economics and Development under this Minister with that of his immediate predecessor, Mr. Macaulay. You will remember that, in the two years between the formation of the Robarts administration and Mr. Macaulay's withdrawal from the Ministry in 1963, this House saw the department expand from an innocuous experiment to a commanding position in the affairs of government in the province. It was during those months that the Ontario development agency was brought into being with an announced capital of $100 million and, I might add in the words of the then Minister, "with another $100 million when that is gone."

At the time the ODA was being developed, the Minister introduced the Ontario economic council, to which I will refer later. He also announced a revolutionary, amazing, and still unfulfilled housing policy; and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, more than anyone else, became the

chief mover and shaker in the government as his policies in committees invaded every department and his economic state of the province speech was given on the day before the Budget itself was brought before this House.

Many of us here remember that the Minister's predecessor Mr. Macaulay, used this department to virtually take over the planning and fiscal policy of the entire government. I personally well remember the poorly concealed scowls from Minister after Minister as he would describe what his Department of Economics and Development had in store for the future of agriculture, tourism, mining, and so on down the list.

Of course, his introduction to the estimates of the department was given immediately before the Budget, and with much fanfare and hoopla. The hon. Provincial Treasurer's moderate speech on the following day appeared to be a very pale effort in comparison, even though, of course, it was of much greater importance.

I remember, as I say, Mr. Macaulay on one occasion being so used up and tired with the efforts of planning all of the government activities that he had to deliver his economic state of the province speech from a seated position, which of course added even more to the drama of the occasion.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, a good many of my colleagues remember the situation—yet we have withdrawn from that position, I feel, much to the detriment of the general affairs of the province. The Minister at that time had great plans for the expansion of agricultural trade with other nations and I know the hon. Minister will tell us later that this has been accomplished partially. The Minister in those days was practically going to take over the efforts of tourist expansion and now all we have to refer to is a rather critical report that the Minister himself mentioned, of which they seem to think very highly in Manitoba, but which indicates that we have done very little from those great Macaulay days.

I must say that we have not had that much style, gusto, and excitement from the department or anywhere else in the government since 1963. The former Minister reminded me of the television juggler whose main act was keeping an increasingly long row of plates spinning on their edges. He would nip back to the first plates just as they were about to clatter into immobility and failure. And then he would give them another little spin. It was an entertaining performance at the time but I remember it as being somewhat nerve-racking. In the end it was a fabulous display of energy and skill—but the torch has not been held high by this Minister the same way and we are still looking for the fruition of some of these great ideas that we were exposed to in years gone by.

My hon. friend, the present Minister, has a much easier approach. I personally believe that he is trying to do a good job. Speaking for a good many private members who have approached him on specific difficulties, we have no complaint whatsoever in the way he will mobilize the forces of his department to concentrate on a specific problem. But naturally, the $20 million that we are asked to vote deals with something I suppose even more important than the Minister's individual approach to his colleagues. His motives, I would submit, are good; but the results, in the broad view, are disappointing to say the least.

Well, to return specifically to the estimates, my first suggestion is that they be presented immediately before the Budget so that the economic situation of the province is described fully before the government's response in the Budget debate is made known. This is surely the trend that was taking place in the earlier days of the department. It was not supposed to be merely an agency to sell in foreign markets what we produce here; it was not primarily an agency for the selling of the government to the populace through billboards—this has been largely done away with, I would admit. But it was heading towards the position where the economic state of the province would be adequately and fully described before the hon. Provincial Treasurer would rise in his place and give to the people of Ontario, and the members of this House, the reaction the government would take to the economic needs of the day.

Now, this would emphasize that the government realizes that, as the provincial tax bite grows proportionately larger, its taxes and expenditures become more important as an instrument of fiscal policy, the most important instrument we have here in Ontario. As it is, our fiscal policy is no policy at all; it is merely the political decision of the government, a group of politicians sitting around a big table, as to where revenues can be increased with the least outcry from the people—or at least the section of the people to whose outcry the ear of the government is most sensitively attuned.

We have heard a good deal about the

possibilities of inflation, but it has never been made clear by the government that our Budget is designed to combat this. It is not made clear what sort of a Budget this is—an expansionist budget or what. And I would think a full economic report should have preceded the hon. Provincial Treasurer's Budget.

The hon. Prime Minister has indicated he would like to abdicate the fiscal responsibility that he wields in Ontario by allowing the federal government to increase its control over the main taxing powers that have been taken from the province. This would reinforce what he calls strong central government. And it is true that this would strengthen federal control of the economy. At the same time, the Prime Minister, in his remarks at the end of the Throne debate, referred to the fact that he sees the federal government making what he calls block grants back to the provinces that would be spent in general areas of our responsibility without any federal direction.

This is an important policy announcement indeed. My point, as it relates to these estimates, is whether this was taken after consultation with the economic council of this province, or whether it was a decision arrived at politically. I would say that if he can arrange it the way he has described it, so that our income is increased while the larger taxes needed are collected by the other level of government, he will have done a clever thing indeed.

I personally believe that better use of public funds and more responsibility is possible if the level of government that spends the money also accepts the responsibility for levying the taxes. Anything else, while highly desirable for political reasons, and perhaps even for general administrative neatness, moves away from economically responsible government.

But, of course, the strange overlapping of taxing rights and responsibilities is well known, as it occurs between the three levels of government. It might be settled if the Smith report were available. This has been referred to in the House before—the investigation carried on by, I believe, Mr. Lancelot Smith, into the taxing responsibilities in this province and in the municipalities in Ontario. But this is the second criticism that I have and it concerns the unconscionably long wait for this important document. If the Smith committee is waiting for the federal Carter report before completing its deliberations, or releasing the result of its deliberations, it is working a thoughtless hardship on the people of Ontario. The information in it should be available to us now, so that progress can be made in solving the vexing taxation problems with which we have become so familiar.

The Smith report is still shrouded in mystery and secrecy. Its lateness was blamed on federal procrastination by an official of this government, commenting at a meeting of the private bills committee; I have referred to this before. It has been predicted by the chief government economist that the report will be available this fall, and there is every reason to believe that his prediction is true. The fact remains that co-ordinated policy is being held up by the lack of information in this field. One of the most difficult areas of provincial responsibility that needs expert tax co-ordination information is that dealing with regional development, a programme that under this administration is sorely inadequate. It comes squarely under the responsibility of the hon. Minister, whose estimates we are discussing at this time.

The Prime Minister has made a statement on this. We have read it carefully and heard it discussed in this House and across the province. It is entitled "Design for Development."

It deals with this matter, sir, but it does little more than tell the boys in the field that the Cabinet is still thinking in terms of regional development. As a matter of fact, the title was so catchy that a good many people who are trying to predict the date of the next election thought that it might take the place of some of the slogans that we have been listening to from the government side for some months. But after looking through the grand design for development, we would readily see that this is going to be no election platform, and that we are going to have to wait even a bit longer before we have the opportunity to go to the people again.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Never replace the word "done."

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Prime Minister will permit me, it shamelessly sidesteps the pressing problems of reorganizing municipal units of government, and assures the wary that regional deveolpment has nothing to do with regional government. The emphasis, of course, shines through very clearly when the Prime Minister on every occasion when the two phrases are compared, jumps to his feet and says that he is not

interested in regional government in this connection at all, and that all we are suggesting is the overlay of another level of government. He is a little sensitive on this point and that is why I want to deal with it at this time.

If the government believes that it can divorce regional development from regional government, or at least a development along the line of regional government, then I submit to you that it simply proves that their development policy is meaningless and useless. The policy is without strength in that it has no machinery for seeing that the economically backward areas of Ontario are lifted into economic vitality. And no effective provision is made for planning, economic or otherwise, that transcends the smaller municipal boundaries.

It is true that the townships in many areas are moving toward a rationalization of important services among themselves. This is happening more rapidly in some areas than others. But leadership from this level is nonexistent, for fear of stepping on the toes of the local autonomy idol. This is the truth. The hon. Minister himself and his colleagues, particularly the Minister of Municipal Affairs, must surely admit this. But while so many of the townships are trying among themselves to co-ordinate their efforts in a broader area, this government sits back with its hands in the air, saying anything we can do to help we would be glad to do; but, of course, all the initiative must come from the local level. They are afraid to grasp this problem and take the leadership that could have been taken if the design for development had been, in fact, a useful and effective one.

Mr. Chairman, the province, as you know, is carved into ten economic regions on the basis of an old and outdated federal study made immediately following the war. Since that time, the development of our province has not followed precisely, or even nearly precisely, the expectations of the studies made almost 20 years ago. The first thing wrong then, with our present state of regional development, is that the regions do not have boundaries that coincide with communities with economic interests. It is obvious that the boundaries should pass through areas of greatest detachment from the main growth centres so that all functions of regional development that we would hope would develop in the future would apply as efficiently as possible, and with as little dislocation as possible.

I am sure the hon. Minister is aware of the need for a careful re-examination of these boundaries; in fact, he has said so. I suppose that it is not even essential that every last square mile of Ontario be included in an economic development region. It might well be that we should select the areas where our efforts would bear fruit now and reconstitute them. If we choose to call the body that is effective in the area an economic development council, as in fact the House does choose, then that is well and good. But we must proceed more rapidly than we are with redrawing these boundaries.

Second, the moneys made available for regional development are in no way realistic. Each regional council will now get sufficient to hire a manager and probably a small staff —a secretary or two. This staff's duties seem to be either as a professional fund-raising group, to supplement the meagre government financing, or as a public relations office to justify the existence of the regional council in the first place, and to attract municipalities to join.

There is no doubt that the withdrawal of a good many of the larger municipalities from the regions over the past years and months is one reason why the department and the government have finally realized that some change is necessary. I have heard it said that the funds that are used in the regional development associations formerly were merely acting as a subsidy to organize requests for further government assistance for highways, parks, conservation projects, and so on. This is no doubt a valuable function, but should be far down the list of true functions of a regional development organization.

The present organization of regions makes it impossible, or practically impossible, for the present government to do anything concrete to develop regions that are lagging behind economically. When this is compared with the federal regional development projects that have been in operation since 1963, we find the provincial plan is sadly lacking indeed.

The federal government makes decisions, politically difficult decisions, as to the designation of certain areas that must have special incentives so that their growth will match the growth of the rest of the communities. The first series of designations were outstandingly successful, although I know the Minister will be able to point out some areas where dislocations did develop—particularly political dislocations. I would draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, particularly the designation in the area around the city of Brantford and Brant county, of which I have

personal and some detailed knowledge. Any study will prove without doubt that the area so designated in 1963 has grown very rapidly indeed and has, in fact, caught up with the surrounding areas behind which it was lagging so seriously at the time.

The provincial government, while talking about equal opportunities, economic and otherwise, for all areas of the province, has been so afraid of making a decision that might detract from some pocket of regional support the government enjoyed politically that, in fact, regional development does not exist effectively at all.

The real function of the regional development council remains obscure. Some regions spend a good deal of their time trying to persuade urban municipalities to join the association and to take part in its financing, or to convince them to stay in. There are many examples where large municipalities have either never entered the associations in the first place, or have withdrawn recently.

I believe that an obvious solution to the problems of regional development is available to the government. It is buried in the remarks of the Prime Minister when he was discussing this matter some weeks ago, but I strongly urge that they adopt it and work more quickly and effectively toward its inauguration. The first step would be to redraw the boundaries of economic regions of Ontario, using modern statistics and the experience that has already been gained in this matter.

The hon. Minister knows that the province of Quebec which, he has said, frequently comes to his office for advice in regional development and similar matters, has blazed a trail for the effective drawing of regional development boundaries in a way whereby all of the government offices taking part in the work of the region itself can much more effectively operate.

An example comes immediately to mind in the area between the cities of Hamilton and Toronto, which has been so active recently in proposals to inaugurate a form of regional government in this rapidly growing area.

The problems in the general Peel-Halton regions are fairly uniform if Metro areas are excluded. They are associated with rapid urban growth, industrialization, the need for water supply and sewage disposal, planning beyond the boundaries of normal municipalities, rapid transit, location of community colleges, and so on down the list.

A second area that should be co-ordinated as a region centres on Galt, Kitchener, Waterloo, Preston and down into the Brantford area, with the possibility of Brantford being associated with Hamilton. The hon. Minister has said himself that considerably more research would have to go into the redrawing of the boundaries, but I submit to him, Mr. Chairman, that you can research and study forever, but somebody must make the decision to redraw these boundaries.

One of the significant developments in the last few years that has changed these regional situations has been the development of highways across the province. I suppose the Sheridan Park development is well located because it is on the Queen Elizabeth Way; the development along the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, particularly in the Kitchener area, is well known, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that Highway 403 is going to have a similar, salutary effect on the Brantford area.

It is in this connection that I would like to mention briefly the need for realization of the impact of these new highways on the regional development of some of the more backward economic areas of Ontario. The fact that the highway count does not justify the building of these roads may be a deterrent to the decision of the hon. Minister's colleague, the hon. Minister of Highways, but it should not be a deterrent to him. He must surely realize by now that in so many of the areas that I have just listed, it has been the highway that has brought the development that is so badly needed in, let us say, the areas represented by my good friends, the hon. members for Bruce and Grey counties.

The hon. Minister may not be aware that, as recently as last night, a meeting of the county councils in this area passed resolutions and discussed at some length the need for the highways as a part of the regional development in that area. I hope the Minister does not abdicate his responsibilities in this connection and will not allow the Minister of Highways to insist on certain traffic counts before this tool of development—expensive but effective—can be brought into play.

Those members who have their attention focused on the "golden horseshoe" will soon become aware, if they are not already, of the absolutely astounding development in the area that has become known as the "golden triangle"—Kitchener, Galt and Guelph—and I would predict that their development may, in the years that lie ahead, equal and surpass that around Toronto and Hamilton.

My own feeling, as I have already said, is that the construction of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway had much to do with the accelerated development of the Kitchener-Guelph-Galt region. The federal designation of the Brant area brought it into line economically with this area known as the "golden triangle," and this large and emerging economic complex in the valley of the Grand river might constitute one of the new regions that I have referred to. I suppose it would be the largest and wealthiest if it could be put together as a community of economic interest.

However, some overall co-ordination of the planning in this area is essential. The location of highways, the development of the conservation work in the Grand valley, the establishment of new schools at the post-secondary level, the control of urban sprawl and the proper utilization of some of the best farmland in the world, is only a partial list of the pressing problems of this second region that I have brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that this first step to redraw the boundaries of the regions making them reflect the requirements of the 1970s is required immediately.

The second step involves the co-ordinating of the Cabinet's responsibilties in this province so that the decentralization of the various provincial departments would take place in these new regional boundaries. All of us, as members of this House dealing with the various government departments, can see advantages to the emerging policy of the government whereby certain departments have divided the responsibilities across Ontario into regions.

We have become familiar with The Department of Highways districts, the provincial police districts, the area offices for Welfare, Labour, and so on down the list. I have watched with interest as The Department of Education has established regional offices. The part of this policy that is difficult to understand is that the regions or areas that I have referred to do not coincide in any way and they form a patchwork of changing responsibilities right across the province. Co-ordination of the efforts of these departments is therefore impossible, and the second recommendation having to do with regional development is that these regions of the province form the boundaries for the decentralized responsibilities of the government.

The hon. Prime Minister has already announced that this is his long-range aim. It is part of the grand design, and it is surprising to hear the hon. Minister of Education announce the day following the enunciation of the grand design, that the new regions for his department do not coincide with the Robarts design. I do not know whether there is anything significant in this fact, other than the realization that all of these things take time, but surely a sincere commitment to carry it out speedily is needed, and it is needed now.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that if these regions had within them various provincial government offices located in some central place, the effectiveness and importance of the regions would soon become apparent. Not only would the various municipalities and authorities within the region be contacting the same people for advice and a variety of services, but surely more important than that, the provincial services themselves would, for once, be co-ordinated as they apply to the region.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the government is not going to act on the main recommendations of the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts. I know that the hon. member for Waterloo South has tried to reconcile the various statements made by the government, but if he would step back from the trees in which he finds himself and look at the forest, he would see that there has been a general withdrawal from the original ideas of establishing regional government across Ontario.

Nevertheless, regions developed on this basis would give a more effective means of co-ordinating not only the economic development but all the responsibilities of the government, and even more important than that, they would also serve as a framework in which the co-operative widening of municipal responsibilities could take place.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister would agree that it is neither fair nor reasonable to compare the workings of his economic council—the economic council of Ontario — with the economic council of Canada. His report, which I leafed through in the few minutes before the House started today, assigns two pages to the work of the economic council of Ontario. But the report of the federal council for the past two years has been a most important document giving basic directions, not only to the fiscal policy of Canada, but according to the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, setting out short- and long-range goals as well.

It must be true, however, that the national

goals set up by the federal economic council in reality will be achieved only if the economies with the various provinces produce their share. There must be careful and rather elaborate interpretation, not only of how our provincial goals fit into this overall plan, but just how statistically we are making out. These two responsibilities can be fulfilled, not only by the Ontario economic council but also by our chief economist, Mr. MacDonald.

According to the publicity about him, he must surely be the most influential civil servant in Ontario. Apparently he is not only expected to be chief economic adviser, but also to provide the necessary advice in constitutional matters—a very tough assignment indeed and one which I believe to be hardly realistic for one man. I say this without questioning his abilities at all, and in fact say that the opinions expressed concerning this gentleman by those who are familiar with his work, past and present, would indicate that he is an outstanding addition to the government service.

When you add to this the fact, the rumour, I would say, that he may take on the additional responsibility as secretary of the Cabinet committee on regional development, he is going to be a very busy man indeed, and may not have time to attend the various convocations where honorary doctorates will no doubt be proffered to him in the months and years that lie ahead.

I was interested to see that the former darling of the government, Mr. Gathercole, who has taken on somewhat independent responsibilities in Hydro, is being fittingly and suitably honoured by York University. I suppose that in some respects, Mr. MacDonald is stepping into those shoes and I would hope the government is not going to demand so much of him that his efficiency and effectiveness is going to be diminished.

I feel the economic council of Ontario, since its inception under the direction of the former Minister has been considerably less effective than we had hoped. It should be the centre for co-ordinating the various departmental efforts based on economic requirements worked out by the council staff. It was probably with this in mind that the former Minister found himself in the position of stepping on the toes of his ministerial colleagues, but it becomes more and more apparent that the various government departments are either acquiring their own experts in these fields, or at least acting as if they had acquired them, and going off fairly independently on these development projects that they have. The report of the council is not impressive, and even the references to its work in past years by the hon. Minister himself, would indicate that it has been relegated to a secondary role.

I believe that it is obvious that the economic council of this province should work with the chief economist to interpret Ontario's part in the national goals outlined by the economic council of Canada, and it is in no way apparent to me that this has been done, or will be done in the future. It would be useful if the council would prepare a report dealing with its overall view of the provincial economy on a year-to-year basis. As a guide to the government in establishing policy of a fiscal nature, it would be invaluable. For the citizens of the province it would give the information and professional forecast that only the economic council of Canada makes available on a national basis now. Such a report would stimulate discussions, thought and planning and would be most worthwhile. To prepare such a report the Ontario council would have to act even more independently than it does now. It would have to be prepared to comment on previous governments' acts and make strong policy recommendations of a broad nature for the future.

We are increasingly aware that the growth rate experienced at the present time in Ontario is the fastest since the war. In fact it is beautifully described in one publication as an overbloom. Many people knowledgeable in the field of economics feel very strongly that the unmanaged expansion of the economy is building up trouble for 1967 and 1968. We are now pressing against our financial resources as indicated by the high and increasing interest rates, and certainly pressing against our skilled labour resources as the hon. Minister outlined in his own remarks.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer himself indicated a few weeks ago that the only dampener on the continuing expansion was the availability of skilled labour. The Minister in his remarks said that there was no possibility for further expansion because we now were happily experiencing full employment. I suppose if we are considering a possible expansion of the labour force we would say, "suffering from full employment." There is no longer a pool of people who can be drawn upon to fill the expanding needs in industry right across the province. It is an excellent situation that has developed.

The Minister referred to the fact that he was stepping up his attempt to bring

people into this province from other countries. But a policy, of course, in this connection, is not to "give me your tired and your poor," which I believe are the words on the Statue of Liberty in the entrance of New York harbour, but more it is, "give us your wealthy and your educated." It is not strange that under these circumstances we find that last year only a few more than 1,000 immigrants were effectively fitted into the industrial requirements of Ontario.

In this connection I feel that our immigration policy could very well be liberalized, using small letters all the way through that word, so that we can actually provide in this province a place to which people from other countries who have no opportunity at all for their inherent skills, would be able to come and take part in our own development. I think particularly of the efforts of our own hon. Minister of Agriculture in co-operation with the federal authority to bring in workers from Jamaica and other coloured workers from these areas. I understand they are going to be brought in on short-term visas only, and will be ushered out of the country as soon as their labour has been accomplished. Surely we can have a broader view of the labour requirements for Ontario and across Canada? My own view is that the hon. Minister's policies in this regard are unduly restrictive, and there is much that can be done to improve the labour supply in Ontario.

The education budget contains large sums that will help with the provision of the technologists we need. The vocational schools at the secondary level, programme 5, institutes of trades, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, vocational centres, schools of technology, and colleges of applied arts and technology, are about the most complete list—that I could think of—of institutions that will be providing these technicians. But what is still lacking is a level of training in technology that goes beyond any of these schools.

The hon. Minister must surely be aware that even graduates from Ryerson, and the good schools across the province, are not, by any stretch of the imagination, ready to step into the job of top technicians and technologists that are so desperately needed. They have to go through years of additional training on the job before they can fill this, which is probably the greatest need of all. So what is still lacking, as I have said, is a level of training that goes beyond any of the schools we presently have.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, it is extremely difficult to transfer from these schools to an engineering course at a university level. So that all of them are, in a very real sense, terminal in nature. All you have to do is talk to some of the recent graduates from Ryerson; those that have done well, let us say, in the technology of chemistry and design, find that if they want to go on to university, even though the hon. Minister of Education assures them that they have every right to do so, they find that after three years at Ryerson they are given credit for, at best, only one year on an undergraduate basis so that they slip very far behind and cannot consider taking these many extra years to take them to the higher qualifications.

I have a concrete proposal that I would hope the hon. Minister and his colleagues will consider seriously. I would propose that advanced training in technology be offered by the province in facilities built at Sheridan Park. Elaborate private research facilities are being built there on land owned and serviced by this government. The staff employed in private industrial research, together with the Ontario research foundation, could provide and superivse the instruction at this advanced level of technology and give the students an opportunity to work on real problems of industry at the same time.

Now, a good many people have suggested this previously. I cannot understand why the hon. Minister, with his typical enthusiasm, could not seize on this suggestion—and, at a time when we are making such expensive and important developments in Sheridan Park, why we could not include there facilities for the training, the advanced training, of these technologists. I am sure the people employed by private industry, by the firms that he listed for us a few minutes ago, I am sure they would be delighted to spend a part of their time in working with these students who would in no way be beginners. They would have received the best that is already available at the non-university level in Ontario. Now, this is something that can be done; and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is sorely needed, and that we should bend every effort to accomplish a programme of this type.

This is the area of training we have neglected. It could be established economically and would be of outstanding value to our future. It would provide a non-university path to the highest level of professional training and capability, and would expand, as these research parks are made available, as they should be made available, in appropriate

centres of Ontario such as Sarnia, Cornwall and Brantford.

Mr. Singer: Where?

Mr. Nixon: Brantford. The availability of capital resources is naturally a subject of great importance to us, and recent discussions regarding guidelines for American home corporations in Canada have been of great interest to all of us here. The Minister himself undertook to make a few comments in this regard and we are all aware of the debate that has been, I suppose, spark-plugged by the former Minister of Finance for Canada in his recently published book. The discussions, pro and con, on his proposals, are taking place, not only in the less informal precincts of this building but in every area across Canada where people meet to discuss important issues.

Even though the matter is of predominantly federal jurisdiction, we have been treated to the views of provincial Ministers from Ontario and Quebec. It has been indicated to me that, maybe I am a Gordon man, I have not said so, but I wonder if the hon. member for Halton would indicate whether he is a Hees man or a Robarts man—there seems to be a difference of opinion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: As usual, he is indicating he is going to come down on both sides of that problem. But, even though the matter is of predominantly federal jurisdiction, we have been treated, as I say, to the views of the provincial Ministers from Ontario and Quebec. Canadians welcome and support reasonable measures to encourage greatly increased participation in corporate ownership by citizens of this country. Many of these are under provincial jurisdiction and Ontario must do more to encourage Canadian ownership of our means of production.

Mr. Chairman, our own Minister, although he has spoken out on this matter, has also followed the lead of his friends and colleagues in the province of Quebec who invade the federal field. Personally, I feel that every individual in Canada, whether he is a Minister of the Crown or just a man on the street, has the privilege to speak out on matters that I suppose do not directly concern him. But we all read with interest the Minister's comments on his views of the foreign aid policies of Canada and I know his wrists must still be smarting from the slaps he received editorially from the major newspapers in this country.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, I, of course, made a survey of editorial comments from coast to coast.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You would not have to make much of a survey to see the slaps on the wrist.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know whether his colleagues in government took him to task for this or not, but in his major foray into this field of federal jurisdiction he appeared to be somewhat misinformed; because even those who do not normally support the present federal administration were quick to point out that, without following the businessman's approach that President Johnson and, I suppose, our own Minister here in Ontario tend to take, whereby they feel that money designed to improve the business community is all that is needed as far as foreign aid is concerned, the government of Canada has taken a choice that I feel should be supported by every thinking citizen in that they will support educational opportunities and opportunities which will help those who have been so seriously deprived over the years in countries less fortunate than our own.

So, Mr. Chairman, although the chief economist—and I have come quite a distance from my first comments about him—comes very highly recommended, I feel the government is expecting too much of him. The other source of guidance, the economic council of Ontario, seems never to have developed beyond a bright gleam in the eye of the former Minister. The chairman of the council has rightly earned an excellent reputation in many fields, particularly in the recognizing, developing, and marking of important historical sites in the province, but the usefulness of his council is something that has yet to be proved.

Before I leave this subject, I would say that some of the reports have certainly been useful in restricted fields. I read with interest the report entitled "People and Land in Transition" in which the council has made a study of some of the economically less fortunate townships throughout Ontario; I believe there were five on which some careful study was made. If this were expanded so that this sort of research would be available, not on a spot basis but so that it would apply across the province, I am sure that the hon. Minister would find it more useful. As it is, the information is that a good many of the farmers in the areas who have been investigated are making out on gross revenues

from the land of under $2,000—which is almost incredible to a good many people who have little sympathy and less information about the difficulties in the farming industry.

Mr. Chairman, the federal white paper on economic development released by the Minister of Finance a few weeks ago indicates that the balance of payment deficit between Canada and the United States has grown by almost $1 billion in two years. Ontario's contribution to this must be very large indeed. I do not know if the statistics branch of the economic council has made Ontario's share of this imbalance directly available but I was interested in comparing this information with our provincial efforts to build up foreign trade based on our manufacturing abilities in this province.

We heard a good deal about Ontario House as a centre for promoting trade with Britain, and of the permanent trade missions established by Ontario in Germany and Italy. By the way, a friend of mine calling at Ontario House last summer told me that he was very interested to see that the main products on display were those manufactured by General Steel Wares. I am sure this was just a coincidence and that we are selling things more than garbage cans and washing machines, but this was just something of interest that he brought back.

It appears, however, that it would be obvious that our biggest efforts to expand our trade should be directed at the United States. This is where our unfavourable balance exists; whereas with Europe, and particularly Britain, they have an unfavourable balance already with Canada and, of course, Ontario is the major exporting province. So it is with the United States that our tremendously large imbalance exists and of course it is a huge market close at hand, made up of consumers who speak our language, whose general attitude and prejudices related to the products they buy are well understood by us. The department is not doing enough to expand our trade with the United States. I believe that a large proportion of the trade expansion budget should be allocated to this important market.

We do not hear much of Macaulay's trade crusade moose any more. The Minister a few minutes ago brought it to our attention that it was not a joke, that actually it is being recognized that it was an effective programme.

Mr. Bryden: The hippopotamus.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, the hippopotamus. Yes, he is not as proud of the moose as the hippopotamus. But I feel that the present hon. Minister is taking a more conventional approach. He is, of course, a competent salesman and I hope he is depending on hard work, rather than gimmicks.

I have always been impressed in his presentations in this House with the list of the old quotations and saws he recounts to us, when he deals with his department. One that struck me during his lengthy presentation was, that after you have made a sale, do not keep on selling. I suppose he had us sold on the efficacy of his department somewhere in the first 15 minutes of his presentation, but as the time is going along, I am falling more and more subject to the same criticism myself, so perhaps I should stop here.

However, with the funds available for real trade development that were formerly tied up in the semi-political Macaulay trade crusade billboards, much more of a useful nature should be accomplished. We are all aware of the fact of the Japanese and European successes in the American market and in Central America and South America as well. They have been phenomenal, but we of course have some advantages over them. Geography, a common language, and an understanding of the business methods of the Americans must at least partially outweigh the productivity, cost advantages, skill and initiative that are being shown by these, our distant competitors.

The American market merits our all-out effort, much more than our negative, buy-at-home approach, or our fear of American commercial domination. We must try subsidized efforts and trial runs for certain products in selected areas; more trade representations in every major commercial section of the United States, rather than just New York, Chicago and I believe now, Los Angeles; more research and guidance for our manufacturers as to American special requirements in styles and fads, and the use of our research foundation to develop new products.

Mr. Chairman, I believe Central and South America as well as the Caribbean Islands to be another area where our trade efforts have been ineffective and too little. These potentially great markets are not adequately served by Canadian trade representation. Our immigration policy, as I have mentioned, has done nothing to raise our stock as Canadians among the people of the Caribbean Islands, particularly the coloured population. Our racial prejudice is regrettable and patently obvious to the man on the street in those places.

Nevertheless, we, in Ontario, have an advantage over the rest of Canada in this regard. The hon. Minister of Education's project to send down used school equipment has met with popular approval, as an indication of our desire to be helpful and neighbourly in a practical way, and one to which no strings were attached.

I do not want to spoil it by suggesting that we cash in on this goodwill, but to the many people from the government side who have visited these southern areas during their holidays, it is abundantly clear that our goods and advisory services would be most welcome, if they were properly presented by trade emissaries representing our government and our manufacturers.

The House is now considering a new statute concerning the replacement of the Ontario development agency by the Ontario development corporation. I know this was discussed during the second reading stage some days ago, but very briefly, I would like to say that the agency is, of course, another of the brain children of the former Minister of Economics and Development, and was going to be financed with $100 million, if it was needed, when the original idea was introduced. He said that another $100 million would be available as soon as that was used up.

Obviously it has not grown as far as the original expectations had anticipated, and there is every reason to believe that the idea of the agency has receded far from the original conception of bolstering the faltering credit ratings of companies having some explainable difficulties, so that the economic development could go on.

The new development corporation will concentrate on giving business advice on a number of specialized matters to enterprises that are beginning, or having some difficulty in continuing what should be an economic enterprise. This, of course, is an obviously useful function, but I believe that the ODC would be more effective if it would include the original concept, and become an agency for applying credit to faltering parts of the economy in the various regions of Ontario.

I assert that this is still possible under the new statute, but the emphasis is elsewhere. I would also object to the exclusion —that does not exist in the bill, but seems to exist in fact—of agricultural enterprises from this credit-bolstering function. It is true there are other agencies, both provincial and federal, that deal with this, and yet the grey areas that have been brought to our attention by various hon. Ministers in the past few days exist in this field as well. There have been occasions when faltering agricultural enterprises could have been assisted more effectively if they had had access to the credit-bolstering functions of this agency.

Once again, the reticence that this hon. Minister may have that his predecessor did not have, of moving into the areas of responsibility of some of his colleagues, is quite apparent.

I want to make some remarks about the Ontario housing corporation, instituted two years ago in this province, for the purpose of carrying out aims that are commendable and familiar to all of us. I have made a point of visiting some of the more infamous areas in the city of Toronto, brought to our attention by the press reports, where people are living in incredible conditions, which I described in a similar debate last year. The conditions are known to many of us as members, who have accepted the responsibility of seeing some of the conditions that are permitted to exist in a supposedly enlightened age.

We see the Ministers of the Crown leaving the front door of Queen's Park in their black limousines with chauffeurs. As they go down this avenue that the hon. Minister of Public Works says he admires so greatly, if they were to turn to the right and go just a very few blocks indeed, they would see some of these conditions that have been described, without the use of exaggeration, as being so disastrous. Incredible, or nonexistent sanitation facilities, broken and boarded-up windows, rat-infested homes and streets, an absence of play areas, children not properly cared for, and an overall miasma of low-income hopelessness are associated with the truly disadvantaged section of our people who live in these areas.

It is still true, and every rural member should confirm this, that there are crossroads hamlets where people, either permanently unemployed or in the itinerant poor category, are living in similar situations. The argument about who really is responsible, the municipality or the province, becomes academic when we see real suffering and degradation in an area where something could be done by this province, if it had the determination to do so.

In the Minister's printed speech, there was included a list of municipalities that had asked for the assistance and co-operation of the Ontario housing corporation. I noticed in reading that over—he did not read it to the House—that most of these were cities and

towns. Very few of them were rural municipalities. It is in these areas, as well as the others, that the Minister and his officials having to do with housing must step in and take a lead. If they are waiting for the local municipal officials to come and ask for assistance, they will wait indefinitely.

I would submit that in many of these areas, and they are not all rural by any means, the local people have grown accustomed to driving through these hamlets, where the poverty is obvious in the broken-down housing, and the children running on the streets without any facilities that they should have. People have become so accustomed to seeing this that they think it is simply a part of the community that will always be with us. This need not necessarily be so, and I know that the hon. Minister believes that it need not necessarily be so.

He said in his own remarks or in the report of his department that he looks for a need and then proceeds to fill it. Here is a real need, and one that initiative can fill. I know that it is not the policy of this government to move into areas where local autonomy should be carrying the ball, but we must get away from this in housing and in a great many other of our responsibilities. Here is something that tops the list, a project on need that this hon. Minister can, and I hope will, fill.

I am convinced that in regional development areas there should be trained people, sociologists and educators, people knowledgeable in public health, homemaking and related sociological services who would form themselves into a group. The group could go over the district and see to it that these real pockets of poverty are eliminated. I know of entire hamlets where a modern housing policy associated with a sincere attempt to provide employment and good education, not only for the youngsters but for the adults as well, would pay off in the increase of the standard of living and decrease in disease and listlessness; that could be the most valuable accomplishment of this government in these times.

I know of no other project that this government could undertake that would be better accepted by the municipalities or that would be more heartily supported by this House. Naturally, it goes much further than just providing suitable housing. It must involve taking other needed facilities right to these people—and this includes schooling, adult education and an opportunity for the youngsters to have some help at the community level, before they ever enter school at all in the sense that we now know it. Excellent studies have shown time and again that by the time a six-year-old enters grade one from a disadvantaged community of this type, he is already earmarked with the cultural deficiencies that make it almost inevitable that he will continue the cycle and plan already laid out for him by his parents. The Americans have "operation headstart," which is a recognition of this need in disadvantaged communities. We have nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment or two about our participation in what is referred to in the estimates as the "international and universal exhibition" or, as we call it, Expo '67.

The hon. Minister, defending the increased cost of our pavilion in Montreal, did so with real enthusiasm which I found to be contagious. Families across Ontario, including my own, are looking forward to seeing Ontario's pavilion, as well as the whole world brought to our doorstep here in Canada in this magnificent enterprise rising in the river on man-made islands in Montreal. I, for one, am delighted that Ontario is going to have an outstanding pavilion with a truly new experiment in architecture to represent it.

The hon. Minister's justification of additional funds, however, the funds needed to complete the pavilion, has been refuted, according to the press, by those in charge of Expo '67. His claim that skyrocketing labour rates and material costs are the reason for the gross underestimation of the financial requirements is apparently not correct and these unnatural extra requirements are due entirely to the type of building and the way and manner in which the hon. Minister is proceeding to have it built for us. While congratulating him on his conception of what Ontario's participation should be, everybody in these trying days of increased taxes is very conscious that we must get a good dollar return for this investment. I know that he will take the opportunity offered in the later period of our discussion to explain the part that the hon. Minister of Public Works had in this, or does not have, just how the planning for the building has gone on, and how the facilities are going to be manned under his direction.

The hon. Minister's enthusiasm for the Expo project is well placed. It is unfortunate that it does not carry over into the other areas of his responsibility that suffer from a lack of enthusiastic leadership. He says that he is looking for needs; there are many of them. His economic council has

had only its first useful impact with the publication of the study entitled "People and land in transition."

The merest beginning has been made delving into the root problems plaguing the life and economy of the poor areas of Ontario. No overall plan is even contemplated in connection with alleviating these troubles. This department has lost all its initiative in pointing out a path for the recovery for the many lost communities in Ontario—lost because the young people have moved away; only aging and inefficient industry remains, and the main monetary base boils down to the old-age security benefits.

The Department of Economics and Development must be far more than merely the foreign agency for a good line of Ontario goods. It should provide the research and direction for provincial fiscal policy, rural redevelopment and the co-ordination of an anti-poverty programme that works between elections as well as immediately before.

The hon. Minister operates a department that is rapidly withdrawing from its imaginative responsibilities staked out by his predecessor. His policy is to leave more and more of the economic direction of Ontario to other authorities. In this he underestimates his own abilities; he should be more than a mere trade promoter and salesman. Ontario needs economic direction in all its endeavours, and in this, the department has failed.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I imagine that I will have time for a few pleasantries between now and 5 o'clock, when we revert to the private members' hour. I would like quite sincerely to congratulate the hon. Minister on his detailed and comprehensive report on his department's activities.

I would also like to congratulate him on his sense of timing. About a week ago I asked him how long he thought he would be in introducing his estimates. He said 90 minutes; by my calculation, he was precisely 90 minutes.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): He is a man of his word.

Mr. Bryden: He is a man of his word—in that respect, at any rate.

It is not my intention to attempt to follow through the work of the department in all of its ramifications. The hon. Minister did that and I think that is appropriate in his case. I think in the case of the Opposition, however, it is perhaps more appropriate for us to raise matters that we are interested in in respect to individual branches and agencies of the department under the relevant votes for those branches and agencies.

It is my hope, I will not say this afternoon, but this evening, to deal with some of the broader issues that arise in relation to the work of The Department of Economics and Development—or lack of it, as the case may be. I will attempt to make some comments on the hon. Minister's own analysis of the current economic situation in Ontario. After that, there are two matters of even broader import to which I hope to refer. I will refer to them because I think that they are of considerable importance to us in considering our own position.

As the hon. Minister himself stated, rather briefly in his introductory remarks, we really cannot consider the situation of Ontario, except in terms of the broader context of Canada and, indeed, of the entire world.

I do not intend to deal with the problems of the universe in all their ramifications, but there are two that I consider to be particularly relevant that I will attempt to refer to tonight.

It is to be noted that the hon. Minister not only provided a comprehensive statement to us; he also had the courtesy to provide us with the text in full. I will say that that is extremely helpful. I can remember how in the past we used to sit here while Mr. Macaulay rattled off a two-hour statement packed with statistics and it was very difficult to keep up with him some of the time, especially in all his citing of statistics, some of which were very much in need of verification.

The hon. Minister however spared us that problem. He was prepared to let us see his own text, and he presented it to us in a flaming red cover. For a moment, Mr. Chairman, I thought that perhaps a new element of radicalism had entered into The Department of Economics and Development. A further study indicated that that was illusory. I will say, however, that the Minister's writer and advisers seem to be considerably more sophisticated than those who write for the hon. Provincial Treasurer. The hon. Minister's statement on Ontario's economic situation, and what he regards as the government's plans in relation to it, certainly was more sophisticated than the Budget statement. It was, however, just a more sophisticated expression of the same nothingness that was presented in the Budget. That is the theme

I will try to develop immediately after 8 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of Motion No. 10, by Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South).

Resolved,

That, in the opinion of this House, a select committee should be established to consider Ontario's approach to changes in the Constitution, particularly an amending formula; that this committee should commence its work immediately, and report to the 1967 session of the Legislature.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Young, resolution 10, standing in my name.

On January 3 of this year, the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario called for a new effort to devise an acceptable formula for amending The British North America Act without resort to the British Parliament. In an interview on the CBC French-language television network, the Prime Minister acknowledged that the Fulton-Favreau formula had proven unacceptable across the country and, significantly, he added: "I do not see how we can stay forever in our present position."

Now, Mr. Speaker, five months later we are still in the same position; and from all public evidence this government has done absolutely nothing about it. No aspect of the malaise that afflicts this nation, as it approaches its centennial, is more baffling than the apparent reluctance or inability of its leaders, federal as well as provincial, to grapple vigorously with the important problems of re-confederation.

Practically all of the study and debate that has taken place to date has been behind the closed doors of commissions, federal-provincial committees and conferences, and advisory committees on Confederation. Outside Quebec, the people of Canada have not been involved in any meaningful way, though it is their own future that is being vitally shaped. Even the elected representatives of the people, both in the House of Commons and the provincial Legislatures, have been involved only to rubber-stamp conclusions which were worked out behind the closed doors; and the chief effort in this connection—with the Fulton-Favreau formula—has proven singularly abortive, perhaps nowhere more so than right in this Legislature.

Not once during this session has the government given a lead on what should be the great Canadian debate. We are marking time, or drifting, as though we did not believe that we were masters of our own destiny—even though the hon. Prime Minister himself observed months ago "that we cannot stay forever in our present position."

The underlying purpose of this resolution is to rescue ourselves in Ontario from this drift. Through a select committee, involving representatives of all parties, it seeks to bring this debate out into the open so that the people may at least be aware of it and therefore have an opportunity to become involved.

However, let me emphasize a point here. For too long the problems of re-confederation have been too narrowly focused on a formula for repatriating our Constitution. To be frank, the wording of this resolution tends to perpetuate this narrow focus. For that reason, I would like to stress that the terms of reference of the select committee envisaged in this resolution should be broad enough to include all the basic problems involved in the reshaping of Confederation.

Never have those problems been in a greater state of flux than at the moment. Fundamental changes are in the making. The basic reason why, on sober second thought, the country discarded the Fulton-Favreau formula, was that it threatened to render the process of constitutional change even more inflexible than it has been, at precisely the time in our history when great changes are needed.

In these formative years, Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming series of federal-provincial conferences may well become a constitutional workshop in which the shape of a new confederation can be clarified. If that process is accompanied by a deliberate effort to involve the elected representatives of the people and, through them, their constituents back home, by way of legislative committees in each province and at Ottawa, then the day may come when this nation will be ready to convene a constitutional convention. But at

the moment we are not ready. Premature calling of such a convention would likely produce a shambles in which the nation would be even more divided through a deeper entrenchment of conflicting positions.

But even if Ottawa and other provinces do not set up such a confederation committee, it is noteworthy that Quebec has already done so; and there are particular, as well as general, reasons why Ontario should do so. Historically, Ontario has always had closer relations with Quebec, and is therefore in a better position than any other province to consider tensions in French-English relations which are at the heart of the Confederation crisis. Furthermore, as I have emphasized on earlier occasions in this session, Ontario has historically been the spokesman for English Canada in the dialogue with the federal government as it seeks to achieve a balance in relations with French Canada.

Ontario has failed tragically to fulfil this historic role as leader and spokesman for English Canada, with the result that our national problems are compounded by a lack of "will to nationhood" in English Canada at a time when Quebec is forging ahead with a dynamic sense of purpose and direction. The interests of this nation as a whole would be served if Ontario could clarify this historic role through the studies and debate of a select committee of the Legislature.

But apart from these special considerations as far as Ontario is concerned, we have reached a stage in our history when the division of responsibilities between the federal and provincial governments, and the fiscal capacity to fulfil them, is in need of basic reassessment. In fact, it is not generally realized that federal-provincial relations, as we know them today, are really a development of the last generation—during and since World War II.

Prior to World War II, federal-provincial relations were restricted to the fiscal agreements on which Confederation was based and the periodic revisions of them down through the years. Generally speaking, each level of government operated in its own sphere and the area of joint action was relatively limited. In the field of social security, for example, it was limited to the old age pension. There were tentative ventures in other areas—joint programmes in agriculture, or in vocational training in education. But each government kept relatively clear of the other's jurisdiction.

Since the end of the war, Mr. Speaker, this has changed drastically as we all know. Not only has there been a widespread acceptance of governmental responsibility for social security, but the financial burden involved, and the desire for equality of standards across the nation, has involved the federal government extensively.

Not only have specific projects, such as the trans-Canada highway, become the subject of federal-provincial agreement, but increasingly it is acknowledged that provincial governments have a role, along with the federal government, in economic policy—at least to establish the main emphasis in economic development within each provincial jurisdiction.

And, indeed, if we needed any proof of that, we have seen it in the last two or three hours in the introduction to the debates on The Department of Economics and Development.

In short, Mr. Speaker, developments have set the stage for a clash, between federal and provincial governments, of new and greater proportions. This is the basic reason for the almost continuous confrontation between the Lesage government and Ottawa. Since the defeat of the CCF government in Saskatchewan, no provincial government in Canada has accepted, as fully as Quebec, the 20th century concept of positive government intervention in the economy, and leadership in providing a wide range of social security measures. When that fact is combined with French-Canadian nationalism, a sharp conflict with the federal government became inevitable.

The basic reason for that conflict obtains in every other province. They are inherent in federal-provincial relations as they have developed in this century. But this conflict, Mr. Speaker, I suggest can be lessened, not only for Quebec, but for every other province, if relations with Ottawa are clarified, and if the area for separate and joint federal-provincial actions are renewed in light of the realities of the postwar years and the years that lie ahead. Thus I would suggest that our Constitution must be flexible, and that consideration of its reshaping by a select committee in this Legislature should be explored in four different areas.

First, that federal powers should be clearly defined so that the central government can deal with problems of economic unemployment and economic dislocation. The federal government must have the power to equalize economic opportunity for all parts of Canada. While this overall power must rest with the federal government, it does not preclude the province playing a growing role, particularly

in deciding the emphasis of that development. Without denying the provinces a role in the economic sphere, which they have gradually assumed in any case, it is possible to concede to Ottawa the powers necessary for a stronger central government than we have had in recent years. No one minimizes the difficulties in achieving this balance, but they will not be resolved by failing to grapple with them. This is precisely why I think that this area that needs to be grappled with and resolved is a topic for the investigations of a select committee.

Second, there must be a clear delineation of provincial jurisdiction, and the allocation of adequate testing powers to enable them to discharge their responsibility. In this sphere, Mr. Speaker, important new questions have emerged. Let me cite two or three to illustrate my point.

Quebec is now demanding, for example, that family allowance payments should be paid over to the province in a lump sum, so that they can be allocated in what the government feels is a more equitable manner, and integrated more fully with other social security payments. Social security, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, fulfills two functions—the meeting of a great social need, and a fiscal need of priming the economy and keeping purchasing power in the hands of those who need it most.

The whole role of social security payments and maintaining purchasing power, stimulating economic activity, is not altered or vitiated by virtue of these payments being made by a province rather than the federal government. Therefore, there is no fiscal or economic reason why this cannot be done, as long as the necessary fiscal and monetary powers remain with Ottawa. This is the essence of what is referred to in the need for a strong central government, but there is a conflict which must be resolved.

Furthermore, there is a growing recognition that our patchwork of categorical welfare payments of various kinds is an inefficient way to meet legitimate needs of the various groups, and results in unnecessary evasion of personal privacy and dignity. If the answer lies in establishing a guaranteed minimum family income, as has been suggested more and more widely, and if that is to be achieved by what appears to be the simplest and most efficient techniques, namely, through a negative income tax, then the implications in terms of reassessing the traditional division of powers between the province and the federal government is obviously a very fundamental one. Ontario has for years been moving without fanfare into the field of immigration, international trade promotion and agreements with foreign powers on questions such as hydro power exchange. One wonders, then, why there has been such an outcry against Quebec's intervention in external policy. Obviously, there is need for clarification here as to what have been areas of intervention, what are legitimate areas of intervention, and the procedures for such intervention.

Third, there must be a recognition for a special status for Quebec within Confederation—but also a clearer idea of exactly what that means, not only in French Canada but in English Canada, too. Ontario should clear its thinking on what are the legitimate limits for Quebec's special status and what, if any, of Quebec's demands are deemed to be intolerable throughout the rest of Canada, or a genuine threat to the survival of Canada as one country.

As I indicated earlier, it is particularly important that Ontario clear its thinking on this question so that it can fulfil its historic role as leader and spokesman for English Canada in relations with Ottawa.

Finally, in any consideration of rewriting our Constitution, we should move to entrenching a bill of rights. Our basic freedoms have all been defined, but the eternal vigilance which is necessary, if they are to be realized for every citizen, will be all the more effective as they can be restored more readily once they have been violated, through enshrining them in a national constitution.

These, then, Mr. Speaker, are the broad areas in which a legislative committee could delve in preparing the ground for the rewriting of our Constitution at some future date. But it is vitally important that this whole process should be rescued from behind closed doors. The constitution of a nation should belong to the people. It is not exclusively the concern of a few politicians and behind-the-scenes experts. Ontario's chief effort in this connection has, for the past two years, been on the committee of Confederation, which acts as an advisory group for the Prime Minister. This year, some $50,000 of public funds will be allocated for this purpose. Such a procedure, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is an abortion of the democratic process. Let us give these acknowledged experts, many of whom have been gathered together on the Confederation committee, an opportunity to present their views publicly to a select committee of this Legislature in all of their variety and conflict, so that a con-

sensus can be achieved among them, and more widely among all of our people. Surely it is a misuse of such a potentially important body that its activities should be carried on in virtual secrecy for little or no consequence, other than some unspecified influence on the public pronouncements of the hon. Prime Minister. So I urge the House to support this resolution so that the vital process of reshaping this nation to cope more effectively with the problems of our second century can be extended to involve more fully both the members of this Legislature and the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I believe I appreciate the motives which prompted the hon. member for York South to make this motion, and I am in general sympathy with them. He is keenly interested in constitutional development in Canada and he seeks a vehicle through which to express this interest, and which may help move the process some steps forward. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the vehicle he has chosen, that of a select committee of this Legislature, is appropriate to the time and the circumstances. We are aware, Mr. Speaker, of two main facts to be considered when we are thinking of constitution-making and constitution amendments in Canada. First, is the legal consideration of how the Constitution can be amended. Now by Constitution, of course, I am making rather limited reference to The British North America Act.

It can be amended quite legally by no more than an address of both Houses of Parliament at Ottawa, and laid before the Queen at Westminster; and to those simple acts, I have no doubt that Parliament at Westminster would agree. Second, it is a convention, however, supported by feared sanctions at future elections, that whenever a matter falling within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces is to be a subject of a constitutional amendment, the provinces are always consulted. Indeed, the Fulton-Favreau formula, which was debated in a motion before this Legislature some 15 months ago, reached us by reason of that convention, and by reason of the courtesy of the Prime Minister of Canada and the courtesy of the Prime Minister of Ontario. There was no legal requirement for it to reach us.

Indeed, the government of Canada was sufficiently courteous with respect to the Fulton-Favreau formula as to ask not only all the governments of the provinces of Canada to approve of it, but to urge them to place it before their Legislatures. All these courtesies having been extended, we find that nine provincial governments have approved the Fulton-Favreau formula.

Having discovered all this, the government of Canada then proceeded to do precisely nothing. It has not laid the formula before the Parliament of Canada, and indeed, it appears unlikely ever to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member's own Prime Minister said it was a dead issue.

Mr. Dunlop: Yes, I said it appears unlikely to do so.

I suppose the real reason for this was not so much the concern about the rigidity of the formula—as expressed by some, but by no means all, constitutional experts. I imagine it was the events—the quite unexpected events in the province of Quebec—where in part as a result of certain difficulties expected in relations with the Legislative Council, and in part because of other difficulties which I think perhaps none of us finds it easy to understand, the Premier of Quebec decided not to proceed with the formula.

It is perhaps an impasse which we have reached and the hon. member for York South, feeling as many of us do that something should be done, and I have no doubt feeling some sense of frustration, has suggested in his resolution what he thinks this Legislature should now do. I do not think that his proposal for a select committee to consider Ontario's approach to a Canadian constitution and to constitutional amendments is really the appropriate step at this time.

My greatest concern is this: I see some very real hazards arising from this kind of process, which could be multiplied if the same kind of process were to be adopted in each of the provincial Legislatures across Canada. A select committee is a reasonably formal, if not formidable, body and its reports are looked upon with a great deal of interest and frequently a great deal of respect, particularly in cases where the reports are made unanimously.

I fear the hazards in the deliberations of such a select committee, and those various bodies that may place recommendations before it would tend toward the development of an Ontario position in Confederation, a position which might insert very real elements of rigidity, directly and indirectly into the position to be adopted by this government and the leaders of this government.

This kind of procedure, if followed, might

lead to ten formal sets of policies, or positions, on the part of ten Legislatures and ten governments across Canada. This additional rigidity, I think, Mr. Speaker, is something that we really do not need at this time in our constitutional development and it could have a perhaps inhibiting effect on future developments.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the initiative at the present juncture should really lie with Ottawa. They might try to revive the Fulton-Favreau formula, such as the hon. member has suggested—but which other people have said is dead so it might be a very difficult effort to revive it—or they must at some point, seek some alternative method. I will come back to that alternative at the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

I would say this, that we in Ontario are not, at this moment, in a really great rush to secure constitutional changes. Some time ago—a year ago or two years ago—the people of Ontario were eager, I believe, to see changes made in the Constitution which would accommodate the province of Quebec and the people of Quebec. This was their main concern. I think they felt other changes were of importance, but of secondary importance. Now that it appears that there is little which can be done by way of accommodation that is going to make any significant difference to the result, we can abide ourselves living, I think, quite happily, within the four corners of a constitution as it now exists.

The hon. member for York South has referred to the importance of the changes in responsibility which have arisen over the past generations, as a result of economic and social change, and the difficulties that this poses with respect to the relative fiscal capacities of the two levels of government. I do not think that this need be settled by constitutional amendment. Indeed, I believe there is machinery available and in use which makes it possible today to make the necessary adjustments in our Constitution to a workaday world. The tax structure committee, the various negotiations with respect to fiscal arrangements, the possibilities of substituting unconditional subventions for the present conditional grants, or shared cost programmes, are all mechanisms open to us today and sufficient to keep Canada alive and viable, so long as we can look forward.

Indeed, I do not think that the relative fiscal capacity and taxing powers of the different levels of government are really appropriate to be inserted into a constitution with all the difficulties that follow in the amendment to the Constitution, because one generation cannot really settle the fiscal situation of a generation ahead, or indeed, can those of one decade settle the fiscal arrangements for a decade to come. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as a workable instrument our present Constitution is adequate but by no means superb.

I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, that if the government of Canada is not proposing to resuscitate the Fulton-Favreau formula they should, in due course, and perhaps in something short of the fullness of time, they should launch an alternative approach to constitution-making in Canada. I suppose the first approach would be the domestication of The British North America Act by its re-enactment by Parliament at Ottawa.

From then on, if a formula cannot be found for the amendment to the Constitution, perhaps the approach of Canadians will have to be similar to the approach of the British —that is to deal with it over a period of many hundreds of years and perhaps item by item. Perhaps we are not like some European nations; perhaps we are not like our cousins the United States were 150 or more years ago; perhaps we are not suited to formulas and constitutions and well-written and clearly stated documents. Perhaps we have to tackle each matter in Canada requiring constitutional amendments such as location of jurisdiction over securities legislation, credit, the control of near banks, item by item, as the situation demands and as it is recognized to be a problem.

I would like, of course, to see a constitution which was a beauitful document; a constitution which contained most of the matters it now contains, but in a manner in which I could present it to my children and suggest they read it with some slight opportunity of understanding it. But perhaps that is never to be our luck in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South suggested that the terms of reference for the select committee he proposes should focus on four main points as requiring attention. I would suggest to him that three of those points—the clarification of the powers of the federal government, the clarification of the powers of the provincial government, and the adjustments of fiscal capacity—are matters which can be coped with within the four corners of the Constitution as it now stands.

The fourth point he raises, however, cannot—and this is of very real importance—the ultimate entrenchment of a bill of rights into the Canadian Constitution. I

would suggest, however, that the matter is not one of the urgency which this resolution suggests. We have a workable constitution in Canada. The timing of any matter or means which might have the effect of developing an Ontario position would not be to add to, but would actually be to subtract from, the assets of the situation and add to the liabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the objectives of the hon. member for York South in making this motion, but I find that I cannot favour the method that he has proposed.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse the motion of the leader of the New Democratic Party. I listened with great interest to the hon. member for Forest Hill. I think really that he had taken the resolution, if I may presume to say this, thinking that its focus was on an amending formula, and that the select committee's purpose would be to study that in detail, while the leader of the New Democratic Party pointed out to us that he hoped we would not narrow ourselves into those terms of reference and he gave four other areas that should be discussed.

However, I could not quite understand why the member for Forest Hill felt such an inhibition about a select committee. I find it puzzling to feel that if Ontario should take a stand, and that stand should be known, that it causes rigidity. Perhaps that has been the reason why the Ontario government has so few times taken a stand in anything about Confederation. They have a fear of being rigid.

The other thing that I find a little confusing was that the member for Forest Hill elaborated on the British system at the end of his remarks, the system of really not having anything tidy, done neatly in slots. But they take a kind of a practical approach with each event, and somehow they develop or evolve an approach to problems.

Mr. Dunlop: They jumble things together.

Mr. Thompson: They jumble things together, and I think this is very true. This, perhaps, is one of the distinctions of the British background towards government. But what I noticed was that he suddenly became very rigid himself when he pointed out to the leader of the New Democratic Party that really Ottawa did not need to talk to the provinces about an amending formula. He has mentioned this before, I remember, in the debate, and he emphasized the legal consideration. It is true that it does not legally need to, but politically, if they are going to amend The British North America Act, they are always going to come to the provinces. I do not think that was really a strong point to emphasize.

Sir, I really want to talk about the leader of the New Democratic Party's proposal. I may say I endorse it wholeheartedly for many of the reasons that he has already expounded. I have always endorsed this. I myself have advocated a select committee when we saw the problems in Confederation. We had seen that Quebec has a group of wise, intelligent and informed men who were working with the Quebec government in order that they could go to an Ottawa Dominion-provincial conference, with ideas—and when we saw that Ontario had not gathered together such men—and we had many in the province—I, amongst others, suggested that this government get going and call a Confederation committee together. But I certainly had not hoped that this would mean the government cloistered them within some hall or room in this building.

We had asked in the Legislature: "Where are the studies that these men are doing?" We have been told by the hon. Prime Minister of the province that there are 20 studies and that he will table them as they are completed. Either he is hiding the studies and does not want to table them, or else they are not really being very fruitful in their deliberations, because as yet we in the Legislature have seen none of these studies. Some of the members of that Confederation committee, I think, are bridling at the bit under the tight harness which this government is imposing on them.

They have got far too much wisdom and ability and bright ideas with respect to Confederation to want to be suffocated under the Conservative mantle. They want to express these ideas to the whole of the population of Ontario—indeed, of Canada. This comes again to the reason for a select committee. I am concerned that everything taking place which is important to Confederation is always done by a small group of men—hidden, secret, never open to the public, to the people, to the electorate.

I would like to emphasize one particular point which I think is of real significance today; it is with respect to Confederation, and that is, of course, the whole basis of tax sharing. I do not want to go into the amending formula as much, because I appreciate that the leader of the New Democratic Party had mentioned that the committee would have a broader base than just

to discuss the amending formula. What I am interested in is to think a bit about the sinews that really give purpose to responsibilities that the provinces will have, and responsibilities that the federal government will have. And that, of course, is the financial resources that they both will have.

The question that I am concerned about is this: We are finding that there is going to be a tax structure committee, and frankly neither Legislatures, nor the public nor, indeed, experts—and there are many of them across Canada—have been fully utilized or informed about the procedures taking place.

The sessions of the tax structure committee—their federal-provincial arrangement—are going to be of momentous importance to the structure of Confederation. The sessions which I presume are going to take place in August and September, with a plenary session in October, will decide the structure of our Confederation financially for the next five years.

And yet there really has been no advanced public or legislative discussion of these proposals by any Legislature across Canada. The select committee proposed by my hon. friend surely could have done this. The tax structure talks are going to be close to a significant deadline when they take place in October.

These are some of the deadlines. The federal government's abatement legislation, under which Ontario this year will get 24 per cent of federal income tax, is going to expire on December 31, 1966. Ottawa's equalization legislation expires on March 31, 1967; the federal-provincial tax-sharing agreement expires about the same time. Yet we have no position papers that we know of, that are prepared and open to the public and to the Legislature. What actually have we heard? What have we heard about this most momentous meeting which will develop the structure of Confederation? What have we heard, Mr. Speaker?

We have heard that there have been preliminary meetings of officials from Ottawa and from the provinces, but there has not been a word to the public about what took place at those meetings. We have heard that Ottawa and Ontario are preparing some studies for this conference, but we have not heard a word about these studies.

I come back again to the point when the hon. member for Forest Hill said that if there were select committees and Ontario's position was stated, that there would be rigidity. He was referring, I think, particularly to the amending form. I want to say, however, that I think it is very important that Ontario's position should be stated before being a fait accompli so that Ontario's position, the government position, can be given some consensus by the people of Ontario. We have not heard a word about these studies that have taken place between Ottawa and Ontario.

Let me go further. As I understand it, there will be no background papers released when the tax structure committee meets. Recently there were two useful publications by the Canadian tax foundation which were released; but they were done on a voluntary basis. As I said before, there are no position papers; they will be released when the conference is on. There will be no observers; there are many outside experts who would like to see the position which Ontario is going to take and which the federal government is going to take, but because they will not know about it, we will not immediately hear anything with respect to their views. No press or public will be at this momentous meeting.

None of the provinces have had any select committee to discuss this area, nor have they had any public meetings. In fact, we have the situation of this momentous meeting, yet all that the people across this land know about it is simply from leaks that they get now and then. We know that there is a Carter Royal commission on taxes which has not reported to the federal government, and I suspect that it will not report until the conference actually starts. The Ontario Smith committee report has not been heard from and I wonder when its report will come in.

To sum it up, I just want to say that the discussion of this tax structure committee is going to have a historical significance; and yet from Ottawa, and from the provincial government, there has been absolutely no effort to get a consensus or even a thinking by experts, let alone the people.

This concerns me, because I believe that at these federal-provincial conferences there has been far too much of an approach to have them as secret dark meetings; decisions made, fait accompli was the term used by the hon. Attorney General when he came back to report on the Fulton-Favreau formula to us —far too much of this approach of fait accompli.

I would like to say, sir, because I will not be allowed to be at the federal-provincial tax structure conference, that I would like to guess at the stand which may be taken. I think, first of all, that the federal government is going to take a tough stand on tax-sharing.

It is going to argue that its ability to manage the economy is going to be seriously impaired if it retreats any further in income tax and corporate tax fields, and I think that we have had some indication from the hon. Provincial Treasurer that Ontario wants four per cent more in the income tax field. In other words, it wants 28 per cent in 1967.

I believe, sir, that this is going to be a hard, tough fight for the hon. Provincial Treasurer to get his four points; and I would like to know, when he goes up there, assuming he faces this road block, what is he going to do? Has he got any bright ideas for a breakthrough, any new approaches that could be offered, or is Ontario just going to walk in with a big club and demand more of the federal share of income tax? If it is going to do that, that is hardly a creative approach to Confederation; but we do not know, because we will not learn what the approach will be on the part of the provincial government.

Mr. Dunlop: He told you in his Budget speech.

Mr. Thompson: I do not think that he would have told me at all. I have asked him a number of times to let us have a look at some of the papers and we have asked about the Confederation committee, a whole—

Mr. Dunlop: He told you about the four per cent; the hon. member can find out in the Budget speech.

Mr. Thompson: I think, sir, that there is a very real danger if Ontario is going to try to treat the conference politically. I have a suspicion that the hon. Prime Minister of the province will go up; then, if he does not get his four points, he will truculently go across the province, calling an election on this trumped-up basis. Certainly, I think there is a danger that he may go there without having done any homework, and with just this one narrow point to get more money with these four points—and with no offer of a workable alternative.

I believe that there are other very serious questions. The question of equalization—I think that Ottawa may suggest to broaden its equalization formula. By that I mean it will include more non-shared revenue sources in the formula. It may then argue that if the provinces need more revenue they should raise their own. They may argue that "we have equalized the tax basis to a large degree, and from now on the provinces are pretty well on their own." This has been done before by people in Ottawa.

Equalization is also tricky from the point of view of Ontario itself, because obviously we want to see a fair standard of living across Canada. On the other hand, we recognize that in the Maritimes perhaps it does not cost as much. This is the irony of this. It does not cost as much to produce some services as it does in a rich province such as Ontario. Well, sir, I would say that there are questions about opting out. This is going to be a question which I think should be discussed in a select committee rather than privately.

The conference will raise this question: Should Ottawa allow unconditional opting out? In other words, should the provinces be able to opt out on a joint programme on the understanding that they may have complete control over the programme's future standards, or should Ottawa keep some control over joint programmes besides what the standards will be and what programmes will be, subject to the opting-out formula?

This is a crucial matter because a great deal of money is now tied up in joint programmes. The Prime Minister previously had talked about block grants in certain fields. He has never made his position clear on this. He has not spelled out how the block grants would be worked in with tax sharing and equalization.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is apparent that the provinces have not worked out any positions on these questions in advance of this tax structure conference. And I think as the hon. leader of the NDP has said, Ontario should be a leader for the English-speaking areas of Canada.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): We are.

Mr. Thompson: And I would think that, to do that, you should not have the fear that if you take a position you will cause rigidity. You should have the hope and the confidence and the faith, that if you state your position it will be such a solid and good position that the rest of the provinces will want to follow. Thank you.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution, for a few moments, I can only wonder why the wisdom that is shown in the ranks of the official Opposition here is not translated to the capital of this nation. Because I think one of the statements that the hon. member for Forest Hill made, which is true, is that the initiative should come from Ottawa. This is a nation, and since the original Fulton-Favreau formula was discarded by Ottawa in the last

analysis, then Ottawa should be giving us that lead to show us the way to a new and a better constitution.

Next year we celebrate our 100th birthday. We are entering a new century. And that year, it seems to me, is the perfect time for this kind of discussion to be taking place right across this land, asking ourselves what the first 100 years meant, asking ourselves where we want to go in the next 100 years and how we expect to get there, and asking ourselves about the basis of that original Confederation and the basis of the new Confederation which is to come in this land of ours.

I do not understand the reticence of the hon. member for Forest Hill to face up to this kind of discussion. He said it will only result in rigidity and we do not need that rigidity. We may not need rigidity but certainly this province needs a position and that position should be a position of leadership in the thinking process of at least the English-speaking part of this nation. The French-speaking part is in ferment; it is deciding where it wants to go and what it wants to do. The rest of this nation should be doing the same kind of thinking and this province should be doing the leading in this regard. So I think we do need the dialogue, we do need this kind of discussion, and all across this province there are people who have ideas and who would like to express those ideas to us.

When the member said that the present Constitution is adequate but by no means superb, I could not help thinking that the same thing holds true of the machinery that was primitive in this nation. A Model T car is adequate if we want to get from one place to another, if we want to take time enough and pay the penalty, but it is by no means superb. The primitive telephone that we knew in the early days of this nation or the early days of this century is adequate perhaps if you want to use the crank, and if you want to put up with the noises on it, but it is by no means superb.

The Constitution which developed this nation during its first century may be adequate if we are willing to put up with the price and the inconvenience. But surely as this nation faces this new century, it is time we began to look at the improvements which could be evolved in this machinery and then to get to work on that improvement. Certainly when the member for Forest Hill said that we can deal with it over the next 100 years, this looks like a typical approach of the Tory mind.

Mr. MacDonald: Something less than the fullness of time.

Mr. Young: Yes, something more than the fullness of time in this case, it seems to me. And he is willing to do it item by item over that century. This is what he said, Mr. Speaker—item by item over the next century when each item becomes a matter of urgent necessity. As we are driven to it by sheer necessity, he is going to deal with it, item by item, precept by precept, line on line, whatever it may be, and take plenty of time, take the next century, and by the end of that century we are going to have the new ideas worked out.

Mr. Dunlop: There will be new ideas in the 100 years still to come and you cannot work them out today or tomorrow.

Mr. Young: We need these ideas now, we need the new constitution—

Mr. Dunlop: It worked.

Mr. Young: Sure it worked, just as the Model T worked, just as the old telephone worked, but who is satisfied with a Model T today?

An hon. member: I would like to go back.

Mr. Young: The member would like to go back; sure, that is exactly what the Tory mind wants to do, get back to the past, to the comfort and the solidity. But he forgets all the disadvantages of the past, he idealizes the past and just forgets what it really meant. He wants to go back to the tallow candles and the old stage coaches; sure, he wants to go back to the Battle of Queenston Heights and fight it over again; my hon. friend says, sure.

This is fine. But this is another century, this is another day, we are entering a brand new time. So today I simply say to this House, let us get down to business, let us give that leadership, let us not be satisfied with the kind of bumbling and procrastinating that we have heard here this afternoon.

So I support the adoption of this resolution and I hope that this Legislature will move to set up the select committee which can get down to business as far as this province is concerned to do the job that has to be done.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): I am afraid time is fleeting and there are already many interjections, Mr. Speaker. In the three minutes —or is it now two—in which there is time to

mention anything about the resolution of the hon. member for York South, it is not possible to state anything of great moment, but I would like to congratulate the member on bringing this matter forward to the House.

While I think not all members of the House will agree with everything that he has said, at least we recognize that his address was a most thoughtful one and was expressive of much concern for our nation. Evidently not only in his party but in the official Opposition, it was thought that this subject deserved attention from the leader of the party, so we have also had the address of the leader of the Opposition.

I cannot take time to comment to any great extent on what he said, but in mentioning the advisory committee which has been set up by this government to study matters of Confederation and to bring forward from time to time reports on this great subject, the leader of the Opposition painted a picture of this government in some way holding down and very rigidly confining the thoughts of the great, prominent and talented members of that advisory committee. Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that any member of that committee, all of whom are recognized as most able people in this province, would be willing to permit his thoughts in some way to be inhibited by the government, and I do not think for a moment the hon. Prime Minister or the government has in any way limited the thoughts and proposals which may come forward.

The Prime Minister has from time to time brought to the attention of this Legislature some progress that is being made in pursuing this great subject, which, as we all recognize, is so important.

Let me conclude by just saying this, that there is, I think, no one in this House who does not look forward to the day when it will be possible to have in our nation, in this realm of Canada, our own Constitution here for enactment and amendment from time to time without the necessity of recourse to Westminster. We felt we were very near to this after some 40 years of attempts being made to bring about this situation, yet, at the last moment, it appeared that agreement was not possible. This was a matter of regret for Canadians across the entire country.

As the hon. member for Forest Hill stated, there should be some new attempts made from Ottawa to arrive at a formula, either a revival of the Fulton-Favreau formula or some other formula which can be accepted by the various Legislatures. I would point out, sir, that reports will be brought forward or perhaps even agreements between the various governments will be brought here and this Legislature will then have its fullest opportunity to discuss all of these matters. The people's representatives must have their say, and will have their say in this Legislature and to the Legislatures of the other provinces and of our nation.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 112

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 17, 1966

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 3581

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3612

Member's correction 3612

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to welcome visitors to the Legislature and tonight we welcome a group of ladies, in the Speaker's gallery, from the HTS group of the YWCA, Hamilton.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, when we reverted to other business at 5 o'clock, I had said that the speech of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development was essentially a more sophisticated expression of the same nothingness that appeared in the Budget speech.

The Minister, in the preliminary part of his statement, talked a great deal about economic goals for the province of Ontario. The only problem is that he did not disclose any plan on the part of the government, either for the future or in the past, to achieve those goals. He used a good deal of the jargon of economic planning and he tossed off a good many figures to claim that the goals set by this government and his department are being achieved in Ontario.

Before we accept the rather glib statements contained in the first dozen or so pages of his speech, I think there are two points we should know. First of all, when the government and the hon. Minister assert that they are achieving the goals that they set themselves, we should notice that those goals were very modest, inadequate goals indeed. I will not take all of them, I will take one only, the primary goal that the government set itself.

The hon. Minister said—and I am now quoting from his speech:

> We set a target to 1970 of an average annual increase in gross provincial product in constant dollars of 5.5 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, this is the target that the economic council set for the whole of Canada.

It is obvious that Canada is not going to achieve that goal if the province of Ontario only achieves the average for the whole of the country. As we know, there are depressed areas in this country which will fall short of the objectives that the economic council of Canada has set. If Canada as a whole is to achieve a growth rate of 5.5 per cent in real terms, Ontario must exceed that rate. That surely is a matter of simple arithmetic. Yet the government opposite contents itself in the industrial centre of Canada with achieving the average for the whole of the country. The country as a whole will achieve less than that average if Ontario cannot better it.

I recognize that the hon. Minister noted that in the year just past Ontario did a little better than that long-term average of 5.5 per cent growth in real terms. Ontario in the year concluded achieved a rate of growth of 6.2 per cent, slightly better than the overall average. But again, Mr. Chairman, let us bear in mind that this was achieved in a boom period, in a period of higher than average growth. If the best that Ontario can do in the year 1965 is 6.2 per cent, it will probably do no better than the 5.5 per cent—if, indeed, it will do that well—in the overall period between now and 1970.

When the government and the hon. Minister talk in terms of achieving goals, all that one can say is that it has achieved goals that are unrealistically low, that offer no challenge to this province, that are based on the assumption that this province is not going to make a fair contribution to the total development of the country.

The second point that should be noticed with regard to the allegedly optimistic figures that the Minister used is that nothing he said disclosed any real overall policy of economic development at all. The Minister has a large number of specific projects about which he is very enthusiastic. I am not criticizing him for this enthusiasm, but he has no overall plan of economic development at all. What is happening this year is exactly the same as was happening a few years ago when we were achieving very little in terms

of economic growth. That is, we are drifting along with the trade cycle.

When the secular trend is down, Ontario's production is down, its unemployment is up. When the secular trend is upwards, our growth rate increases somewhat—far from adequately—but it increases; our unemployment is down and our level of total employment is up. So the Minister is merely congratulating himself that he is capable of drifting along with the tide. There is really nothing that the government has done that has contributed to the upswinging in the cycle which we have been experiencing in Canada, and indeed through most of the western world, for the past number of years.

It should, however, be noted and the hon. Minister did not really note it, that we are very likely reaching the peak of the cycle. We have been moving upwards in accordance with the trends that have taken place ever since World War II. There has been a boom, followed by a bust, followed by another boom, followed by another bust, followed by another boom. Now we are probably reaching the peak of the new cycle. There is no evidence that The Department of Economics and Development, or the Minister, has formulated any plans to deal with the situation which will soon be reached when the peak of the cycle is achieved. I do not wish to be an alarmist, Mr. Chairman, but I think we should take note of the fact the storm signals are already starting to appear.

First of all, there is unquestionably a dangerous inflationary situation in Canada today. I am aware that the Minister, in his introductory remarks, dismissed suggestions of inflation. He followed the line of the pundits, that there are not really any serious inflationary pressures. For several months now the pundits have been saying every month that there is no inflationary situation at all, and every month the consumer price index makes another surge forward. It has now reached record levels.

I think it should also be noted, Mr. Chairman, that as far as available figures disclose, the inflationary pressures are strongest in Ontario. There is, of course, no breakdown of the consumer price index by provinces. Sub-indexes, however, are produced for a number of the leading cities in Canada. I think it is worth noticing that in the past year the largest increase in the consumer price index in any city in Canada has taken place in Toronto. The second largest increase has taken place in Ottawa. The only two cities in Canada which are included in this particular series of the DBS show the largest increases in prices. I think it is reasonable to assume from that that the inflationary situation that is developing all across Canada is most acute in Ontario.

The second point, I think, that we should note is that there is obvious evidence of growing lack of confidence. To put it mildly, the bottom has fallen out of the stock market. Now, I know that the automobile boys in Detroit say that the troubles in the stock market arise from efforts of people like my friend from Yorkview to press the need for safer cars, but very few other people agree with them on that. It is true that there have been cutbacks in automobile production. This in itself is a sign, I think, of things to come. The North American economy is tied, to an important extent, to the tail of the automobile industry and demand in that industry is slowing down.

The general lack of confidence arising from that and other similar phenomena is showing itself in the stock market. So, we have before us the evidence of growing lack of confidence and, failing policies to offset it, this is almost certain to lead to a reversal of the upward trend in economic activity which has been taking place for the last few years.

The combination of developing inflationary forces and growing lack of confidence, in my opinion, are phenomena that are worthy of consideration. Yet in all the 60 pages of his speech—or it is almost 70 pages—the hon. Minister hardly even referred to these two phenomena.

The basic problem we face in Canada today, and in Ontario, Mr. Chairman, is to truly meet the objectives that were set a little over a year ago by the economic council of Canada. There were really two sides to the programme suggested by the economic council. On the one hand, the council suggested that we should maintain a high level of growth, a high level of employment and increasing productivity, and on the other side, it insisted that if we were to achieve the maximum potential of our economy, we would have to do those things in terms of a relatively stable consumer price index, that we would have to do it without generating inflation.

This, I think is the significant thing in the analysis that the economic council of Canada produced, a year and a few months ago. We have to maintain a high level of growth without inflation. It is not too difficult to achieve one or other of those two things. As far as effecting both is concerned, it can

be fairly said that that has never been achieved in Canada since World War II, or indeed in Canadian history. We have shown ourselves capable of maintaining the rate of growth that the economic council of Canada has suggested is desirable, but only at the expense of inflation. On the other hand, we have shown ourselves capable of avoiding inflation, but only at the expense of an unduly slow rate of growth.

It is useless to talk about the fact that in this present inflationary or pre-inflationary period we are maintaining a high rate of growth. The point is that we are not meeting the other objective, which is equally important. The result is that the federal government itself is facing a serious dilemma. It is being criticized severely in many quarters for its current tight money policy which, I think, brings us back to 1956 and 1957, when there also was a tight money policy which succeeded in breaking the boom and throwing Canada into a prolonged recession.

I notice that Mr. George Hees is one of the latest critics to join the ranks of those who are blasting the federal government for its growing tight money policy. The only problem is that the federal government does not know what to do to check the current inflation, so it is resorting to the old-fashioned device of tight money. It will probably succeed in checking the inflation and, in doing so, it will probably also succeed in throwing the economy into a tailspin.

The hon. Minister did not consider that possibility in anything that he presented to the House this afternoon.

The basic problem is that in Canada we have no long-term programme for economic growth at all. The federal government has been caught by surprise. It is resorting to the usual short-term expedients to check inflation, but it is incapable of checking inflation without creating the danger of producing a recession. It is following the old expedients that have been tried in the past and have failed.

It has not, for example, done what Sweden has been doing for a generation, that is, to undertake long-term planning of investment. I admit the hon. Mr. Sharp, Minister of Finance, has adopted a sort of a pale imitation of that Swedish programme but it is only a short-term programme. The basic point is that we were not prepared, although surely we should have been, for the present inflationary situation that is developing. I say that we should have been prepared for it because it is following the pattern that the trade cycle has followed ever since World War II. It is also the same pattern as it followed prior to that, though in a less extreme form now.

Moreover there is absolutely no evidence of any long-term planning in the province of Ontario. The Minister has devised a number of specific measures, some of which are interesting and useful, some of which perhaps may be a little more in the category of public relations devices, but they still add up only to a collection of specific measures. They are measures designed to take whatever advantage we can of the present favourable economic situation as long as it lasts. They disclose no attempt at all to influence that situation, either jointly with the federal government and the other provinces of Canada, or by our own efforts. We are simply prepared to drift along with the times, to make the most we can of them and, I suppose, to be prepared to tighten our belts when the trade cycle turns down.

I am sure that members of the House will be happy to know that I do not intend tonight to deal with the New Democratic proposals for economic planning. I have outlined them in the past on numerous occasions in this House. They have also been outlined, more competently no doubt, in other places. Any who may be interested in them can find them either in speeches I have made in the Budget debate, or on the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, or in publications of the New Democratic Party.

So I will not go into them now. I will content myself with saying that Canada is lagging behind—and when I say Canada I include also Ontario—Canada and Ontario are lagging behind almost all of the civilized countries of the world when it comes to economic planning. The only country we are not lagging behind is the United States. The United States can afford—or up till now has been able to afford—the luxury of inefficiency, but we cannot. We do not have the kind of resources the United States has. We should be taking or getting examples from other advanced countries—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Have you ever compared our mining industry with the countries you have mentioned?

Mr. Bryden: If the hon. Minister cannot bring himself to consider the example of socialist Sweden, perhaps he could look at France at least. But no Minister of Economics and Development, and no government of this province has ever been prepared to

give any serious consideration to economic planning, except to the extent of using some of the jargon that is produced in relation to that type of policy.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Minister that we cannot forever drift in this way. We have no reasonable basis to expect that we are going to escape the recession which up until now has always followed every boom. I am not going to try to forecast precisely when the recession will come, I pride myself in not being an economic forecaster.

It is my observation that most economic forecasters never forecast anything except what is already happening. They say that what is happening will continue to happen for an indefinite period in the future. Events have usually belied their statements.

But this much we know for sure, that up until now in Canadian and Ontario history, every boom has been followed by a recession. I think it is time that we took cognizance of that fact, I think it is time the hon. Minister of Economics and Development took cognizance of it. I would have liked to have seen him this afternoon note that fact and come forward with policies that for once would attempt to offset the almost inevitable trend towards recession which will follow, I fear, very shortly.

The Minister's failure to do so represents the total failure of this government in the field of economic policy. I do not suppose that I should single out this government for condemnation because there has been a similar total failure at the federal level. Indeed, it would be quite fair to say that the federal government is much more worthy of condemnation because it has a far greater responsibility in this field than any provincial government. Even so, I would suggest that failing constructive leadership by the federal government, this government, the government of Canada's most populous province, should be prepared to step into the breach to some extent.

Further than that, it should try to impress upon the federal government the need for economic planning under federal leadership and with the co-operation of both federal and provincial governments.

However, this is not happening. In terms of economic policy, we in Ontario are no further ahead than we were 15 years ago. As I have already stated, we use some of the jargon, some of the terminology, that has developed in relation to economic planning, but we have none of the content whatever of adequate plans. As a result, we will undoubtedly continue to be helpless victims of the trade cycle, drifting along with it in whatever direction it may go.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the two or three minutes that I had available to me this afternoon, I said that there were a couple of matters of a broader import that I would like to deal with this evening. Sometimes I think we tend to become too preoccupied with our own immediate problems, our own little bailiwick. The Minister himself noted, and I think quite rightly, that neither Ontario nor Canada can be an island unto itself. We have to consider ourselves as part of a total world economy, or at any rate of a western world economy.

I think sometimes it is worthwhile to look at some of the broader problems that arise in this larger western economy of which we are a part. I am not going to talk about balance of payments or exchange problems. They are very important, but I am going to talk about two different issues which I think are even more important than the balance of payments.

To introduce the first of them, I would like to refer to a question that I have had on the order paper for some substantial time—for at least two months I think—in which I asked for the cost to the public Treasury of financing Ministers on the numerous trips that they are now taking to various exotic places throughout the world. Although my question has not been answered as yet, I am willing to hazard the guess that the greatest world traveller of all the Ministers is the Minister of Economics and Development. He nods his head to confirm what I have said.

If the speech he made on April 14 to the Empire club in Toronto in an indication of what he says when he goes abroad, it would be a good idea to keep him at home. We could thereby save ourselves a certain amount of money and, what is more important, we might be able to preserve such store of goodwill as we now have in other countries, especially in developing countries. His speech was a classic example of that arrogance which has made white men the objects of suspicion and even hatred in country after country throughout the world. Nothing could be better calculated to assist in the spread of world communism.

For three centuries the predatory white man, in his mad scramble for profits, brought almost all the non-white peoples of the world under economic and often political subjugation. He destroyed the internal social and

cultural balance of their own communities, not to speak of their sense of personal dignity, and gave them as little as possible in return. The coloured man was merely an instrument to satisfy the rapacity of the white man. He shared very little in the huge economic benefits derived from the exploitation of his homeland and, where he did share, it was only to the minimum extent necessary to consolidate the white man's economic empire. Worst of all, he was personally denigrated and humiliated.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Man the barricades!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: We see the white man's arrogance coming across the floor of the House. We do not have to look abroad to see this process in operation. It happened and is still happening right here in Canada in regard to our own Indian population. It is melancholy to think, but it is probably true, that other indigenous peoples have suffered even worse than the Canadian Indian.

Take the case of Africa, Mr. Chairman. Africans in numbers that beggar the imagination were for 200 years the victims of the slave trade—a sustained and massive record of man's inhumanity to man that finds few parallels in human history. The result was that that the indigenous cultures of Africa, some of which were remarkably advanced, were utterly destroyed.

The slave trade was finally abolished, but the damage had already been done. Moreover, no serious effort was made to repair it. Most Africans continued to be slaves, in fact, if not in law. They were neither admitted into the white man's society nor given an opportunity to re-establish their own cultural and social balance.

After World War II their demands for independence became irresistible, but very little was done by their European masters—nothing at all in the case of the Belgians in the Congo—to assist them to prepare themselves for the responsibilities of independence. Is it any wonder that most of the new African states are encountering serious difficulties in finding the basic political, social and economic stability which it took us a thousand years to achieve?

In place of the smug sense of superiority which shone through in every line of the hon. Minister's Empire club speech, I propose that our policies towards the newly established nations of the world should be founded on a combination of humility and understanding. First of all, we have to recognize that basically the problems of these countries arise out of the crimes of our own white forefathers.

Once we squarely face that undeniable fact, Mr. Chairman, then we will be on the road to understanding.

We will be able to develop some appreciation of both the difficulties and aspirations of the peoples of these countries. This will enable us to give genuine assistance to them in overcoming their difficulties and achieving their aspirations.

At the Empire club, the Minister is reported to have unveiled what he chose to call the Ontario plan. Let us hope that it will never develop beyond what appears to be its present embryonic form. Half of Canada's current foreign aid, he is reported to have said, should be used to provide incentives to Canadian businessmen—by which he probably means the Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. firms—to set up plants in underdeveloped countries. In other words, he is proposing that public funds should be used to finance a new generation of economic freebooters to establish a new era of imperialism in the newly independent nations.

Apart from the questionability of applying capital-intensive techniques too quickly to countries whose major problem is a chronic labour surplus, the Minister shows all the sensitivity of a bull in a china shop to the complexity and delicacy of the problem. The people of the developing nations will simply not tolerate another round of economic imperialism. They have had enough of the kind of charity which provides them with crumbs and the white man with whole loaves.

Only one valid criticism can be made of Canada's current external aid programme: it is pitifully inadequate. It is impossible to arrive at an accurate estimate of the amount Canada is now spending on external aid because so many individual items, most of them purely marginal, are involved. If everything is included, however, it would appear that not more than $300 million—and when I cite the figure I am really giving the federal government the benefit of the doubt; as far as I can figure out it is only about $200 million, but I will take the figure as $300 million—will be spent on economic aid in the current fiscal year. This is about 3.5 per cent of our total federal budget of $8.5 billion, and not much more than one-half of one per cent of our gross national product.

Are we, with our much vaunted Christian charity, willing to share only half of one per cent of our own abundance, so that people at or below the starvation line will have enough to eat today and some hope for tomorrow? Are we not willing to sacrifice a second or third car or TV set or a shiny new powerboat in order that fellow human beings might live?

Our governments apparently think not. I think they are wrong. I think that if the case was put squarely to the Canadian people, they would be willing to make at least minor sacrifices to help those whose need is so great that we can hardly comprehend it. I am not suggesting that any sacrifices should be made by those in our own country who are living in poverty, even though their poverty is almost affluence when compared to the grinding poverty which is the lot of most of the human race.

I am not even suggesting that the rest of us should sacrifice any necessities or even modest luxuries. All I am suggesting is that we do not have to wallow in all of the frivolous, meaningless luxuries which the advertising men are trying to persuade us we cannot live without. Obesity is a major problem in North America—this in a world in which two-thirds of the people are starving.

Even if we cannot be moved by human sympathy, our own sense of self-preservation should tell us that there is no future in piling luxury upon luxury. The greatest single threat to the security of the world today, and thus to our own security, arises out of the fact that the rich nations are becoming progressively richer while, in relative terms, the vastly more populous poor nations are becoming progressively poorer.

As we here in Canada sit in an overfed condition before our TV sets in our comfortable homes equipped with a hundred modern conveniences, we repudiate as an invention of the devil the Marxist concept of class conflict. Yet all around us there is developing an international class conflict which will submerge us if we do not soon take drastic steps to overcome world poverty and its causes. The white man of North America and Europe cannot much longer continue to live in affluent, privileged suburbs on the fringes of a vast world slum.

In pursuit of what it describes as a policy of containment of communism, the United States is at present pouring hundreds of millions of dollars down a military sinkhole in Vietnam. Yet, all of the western world together—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would say that other countries in the western world do not surpass Canada or Ontario.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Have you read his Empire speech?

Mr. Bryden: Yet all of the western world together—has not as yet been able to muster enough assistance to prevent outright starvation in India. With massive assistance which is clearly needed and which the west can clearly afford, India could become one of the greatest bulwarks against communism. Without it, it may well fall into the communist orbit.

This is the context in which the hon. Minister made his fatuous speech to the Empire club. The last thing the world needs is a Canadian programme of handouts to its own businessmen, or the subsidiaries of American businesses, to establish a new world imperialism. Our aim should be to establish a partnership with the developing nations, accepting many rebuffs and disappointments along the way, to develop a world economy in which the benefits of world production will be shared by all peoples, and not just by the white man.

The first urgent need is not, as the hon. Minister suggests, a contraction or redirection of Canada's external aid programme, but a large expansion of those programmes from the present level of about one-half of one per cent, to at least two per cent of the gross national product. The present purposes and methods of those programmes are satisfactory, notwithstanding what the hon. Minister said in his Empire club speech.

The trouble is that in total they represent only a drop in the bucket. Instead of criticizing the small amount of good Canada is already doing in the external aid field, Ontario should be pushing for a great expansion of that effort. To that end, it should be prepared to offer some of its own resources to the common cause, and when I say some of its own resources, I do not mean subsidies to the subsidiaries of U.S. corporations to set up bicycle factories in Ghana or Tanzania or some such place as that.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I would like to discuss briefly. It too, I think, provides some of the setting in which we in Canada and Ontario must develop economic policies, and I am referring to the growing stranglehold that foreign and mainly U.S. corporations are exercising over the Canadian economy.

This is a matter of concern to many people

in this country. I realize that a substantial number of people, including I would judge, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, see no cause for alarm. It is difficult, however, to understand their complacency in the face of plain facts. A DBS survey published last summer showed that out of 24,508 corporations covered, 7,439, or nearly a third of the total, were more than 50 per cent owned by non-residents. This concentration of foreign ownership is greatest in manufacturing and mining.

And it is only part of the story, and not really the most significant part, Mr. Chairman. Although the actual number of companies with more than 50 per cent foreign ownership constituted only a third of the total number of companies, the equity stock of these companies added up to $23.8 billion out of a total for all the companies surveyed of $32.6 billion, or almost 75 per cent of the total. In other words, the corporations that are more than 50 per cent foreign owned represent 75 per cent of the total equity stock of corporations in manufacturing and mining in Canada. These companies, under foreign control, are in the main the big companies, those whose decisions have an important effect on our economy. The Yanks still let us run our own corner grocery stores and other small businesses. They are content to control the big companies.

Moreover, the DBS figures take no account of the fact that it takes much less than a 50 per cent holding of equity stock to exercise complete control over a company. For example, more than 90 per cent of the stock of the Bell Telephone Company is technically held by Canadians, but that company is effectively controlled by one of the world's most powerful monopolies, namely American Telephone and Telegraph, even though AT&T holds considerably less than ten per cent of the stock. I am not quite sure what the figure is now, but it is probably around five or six per cent.

Thus, the degree of foreign ownership and control in Canada is not fully brought out in the DBS figures. Even so, the overall picture is quite clear. More and more of Canadian industry, particularly in the critical resource and manufacturing fields, has been falling under the control of huge international corporations based mainly in the United States. The process is now so far advanced that it is not difficult to foresee complete control by such corporations over all significant industrial and resource enterprises in this country.

There are some who simply turn the blind eye to this trend. Canada needs foreign capital they repeat over and over again; let us get the capital and damn the consequences. Such was the viewpoint expressed recently by Saskatchewan Premier Ross Thatcher and Manitoba Opposition leader Gildas Molgat, two of the Liberal Party's large and growing stable of partly housebroken reactionaries.

A similar viewpoint was expressed by our very own hon. Prime Minister, in his speech of May 10 to the A. E. Ames and United States Investment Group. Characteristically, the hon. Prime Minister hedged his statement with a mild "but," and/or a mild "if," but not enough to alarm the noble assemblage to which he was speaking.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: After he had set forth what he regarded as an imperative need for more and more U.S. investment, a knowing doubt apparently entered his mind, because he added, and I am quoting from his speech of May 10: "This is not to say that we are not concerned over the possibility of foreign domination of our economy. We are."

The doubt was short-lived, Mr. Chairman. He immediately went on to assert that our real problem would not be an excess, but a shortage of foreign investment.

There are few who would deny that Canada needs foreign capital if it is to continue to grow, but before we jump to the conclusion that foreign control is the necessary price of foreign investment, I would suggest that we look at what is actually happening. There have been a great many discussions of foreign control in the newspapers of late, especially since Mr. Walter Gordon published his new book, which is a rehash of his previous book, but there really has been very little effort to look at what is really happening.

I think it is worth doing that. To get the complete facts we have to go to U.S. sources. It is a remarkable thing that in order to find out what is happening in Canada, we have to go to the United States, but the United States department of commerce has been very generous in providing a complete picture of what is happening.

That department annually reviews the sources and uses of funds of foreign affiliates of U.S. companies, not only Canadian affiliates, but U.S. companies all over the world. I will naturally confine myself to what their survey has shown with regard to Canadian

affiliates of U.S. companies. The latest analysis of the department was contained in the November, 1965 issue of its monthly publication, *Survey of Current Business.*

After payment of dividends, financing by U.S.-controlled companies in Canadian manufacturing, mining and petroleum industries, totalled $1.96 billion in 1964. That is just under $2 billion. That is shown here in this publication I was referring to—$2 billion almost. Only $125 million of this sum, that is six per cent of the total, came from the United States. The actual U.S. money that U.S. companies are bringing to Canada is small and is getting smaller every year.

In 1962, their total financing in Canada after payment of dividends, was $1.6 billion—a little over one and a half billion dollars—of which $201 million or 12.5 per cent came from the United States. That was in 1962. In the space of two years, their contribution of funds from the United States dropped from 12.5 per cent to six per cent of their total financing in Canada.

It is nonsense to say that Canadians must put up with increasing U.S. control of our economy because that is the price of U.S. investment in Canada. The plain fact is that the growth of control by U.S. corporations in Canada is bringing only a very small and declining amount of U.S. investment funds with it. We do not have to give them control of our economy in order to get their investments funds. They are bringing very little in, these companies which now control the major enterprises in our resource and manufacturing industries.

Where are they getting the money that they are investing in Canada? They are getting it nowhere else than right here in Canada. In 1964, $764 million, or almost 40 per cent of total net financing of these U.S.-controlled corporations came from their depreciation and depletion reserves, that is, reserves generated in Canada and held in Canada by the Canadian subsidiaries. An additional $644 million, about a third of the total, came from their undistributed profits. The remaining $423 million came from stocks and bonds sold outside the United States, and almost all of these securities were undoubtedly sold to Canadians.

A portion of this money went to finance inventories and receivables, but more than three-quarters of it was invested in property, plant, equipment and other assets. U.S. controlled corporations are steadily expanding and improving their plants in Canada and they are building new plants. In addition, Mr. Chairman, they are buying out more and more successful Canadian enterprises as going concerns.

Just as an indication of what they are doing, here is a page from the business section of the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of January 5, 1965, that lists some of the major Canadian concerns that were bought out by U.S.-controlled corporations during 1965. Whether they are simply expanding their own plants and building new plants, or buying out Canadian enterprises, either way their tentacles are extending further and further through the Canadian economy.

Does this represent increasing investment of U.S. funds in Canada? Not at all. It represents increasing investment of Canadian funds by and under the control of U.S. corporations. In short, Mr. Chairman, the Americans are buying us out with our own money. U.S. corporations are not bringing any significant amount of U.S. money into Canada. They are reinvesting funds generated in Canada which they have captured in depreciation allowances and undistributed profits. While our governments have slumbered, these corporations have got control of a large and increasing proportion of Canadian investment funds. They are using these funds to extend their control still further.

It is all very well to say that the Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. corporations are good corporate citizens. This is a favourite expression of the Minister. I am not quite sure what it means but in any case, the fact remains that to an increasing degree decisions affecting our economic development are made outside the country in response to conditions that are not Canadian conditions and to government policies that are not drawn up with Canadian interests primarily in mind.

How could anyone say that our long-term independence as a nation is not threatened when we have only indirect and diminishing control over decisions which are vital to our economic welfare, when our statesmen have to make pilgrimages to Washington to seek modifications of policies governing companies which theoretically are Canadian companies? We have to go to Washington to deal with policies that affect policies with Canadian incorporation.

Among other things, this problem has given rise to a major policy disagreement in the federal Liberal Party. On the one hand, there is the Rt. hon. Mitchell Sharp, who describes his essentially *laissez-faire* approach as that of an optimist. On the other hand, there is Mr. Walter Gordon, whose interventionist

policy is seen by Mr. Sharp as an expression of pessimism.

In other quarters, it has been said that Mr. Gordon represents the left wing of the Liberal Party. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, then one can only conclude that the main body of the party is somewhere in the vicinity of Social Credit on the political spectrum. I do not object to government intervention; indeed, I regard it as essential to any effective attack on the problem. But it surely must be obvious that the measures Mr. Gordon is proposing will not reduce foreign control of Canadian industry one iota.

His basic objectives have not changed from those he has been expressing for several years. He wants to induce foreign-controlled companies to make 25 per cent of their equity stock available to Canadians and to include some Canadians on their boards of directors. This will permit a few privileged Canadians to partake of the dividends and directors' fees which such companies may see fit to distribute. It will not, however, have any effect at all on the problem of foreign control.

A company, whose stock is held 75 per cent outside the country, is just as effectively under foreign control as one whose stock is entirely foreign-owned. Even if Mr. Gordon reversed his figures and aimed at encouraging 75 per cent Canadian ownership of equity stock, the sitution would not be significantly altered. In the modern corporation, with its far-flung body of rank-and-file shareholders, a cohesive, organized, management group at the centre can exercise complete control with far less than 25 per cent share ownership. Indeed, with as little as two or three per cent in some cases.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That is the point Mr. Gordon missed.

Mr. MacDonald: One of many points he missed.

Mr. Bryden: That is what I am trying to suggest. His suggestion that we will change the situation by inducing American corporations to permit 25 per cent of their stock to be owned by Canadians is totally wrong. That will have no effect; it will not affect—

Mr. White: It has a negative effect.

Mr. Bryden: Well it certainly will not have any effect on the problem of foreign control. I am glad that my hon. friend from London agrees with me at least on that point.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): What do you think about the youth group tonight?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well you are a continental in every respect.

Mr. Bryden: Moreover, nothing is to be gained by having one or more authentic Canadian natives on the board of directors of a foreign-controlled subsidiary. These captives may provide the public relation boys with a means of giving a Canadian image to the foreign company, but when the chips are down they will do as they are told by their foreign masters or get out and sacrifice their directors' fees and perquisites.

In any case, the problem of foreign control of Canadian industry is merely one aspect of a much larger problem. In the last analysis, what we are seeing in Canada today is a phase, and it is only a phase, of a world-wide trend towards the concentration of control over industry. In Canada this problem is complicated by the further problem of foreign control.

Mr. Gordon seems to assume that our troubles would be over if the secondary problem, the problem of foreign control, were solved. That is, he thinks that we can solve the problem if major corporations in Canada today were somehow turned into genuinely Canadian corporations with Canadian boards of directors and a majority of shares held in Canada.

Even if this were possible, Mr. Chairman, and nothing Mr. Gordon has proposed will bring it about, we would still have not solved the basic problem. That problem is the growing concentration of economic power in the hands of a declining number of huge monolithic corporations which are really accountable to nobody. Personally, I see little difference in being dictated to by Canadian monoliths rather than American monoliths. I do not want to be dictated to by any monoliths at all.

It is sometimes argued that corporations are accountable to their shareholders. This myth is a great favourite with the apologists for corporations but it has no substance to it at all. Shareholders are scattered all over the country, indeed all over the world. The management group is cohesive and concentrated. The shareholders have no influence at all on management decisions.

It is also argued that corporations are subject to the sovereignty of the consumer. This has some substance to it but not very much. The major corporations of today have strong monopolistic power in the market. They can and they do administer prices. Moreover by massive, largely irresponsible, advertising campaigns they create demands

that do not meet any genuine human need and thereby divert our resources into frivolous and wasteful uses. And all the while they fleece the consumer with a great variety of misleading practices.

Another argument that is often resorted to is that big labour counterbalances big business. In fact, this argument is frequently carried a stage further by the apologists for big business. I have also heard it being carried a stage further by the leader of the Opposition in this House. It is alleged that the real danger comes from the unrestrained exercise of power by labour. Trade unions are being used in much the same way as Hitler used the Jews in Germany. The finger is pointed at them to divert attention from the real concentration of power that is taking place in the community.

There is no question that trade unions have moderated the raw exercise of power by corporations, especially to the extent that that power is directed against the employees of corporations. Even in that rather limited field, however, the influence of trade unions may be declining. The printers' strike in Toronto has illustrated the almost total power, the terrifying power I would say, that a strong, co-ordinated and ruthless management can exercise over even a well-established union.

In the broader picture, trade unions hardly offer any counterbalance to corporations at all. The net profits after taxes of General Motors regularly reach between $1.5 billion and $2 billion a year. In other words, after this huge monster has covered all its expenses and taxes and has made ample provision for expansion, it has a surplus left over that is approximately equal to the entire Budget of the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Your Budget is big business.

Mr. Bryden: And General Motors has a huge surplus. Money represents power in a capitalist economy and the entire trade union movement of North America cannot begin to match that concentration of money under the control of this one huge corporation. So when we talk about the problem being to curb the power of trade unions, we are simply talking nonsense, Mr. Chairman. General Motors by itself has more power than all the trade unions of North America put together.

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor Sandwich): What is your solution?

Mr. Bryden: Finally, it is argued that governments can restrain the unrestricted exercise of power by corporations. There is considerable truth in this, but unfortunately any governments we have had to date in Canada have shown little interest in making corporations genuinely accountable. At most, they nibble away at the fringes of the problem, through such measures as anti-combines legislation, which have had no effect at all on the concentration of corporate power.

Even when a government appears to be standing up to corporations, it rarely shows the staying power to make its policies stick. For example, a few years ago President Kennedy appeared to score a great victory over the steel companies of the United States by making them forego certain large price increases they had announced and even to roll back some increases they had actually put into effect. Within a year, however, the companies had quietly put into effect all the increases they had in mind and a few more besides. Corporations will usually avoid a direct confrontation with government, knowing full well that, by being patient, they will get their way, anyway.

Thus, when we talk of growing U.S. control over the Canadian economy, we should see it in its broader context of growing corporate control over the whole western economy. Apart from the threat of communism, this is the most important single problem faced by the western world today. Like communism, it threatens the very foundation of free, democratic government. Even if we contain communism, and I think we can, we will not have accomplished too much if most real power falls into the hands of a small international corporate élite.

Obviously, there are no easy solutions to this problem. It is time, however, that we at least started to search for solutions and, with that in mind, I would like to make a few preliminary suggestions.

First of all, our corporation tax structure both in Canada and Ontario should be completely reformed. Depreciation reserves and undistributed profits provide corporations with the means by which they extend their control. So if we want to limit the extension of their control over the economy we should start striking at the means by which they extend that control. They use the surpluses of one company to buy control of another and so on indefinitely. This is a process that has been going on for a long time and it is accelerating. I regret to see that the hon. member for London South apparently missed the first lesson in economics, but that is elementary.

Mr. MacDonald: I know that is regrettable.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go into a detailed demonstration of what I have said because I believe it is self-evident, but I would remind the House that I have already cited figures to show that this is exactly the way in which U.S. corporations are gaining control of the Canadian economy. They are using depreciation reserves and undistributed profits generated in Canada. They are not bringing in money from the United States.

This is obviously true with regard to the subsidiaries of U.S. corporations operating in Canada. It is in fact a well-nigh universal process in the western world.

We can offset this trend, Mr. Chairman. I am not saying that we can reverse it, but we can offset it by tightening up our present provisions regarding depreciation and depletion allowances.

We hear many cries of anguish on behalf of the poor little bare foot boys like the Ford Motor Company of Canada, about the terrible corporation taxes they pay. As far as the little ones are concerned I would like to cut their corporation tax to about five per cent, but I am now talking about the larger ones.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): I heard the hon. member refer to depreciation and depletion reserves. I would point out that reserves are simply an expense charged against the operating cost of the business. Reserves do not in themselves set up any capital funds whatever. In order to provide money, there must be a depreciation reserve fund of actual money taken from the business and set up for the purpose of replacing the assets that are gradually wasting or being used. A depletion reserve is simply a recognition that the original assets, such as in a mine, are being depleted through being mined and there is just so much left, so that actually the capital value is being reduced. But as far as providing funds, neither the depletion reserves nor depreciation reserves provide one cent of money.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is lesson one, but if we go on to lesson two—

Mr. Chairman: That was an interesting question.

Mr. Bryden: It was a lengthy question, but I was very interested in hearing it and now I will proceed to answer it, Mr. Chairman. I will say to my friend, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox that that is lesson one. But if he would go on to lesson two, he would find that is not the way Canadian corporation tax laws work at all. They permit large acquisitions of reserve funds through which corporations extend their operations. As a matter of fact, before the member asked his question, I was making reference to cries of anguish that are sometimes uttered with regard to the high corporation tax rates that are paid in Canada. Now, it is really impossible to compare corporation taxes in different countries because they are too complicated—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Is that the highest?

Mr. Bryden: We are not the highest, we do not even have the highest rates. But apart from that, there is a lot more involved in the corporation tax than the crude rate. Everything depends on what is involved in arriving at the tax. Now, the *U.S. World News and Report* made a survey a couple of years ago and it found that of the countries surveyed—which included most of the advanced countries in the world—Canada, in fact, had the lowest effective rate of any of them. Our provisions with regard to depreciation and depletion allowances taken in total and averaged across them all, are by far the most generous. Thus, notwithstanding the information that the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox communicated when he was asking for information, it is not true by any means that depreciation allowances under Canadian tax law merely provide for replacement of assets that are being used up.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am sure my hon. friend would allow a question. Would he suggest that Ford Motor Company of the United States pay less corporation tax than Ford Motor of Canada?

Mr. Bryden: I do not know what the question relates to.

Mr. Whicher: I am sorry, I was not trying to be the least bit smart about it. I just said this, would the hon. member suggest that Ford Motor of the United States, as far as corporation taxes are concerned, pay less taxes on a percentage basis than Ford Motor of Canada? In my opinion, Ford Motor of Canada pay more.

Mr. Bryden: Well, yes, that may be the hon. member's opinion, but I just tried to suggest that on the basis of what admittedly is very limited evidence, it is not a fact that the effective rate is higher here than it is in the United States. I am prepared to agree that it is a very hard thing to determine, but we get absolutely nowhere by just

comparing crude rates. We get particularly confused, Mr. Chairman, if we do what is so often done, and compare the federal rate in the United States with the combined federal and provincial rate in Canada. If we are going to make comparisons, we should also include the rates of taxation levied by the states in the United States.

However, the fact still remains, whatever may be our situation vis-a-vis the United States or any other country, the fact still remains that about 40 per cent of the expansion of U.S. corporations in Canada in 1964 was financed out of depreciation and depletion reserves. Those are figures from the U.S. department of commerce, they are not my figures. I suggest that that gives us a key to one of the places where corporations, and in our particular case U.S. corporations, are getting control over our economy.

Mr. Whicher: If one machine wears out, they have to buy a new one.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Well, I already dealt with that point in response to the question by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. Chairman: I think we should let the member for Woodbine complete his statement so we can go on with No. 1 vote on the estimates.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I had been on the point of saying that we can offset this trend to increasing control by a decreasing number of large corporations by tightening up our present provisions regarding depreciation and depletion allowances, and by taking steps to induce a greater distribution of profits.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): To whom?

Mr. Bryden: To the shareholders, who else?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The shareholders are not complaining, the hon. member is.

Mr. Bryden: I believe that the corporation tax on undistributed profits should be increased to at least 75 per cent.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Oh, sure, that is great.

Mr. Bryden: And that the tax on distributed profits should be reduced to 25 per cent. You know, Mr. Chairman, it is always amazing the howls of anguish one hears when one starts to suggest a free enterprise solution to a problem. I am suggesting that these fellows should disgorge their profits and give them to the shareholders who are obstensibly the owners of the corporations. They will not do that in the normal course of events. They give them enough so they will not squawk, but they keep the larger part in the corporation treasury to become an instrument for aggrandizement of the managers. Now, I am suggesting that we should try to make the system work the way that these gentlemen over there say it works.

Mr. McKeough: Will the hon. member permit a question? Is he making any distinction whatsoever between what I would call small companies, in some cases family-owned, in some cases individually-owned, which are corporations in the true sense of the word, and companies of the size of the Ford Motor Company?

Mr. MacDonald: He indicated that earlier.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. member asked the question because I admit I did not really go into the point. I want to make it clear, however—

Mr. McKeough: No, the hon. member's leader did, though.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to make it clear, as I think I tried to do to the hon. member for Bruce, that I am talking about the huge international corporations. I think that has been implicit in everything I have said up to now, but I admit that I did not make the distinction. So if it will make the hon. member for Kent West feel happier, I can tell him that I have no corporations that he is interested in in mind. I should not put it on that personal basis, however, so I will say that I am not worried about being dictated to by a corporation with a capitalization of half a million dollars or something like that. Those are not the companies I am worried about. As a matter of fact, I think they should start to get worried about the increasing control of the huge monoliths because a good many of them are going under along the line.

However, getting back to my proposal to increase the corporation income tax on undistributed profits and to reduce it on distributed profits, I think, Mr. Chairman, that this would help to get the funds that corporations now use to extend their control into the hands of the public at large. It would at least be an incentive for them to distribute

more of their profits. Even if they refused to disgorge a substantial part of those funds it would go to the federal and provincial governments and so would be taken out from under their control in another way.

The second suggestion I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that governments have to play a much more active role than at present in the development in our resources and industry. I am not going to repeat now the proposals this party has made on many occasions regarding economic planning—I already gave that undertaking. But as one example of what we have in mind, I would say that the Canadian development corporation, about which the Liberals have been talking at great length but about which they have really done nothing as yet, should be used as a major instrument to mobilize Canadian savings for investment in Canadian resources and industry.

The government should be prepared to invest in new industries where necessary. It should also be prepared to buy shares and thus obtain a voice in existing enterprises that are threatening to get beyond all control.

Moreover, in my opinion, the Ontario government should be prepared to reinforce federal efforts by adopting a similar policy. The newly established Ontario development corporation is to serve as a sort of mortgage broker as far as small enterprises in outlying areas are concerned. This is a useful function, Mr. Chairman, but it is really of quite minor consequence.

The corporation—that is, the Ontario development corporation—as it is now constituted will have no impact at all on our basic problems.

Finally, we cannot escape the fact that ultimately the control of corporations is an international problem. Mr. A. A. Berle, probably the leading United States expert on corporations, said a decade ago that the "institutional corporation . . ." has . . . "concentrated power into a small directing group," and there are . . . "a couple of hundred or so" such groups in the entire western world. He went on to say:

> As yet, the community has not created any acknowledged referent of responsibility, no group from which they can take their power mandate or get instructions.

Now, those are not my words; they are the words of Adolph Berle, who is essentially an apologist for the modern corporation.

The huge modern corporation is international in its scope. As a result, no national government, not even the government of the United States, can hold it strictly to account. It can play governments off against each other. It can undermine progressive governments and bolster up reactionary regimes in underdeveloped countries. It can even involve the armed forces of major powers in promoting its own narrow interests.

Thus, the couple of hundred or so power groups to which Berle referred can be brought under effective control only by international action. Unfortunately, existing machinery for international co-operation is still in a rudimentary state, but Canada, of all countries, should take the lead in developing it. We, who are on the verge of becoming an economic colony, should be giving a lead to others in a similar position in devising the means of bringing international corporations under democratic control. Thus, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister of Economics and Development recounts his little triumphs here, and setting up a marginal enterprise there, we should bear in mind the broad context in which all such activity is taking place.

I am not inclined to criticize most of the specific projects the hon. Minister has in his repertory, but when they are all added up they still amount to nothing more than a collection of specific projects. There is still no evidence in this province of even the embryo of an overall economic policy. As long as that is so, it can only be said that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has failed completely even to accept, much less discharge, his basic responsibility.

In developing such a policy, we will naturally have to take into account the specific situation of the province. At the same time, we will also have to take into account the broader problems, some of which I have touched on to some extent in these remarks. It is my hope that I may have brought to the attention of the hon. Minister at least the fact that these problems exist, and that the government of Ontario must join forces with the government of Canada—and, through it, with other governments in the free world—in finding solutions to them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Economics and Development.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Chairman, I took note of the comments of my friend, the hon. member for Brant, this afternoon when he

pointed out that I had taken 90 minutes to deliver my comments. I noted that he took 70 minutes to rebut thost comments, and the hon. member for Woodbine took 80 minutes; so if this is a very ineffectual programme, it certainly took a lot of time to disparage those opportunities on the part of hon. members opposite.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a nice debating point. Now let us get down to business.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just hold it now. I have something for the hon. member, too.

Mr. Chairman: I should point out to the Minister that it has been the practice in the House to permit the lead-off speakers a wide range of discussion when they are reviewing the estimates of a department, but it does seem to the chair that this privilege has been somewhat extended during this particular session.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I agree, Mr. Chairman. I do not intend to comment on many matters discussed tonight; I think we can do that at a later time. I would like to say though, this afternoon, when the hon. member for Brant was talking about the hippopotamus, that I can say that the two parties across the road have the unique distinction of having been defeated in 1963 by a hippopotamus!

I also think, Mr. Chairman, that on this side of the House when the Minister outlines what he is doing in his plans and what he has achieved, he is accused of boasting; but when the Opposition members advance the same ideas, it is careful and efficient planning; so I would just like to make that point and leave it with my hon. friends.

I might say that I have a very excellent staff. They prepare some very good groundwork for me and many of the speeches I make. I can assure you that I write many of them myself, and those I do not write I certainly go over very carefully. I take full responsibility, not only for the speeches I make outside the House, but those I make in the House—including the presentation I made this afternoon.

On the matter of the industrial report that the hon. member for Brant discussed this afternoon and said that he would like to have—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I think the hon. Minister is referring to my question. I did not mean to—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I appreciate that.

Mr. Thompson: I realize that the Minister is very busy and he is naturally going to use the talents of his staff to put it together and then work at it himself. The question I asked was as to the precise meaning of the hon. Minister's statement that:

> The function of this branch is to conduct economic investigations and study the implications of a feasibility — analyzing nature.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer that now. A feasibility study was made; and perhaps the choosing of the wording was somewhat hard to understand, but what it actually means is that when we make a feasibility study, we have to look at the implications of that study before we make recommendations to the government. I think that pretty well covers the point that the hon. member raised. I can understand his doubt; I looked at it twice myself.

Getting back to the Ontario industrial report that the hon. member for Brant said he would like to have at least a couple of weeks in advance, it impressed me that this would solve the matter of Ministers making speeches. If hon. members got that report there would not be any need for speeches. Maybe that is a good idea.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Does the hon. Minister mean this report?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. Much of the material is in the industrial report as you can see. The matter of licence agreements—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Do I understand that what the Minister is saying is that this has been available for a long time and was put on yesterday just as a prelude to his own remarks?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we received that two days ago. In fact, we just have a couple of hundred copies off the press; the rest are being printed today. If I had had it before, and I had been on my estimates, we would not have had that report in the House. I think last year we got it the day before we went on with our estimates, but I just want to point out that much of the material used in the presentation of the Minister's estimates come from that report. That is the reason why I think it should come out the same time we make our presentation.

The matter of regional development is, and has been, carried out by all departments over the last several years. I do not think we can

say regional development is just something that we found out about a year ago February. We took a year to plan that conference—and I can assure you there was a great deal of thought given to regional development long before I joined the government—but perhaps we have pinpointed some of the problems and the things that can be done in our design for development programme.

It certainly will give us an opportunity to co-ordinate more closely all the activities of the various departments and perhaps place priorities on the things that should have priorities. In doing this, I am sure that we are going to look at the potential in every area, in relation to those priorities. That is what I think design for development will do. It will pinpoint, perhaps in a closer context than before, the matters of regional development that other departments have carried on.

I was interested, also, in the hon. member's comments on boundaries. This was one of the first things I can assure the hon. members we are going to take a close look at and study. We believe boundaries should be pulled together. It is not going to be easy in some departments, but at least we have a starting point. I believe that perhaps a year from now we can bring information into the House and point out to the hon. members that we have taken note of your comments with reference boundaries.

We also agree with the hon. member that the highways do not have to follow growth. They can lead growth into many parts of the province, and again I think that is what our highways department is doing, by providing access to these remote areas of Ontario. It certainly is going to develop growth in these areas, if there is any growth there to be had.

Now there was a comment or two made on the Ontario economic council, and I might again say that this is not set up to duplicate the work of the economic council of Canada. I thought I spelled that out this afternoon, and also last year. Long-range forecasting and target-setting is done by the economic planning branch of the office of the chief economist, and these men are working very closely with their counterparts, not only in the various departments of this government, but also in other provinces and with the Canada economic council. So I think the job of the Ontario economic council is entirely different to that of the economic council of Canada.

I might point out that they have almost 50 to 75 economists on their staff. We certainly do not have that, and I do not think we need that number while we are building up the staff of the chief economist to do exactly the same thing.

I noted that the hon. member for Brant suggested that perhaps the technological training centre be worked out for the Sheridan Park complex, and this has been discussed with the hon. Minister of Education and others, but I think first of all we must have the complex built and available for these students if we move in that direction. I can assure you that it is a good idea, and it is one we are looking at, and if we can get the co-operation of industry located in Sheridan Park, I have no doubt that in the not too distant future Sheridan Park can be used for the purposes that the hon. member suggests. We are open to further discussions on this, and I am sure I will be able to report back to the House in the not too distant future this has happened.

Now, in the matter of immigration, I hope we did not leave the impression this afternoon that we handle all the immigration that comes into the province of Ontario. It was not that intention, and I think I spelled it out very clearly. Something like 146,750 people immigrated to Canada last year and 79,702, or 53 per cent came into Ontario. We had nothing to do with most of the immigration coming here, but we did have something to do with the people I talked about this afternoon, the 1,800 that we introduced through our department, and brought them into the province, and spread them into 140 different companies who wanted these skilled workers.

If you add to that their families, we estimate that we did, through the department, bring in at least 5,000 new Canadians, and I anticipate that there will be a greater number in 1966, in view of the programme that I mentioned this afternoon that we are now operating in the U.K.

I might also make it perfectly clear, and I am sure my opposite number in Ottawa will agree, that no province in Canada has done more to co-operate and work with the federal government to assist in bringing in immigration, sponsored and otherwise, than we have in this province.

The trade balances were brought up as a matter of selling, as the hon. member said, more to the United States, and I agree with him wholeheartedly. This is where we have one of our largest deficits, and we have been doing something about it as I mentioned in our department's estimates this afternoon. We have had business opportunity missions there in 1965, totalling nine, going into the major cities in the United States. We have had four direct sales missions. We have brought

in any number of U.S. buyers to these trade shows that I mentioned earlier today. We are advertising in the *New Yorker* and *Business Week* and *Harvard Business Machines,* selling Ontario as a place to do business.

In fact, the Starch Report indicates that the ads that we have been running in *Business Week* have been number six in rating in that magazine; and there are something like 200-odd advertisers in *Business Week.* That is pretty tough competition. So the type of advertising we have been doing in New York to sell Canadian products and sell Americans on the fact that this is a manufacturing economy up here, we believe, is doing the very thing that the hon. member was interested in seeing that we did do.

This is in addition to the support we get from the work out of our two offices in New York and Chicago, who are contacting American businessmen and leading our Canadian businessmen to prospects over there almost every day in the week.

Now, on the matter of foreign trade, which again the member brought up, and I will touch again on what the hon. member for Woodbine said in a few minutes. We believe this province has a very vital interest in foreign trade, but I do not intend to get into discussion on it tonight, except to say that we make a major contribution to the national income, and also in that respect, pay quite a bit of the money that goes into foreign aid subsidies.

I also think that we have a great future in the markets that foreign aid is creating, not only for us, but for other highly industrialized countries. It was suggested the other day that Canada should make its grants in agricultural products. Most of these products are eaten tomorrow and forgotten about the day after. Our American friends are shipping highly sophisticated industrial equipment, and I believe Canada should take its place in a foreign aid programme in supplying industrial equipment also.

I also want to make this comment, I do not say, and I did not say in my talk to the Empire club, that we should give less. I said we should give more, but we should give it in a more practical manner than we have been giving it, and again I would like to touch on this before I finish with the comment of the hon. member for Woodbine.

I might point out to the hon. members that when I talk about a practical basis, a few days after the speech—I think it was just by accident, or coincidence, I do not know which—Ottawa announced that the gentleman in charge of foreign aid was made the new ambassador to Japan and they were looking for a businessman to look after the problems of foreign aid. I have talked to a young gentleman who I think will be doing that kind of work.

Now, on housing, urban development, as the hon. members understand, is a matter for The Department of Municipal Affairs to discuss. My job, in my department, is to build houses when the urban development programme is completed and the land is there for us to put houses on. On the matter of rural community developments, this is a matter that both federal and provincial governments are concerned with, and within the province involve six or more departments. I sit on a committee with six of my associate hon. Ministers, on matters of community development.

Mr. Nixon: Who is chairman of that committee, the hon. Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, the chairman is the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

We have already commenced to analyze this area with inter-departments, and the Indian problem, of course, is one that has brought about this community development programme. We have had a number of studies made, there is some work already being done to build up a pilot project, as you know. I am sure that before others are through their estimates, such as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, there will be more said on this pilot project.

Now the first report on the "People and Land in Transition" that the hon. member for Bruce brought up the other night is one indication as to how we can through we believe, regional development do something in the rural areas. I think this report is perhaps one of the most important this province or any of its associated committees have brought out, and I believe it is going to pinpoint some of the difficulties that the hon. member for Brant brought up this afternoon—that we have some rural poverty and we are only going to get rid of that rural poverty by attacking it on a different basis to that which we have to assume will solve the same problem in the major cities in this country.

Turning my comments to the hon. member for Woodbine—I see he is not here but it does not make that much difference—the projects for 1966, I just want to say that if they produce the same results as they produced in 1965, I am not going to argue with success. We have provided in this province in the last year 75,000 jobs or helped to provide a climate to produce 75,000 jobs. We do not

take credit for the whole 75,000. There were 97,000 more people working in March of this year than March of 1965, and it indicates that some of these minor projects that the hon. member referred to are working in the interests of this province and the people of this province.

We recognize that the peaks and cycles in our planning for the department's activities must take into consideration what is ahead, and I agree with the hon. member for Woodbine that there are signs indicating that changes are coming about. One only has to see what has happened in the United States in the last week or so when the automobile industries cut back and the steel industries are affected.

I know in my former business, the durable goods manufacturers are feeling somewhat of a slow-down in their operations, but we have taken this into consideration when we planned and took the facts and figures provided by the economic council of Canada over the five-year average and, as the hon. member was good enough to mention, we beat it last year. We perhaps are not as confident as we were last year at the same time, but I think we are realistic in view of what is happening.

He did mention that perhaps we should take a look at Sweden, and I want to assure him I have a very great interest in the way they operate the Swedish economy. I think they have done an excellent job. I think he would also be the first to admit that the prices there are pretty high. They pay, I think, 88 cents for a gallon of gasoline compared to our 45. So everything is not rosy in Sweden, even though they have, as I say, an economy that most of us look at with a great deal of interest. So we are not averse to looking at other economies and taking the best out of all, and I can assure the hon. member that I watch what the Japanese are doing and what my friends in Europe are doing, the EEC market and also Great Britain.

As the Chairman said just a few minutes ago, we have ranged far and wide tonight in this discussion, and I do not intend to touch on it except to say that I am sure that in the comments of the member for Woodbine when he talked about my speech at the Empire club, he did not talk about the speech, he took something out of context of the speech. If he had read the complete speech, he would never have said what he said tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: It was in the *Globe* editorial.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not care about the *Globe* editorial. I will also say that I will be glad to send the hon. member a copy of my reply to the critics on April 4, which fully outlines what I said about foreign trade and why I say we should change our means of foreign trade, and nobody can distort the facts there. I have said we need to do more in foreign aid, but we need to do it on a more practical basis, and I will match my experience with anybody sitting on that side of the House on foreign aid matters. I have been there. I know what they need.

Mr. MacDonald: A little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not. A little bit of experience is better than a little bit of knowledge.

Mr. MacDonald: Does one responsible authority or government agree with you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know. I do not worry—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Minister would have heard about it—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I see all the editorials across Canada, and as far as I am concerned, they completely agree with what I had to say.

I may suggest this to the hon. member, that since I was in some of these countries I have a constant number of these people from government coming into my office saying: "When do you think the federal government will allow us to entertain a programme of this type?" I said: "I do not know. I have talked to my friends in Ottawa and so far have not been able to convince them that we should change our method of granting foreign aid."

I did not say that we should cut it out, I simply said we should do more on a practical basis and my friend from Scarborough West, who has been in some of these countries, recognizes that we have to do more, and certainly more on a practical basis.

Mr. S. Lewis: Not on the Minister's basis.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, read the reply to the critics and I think that outlines it very clearly, what we should be doing and what we are not doing.

Mr. S. Lewis: Just a question, Mr. Chairman; when the hon. Minister talks of the reply to the critics, is that the reply that was printed in the newspapers in a letter under his name, or was it an additional reply?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, that was a reply that was printed in one newspaper, but was

only about one-third of the reply sent to the newspaper. They did not print the entire reply that I sent to them.

Mr. S. Lewis: These sinister newspapers! You can never trust them. Could we have a copy of the full reply?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to send the hon. member a complete copy with my compliments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to conclude by suggesting that when the hon. member for Woodbine said that some of the little things we are doing did not have very much effect, I just say, as I said earlier, that we have created a climate where 75,000 new jobs were found; 178 new factories with an investment of over $200 million came into being; 114 manufacturing arrangements were made to manufacture products here that were formerly imported; and 494 plants had sufficient confidence in this government and this economy to expand their operations. And the income in this province is 33 per cent higher, per capita income was 33 per cent higher than the income of any other province in Canada and most states in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, if that is a small programme, I think we should have more of them.

On vote 401:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask by way of explanation on a point of order. I must say that I am puzzled as to what departments or what branches go into various estimates here, and I wonder if I might make a plea that next year if it is possible to set up the estimates so that there would be some clear indication where each branch fits in. For example, as I read through this report which the Minister put on our desks today, I find, to cite one example, that he has an immigration branch. Now, as I take a look at the estimates presented to us, where does the immigration branch fit in?

Mr. Chairman: I think that would come under Ontario House.

Mr. MacDonald: Under the Ontario House?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is under vote 401, the main vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that just shows how confused we can get. The Chairman thought it was the Ontario House and the Minister says it is under 401. My point is made emphatically. I am wondering if the various branches, in some fashion or another, cannot be indicated in the estimates. There is no indication here at all. Indeed, if I may ask for clarification, Mr. Chairman, on one other point—in the main office estimates, vote 401, you have the grants to the regional development association, but if you read the annual report you will find that the regional development branch comes under the chief economist, which is item 403. Now, when one wants to discuss regional development associations, does one discuss them under the grants under the first vote or does one discuss them under the chief economist, the third vote?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member can discuss it wherever he likes.

Mr. MacDonald: My main point for rising, Mr. Chairman, is that I think there is a great deal of confusion here, which I would just draw to the attention of the hon. Minister in the hope that next year the estimates might be so drawn up that we would avoid the confusion.

Mr. Chairman: In order to follow through with the sequence, I would suggest that we deal with the grants under 401, and I understand that the regional studies come under 403.

Mr. MacDonald: Regional development?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the economic reports and the studies, but we can clarify this as we go on.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, under item 1, salaries, I would like to raise a matter having to do with policy regarding the department. There has been a suggestion made previously and also inherent in the hon. Minister's reply a moment ago concerning the community planning branch that is operated by his colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. It has been stated by responsible people that it should be considered that this branch might be moved and put under the direction of the Minister who also has the broad responsibility for housing and for regional development.

I wonder if the Minister would care to make a comment on this suggestion, particularly in the light of the fact that in his reply a few minutes ago, he felt that he was powerless to act in some regard because the community planning branch was elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the community planning branch was at one time —a couple of Ministers ago—in The Department of Economics and Development. It was called economics and planning back in those days. It is in the department of the Minister of Municipal Affairs at the moment, as long as it is operating as it is at the present time. Also, as urban developments is in there it was felt that was the best place to leave it.

I do not know what the programme will be in the future, but it is something we could take a look at. If we feel it will operate more effectively in this department, perhaps we could discuss it with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: My own feeling about this is that if someone in the government is going to take hold of the problems inherent in housing difficulties in metropolitan areas, and particularly the whole problem of world poverty, a good many of these arms of the government are going to have to be centralized under one department. My experience is extremely limited in this, but I would say that wherever one of these broad-ranging Cabinet committees is brought into play to co-ordinate a number of departments, we do not seem to get effective action. What we require is the commitment of one Cabinet Minister to the problem and imaginative action being taken.

Now, it seems to me that if the Minister were seized with the emergency of this problem and saw it as a need that had to be filled somewhere in the government, it might very well be a better development in his own department that he could look to. I, for one, would be delighted if some of these branches would be brought under one ministerial roof, so that the work on the war on poverty, as it has been called, might be better co-ordinated.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to question the hon. Minister on this. We have always been concerned about small departments—foster children in some areas, shuffled back and forth—and it would seem that with this community planning branch there was a time when Mr. W. M. Nickle, I think, had a whole grouping of assorted departments, and I think that might be what the Minister referred to.

The community planning branch and the regional development association—I can see a region representing more than a community—but could the hon. Minister tell us why they would not be interrelated? What does the community planning branch do that the regional development association does not do?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps we should establish first whether this will be discussed under vote 403—the grants will be discussed under 401. Perhaps the Minister will establish that now.

Mr. Thompson: My real concern is to know why—because housing comes under urban renewal development—this branch has to be brought into the hon. Minister's department.

Mr. Chairman: We can bring it in under the proper vote; we have a vote here under the Ontario housing corporation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member the exact responsibilities of the community planning branch. As I said, that is not my department. I think that the regional development programme goes much further, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has just suggested. I think that in regional planning we are going to perhaps be more diversified in the things that we will do in the various regions. We will not be as closely associated with, perhaps, the various planners who are in close contact with The Department of Municipal Affairs.

This is one of these matters that, before we get through with our regional development programming next year, we will have to sit down with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and decide where best we can co-ordinate our activities. But I think there are two distinct responsibilities there. Whatever the community planning branch does, I am sure that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is well aware of the need for keeping it where it is. And I am sure that as we develop our regional development programme, we will plan for the coming year and will have lots to do there without taking on any other departments.

Again I say, if it is in the interest of the province and the programme to do some combining of matters such as this, I am sure that I can talk to my colleagues, but I am not looking for any more to do. I would like to get rid of a little, and I am sure that they would also, but I am quite prepared to co-operate with the other departments and see if we can co-ordinate our activities and get better results. But I believe that the development programme that we have is considerably different to what the community planning branch has done in the past number

of years. It is an entirely new approach to assisting the various municipalities and the province as a whole.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister what reports does his department get from the community planning branch?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As my hon. colleague says here, community planning is physical planning, and the hon. member asks what co-operation we get—

Mr. Thompson: No, reports; what reports does the community planning branch—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that any reports they have would be available to us and our regional development people work very closely with them. If we need reports from them, I am sure that we can get them. I cannot tell the hon. member whether we do or not, but if they have any reports and we can use them, they are available, and the same goes for our regional development people. If we have reports we would be glad to pass them on to their department if any use can be found for them.

Mr. Thompson: My point is, Mr. Chairman, that I have often found that although there is harmony between Ministers, that one of them has a branch that is happily going this way and another Minister has a branch that is also doing the same thing. We are always trying to get more harmony between you by suggesting that there might be duplication in government services.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have great harmony.

Mr. Thompson: There might also be great duplication.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are known as the harmony kids.

Mr. Thompson: There might be great duplication. Has the hon. Minister ever received a report from the community—

Mr. Chairman: I must ask the leader of the Opposition—if he will, please—to point out to us under vote 401 where this comes.

Mr. Thompson: Under "Policy," and I am asking the hon. Minister if he has ever had reports. Could he find out if—

Mr. Chairman: I think this House should establish at this particular time whether we are going to consider the community planning branch under this particular vote. I do not think it comes properly before us.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I think the problem we are discussing is the co-ordination of the community planning branch with the regional development associations, and I submit that, under your ruling, is going to come under the regional development grants. If that is where it is going to come, fine, but if it is going to come here, there are a few others of us going to get in and confuse the picture and increase the chaos. So let us have a ruling; either debate it now or debate it later.

Mr. Chairman: There is no objection to debating it in vote 401 under number 5—"Grants." There is a grant to aid regional development. But there is nothing here that I have that refers to community planning. I think at this time we should follow the sequence under vote 401. Is there anything under item 1?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify this; under what vote may I bring it up again?

Mr. Chairman: Under item 5.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401, item 1—item 2—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in regard to item 1, there seems to be a fairly substantial salary bill covered by that item. I wonder if the hon. Minister could explain just what functions of the department are included there, and what staff above the level of stenographic and clerical staff is involved?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The senior staff in the main office vote comprises: in the office of the Minister, five; the office of deputy Minister, three; the information services, six; special projects—that is Expo—five; administration, 61. That is broken down to one in general services. Then there are four in immigration, and the total main office complement is 83 people.

Mr. Bryden: You refer to immigration, is that a sub-unit within the main office? Where does that fit into your picture?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Up to this year, the director of immigration was located in Ontario House in Great Britain, but we have just appointed a new director of immigration in Toronto. His head office is now in Toronto,

at 950 Yonge Street, and under the administrative section, under vote 401.

Mr. Bryden: Does he have people under his supervision who are stationed in other countries?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, he has the responsibility for the staff in Ontario House, and also the staff at the office in Glasgow.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under this immigration, I believe the other night the hon. Provincial Secretary said there were 86,000 immigrants settled in the province of Ontario in 1965. Could the hon. Minister inform us, are these all skilled personnel, or what percentage was skilled, and what percentage was unskilled?

Mr. Chairman: Before the Minister answers this, could we establish whether immigration matters of the department are going to be under the Ontario House, under vote 405 or under vote 401?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will deal with it right here.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Immigration under vote 401, as it concerns his department.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Answering your question: In 1965 I think I mentioned there was something like 140,000 people came to Canada, of which 53 per cent, or some 70,000 came to Ontario. We would have no way of knowing, outside of the 1,800 I mentioned that we hired or we worked with ourselves to place them with 140 companies here, how many of that group were skilled. I think you must understand that when they come to Ontario House or our offices overseas, we then look at them, find out where they want to work, what their skills are, and they have to go through Canada House in London and be cleared through there.

The 1,800 I talked about, we know they came to Ontario, we know their families came to Ontario; but of the balance I could not tell you how many were skilled. I would hope that this year, with this new programme we have where we are advertising for skilled people in many parts of Europe, that we will be able to get a closer control or get more detailed information on what skills are coming into the province, than we have had in the past. But they must, as you understand, all be cleared through the Canadian immigration services in London, England.

We just supplement what the federal immigration authorities are doing in their London office and their offices around the world.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this heading, dealing with those immigrants who are skilled; of course we need a number of unskilled personnel, in the agricultural industry in particular, and we just cannot have all skilled personnel coming into this country, we must have some unskilled personnel. I would say that a good many of those in agriculture would like to secure individuals from Europe, from different countries, and they want to make an effort to try to get them even from Portugal, but unfortunately the federal government will not give consideration to those from Portugal or of Portuguese nationality. What effort is put forth by your department in order to convince the federal government that we need unskilled personnel as well as skilled personnel?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is a good question. I wish I had all the answers.

As you will recall we published a report made up between ourselves and many departments of the federal government and many of the departments of this government, last July, at which time we discussed the skilled and unskilled people that we needed in Canada. One of the major problems that the federal authorities have been confronted with, of course, is the sponsored immigration coming from certain sections of Europe in untold numbers. We do not see anything wrong with it, because most of them are assimilated into our society and without many of them we would not be doing the construction in the city of Toronto and many other cities that we are doing today.

But the sponsored immigration has brought with it many other problems, which I think you have read about in the newspapers. There are a number of people who come here without any language, and getting a job without knowledge of some of the language certainly means someone has to do some work to help these people so they can get themselves placed in Canadian industry.

I have had some correspondence with the new Minister of Immigration, the hon. Mr. Marchand. I have had considerable to do with Mr. Nicholson, the former Minister of Immigration. In fact, I think if you talked to Mr. Nicholson, the reason why we have an accelerated immigration policy around the world today is because this province, working with Mr. Nicholson, did our best to get the immigration authorities in Ottawa to recognize that more attention should be paid to

many other parts of the world. I think I can say without fear of being accused of bragging that we now have an immigration office in Tokyo, Japan, which we never had before; we have an enlarged federal office in Hong Kong. I talked to the young lady who was recently sent to Greece to get the Greek immigrants. Our own offices in Dusseldorf and New York, are constantly assisting people who come in looking for information about emigrating to Canada, and I myself was in the Philippines and talked to the immigration people down there with reference to nurses. I think that almost every two weeks there are 40 or 50 nurses from this part of the world going into our hospitals across Canada.

So we feel that we have—

Mr. Bryden: Do you not think those nurses might be needed where they came from?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, that is their choice. They are not indentured labour. If they do not want to come, they do not have to. There are a lot of nurses leaving here going to other parts; also teachers, professional people.

But you asked what could we do to stimulate more immigration. I think that again the programme of advertising we now have going on in the U.K. has been recognized by the federal authorities—and they have said so in writing—as a programme that has been very helpful to them. I think you must recognize their position: As a federal government they cannot advertise for people for any one particular province. They must advertise for Canada as a whole.

Now this is what we call a shotgun approach. It has been used for years and the approach that we are trying to use, in co-operation with the federal authorities, is to use the rifle bullet approach and pick up the skilled workers that we need to provide jobs for the unskilled. Now I might suggest to you, and I am sure many will disagree with me, but I say that a skilled worker will provide jobs for at least three unskilled. And you say, which comes first, the chicken or the egg? I think we have to have the skilled workers if we want to open our doors to more of the unskilled people around the world, which I think we should be doing.

I mentioned to my people just this week that as soon as my estimates are through, I hope to have a conference with the new Minister of Immigration, Mr. Marchand, and discuss many matters, particularly the matters you have read about in the press about the 250 miners. I might suggest to you that while grade 10 education may be fine, and needed in the city of Toronto, a miner with grade 10 education I do not think would be interested in going down a mine shaft. These people we talked to in Italy have grade 4 or 5. Now a grade 4 or 5 in the mining country is a grade 10 equivalent. But if that miner decides not to mine and comes down to Toronto, then he would have a hard job perhaps in getting located. This has been perhaps the problem and the question in the minds of the federal authorities, what happens if the man does not stay in the mining community?

We know that we need about 5,000 miners in northern Ontario right now and they certainly are not all going to have grade 10 or equivalent. To me the equivalent in mining is being able to go underground, so I think that there has to be a common sense approach to how we get these people in with less than grade 10 education.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, recently the Minister of Economics and Development put out a new booklet and he did not mention agriculture or mining. What was the reason?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I mentioned earlier today that the book was not a book to end all books; it was a book actually designed to allow people answering this advertisement that we have been running in Europe, and the U.K. at least, to look at the book and compare for themselves, as a skilled worker, what the cost of living would be in an equivalent job here. I think we list a shoemaker earning "X" number of dollars in Canada; well if it is a shoemaker coming from Greece I think he can translate that into his own dollars and he can see at $80 a week as a shoemaker what his costs would be for a pound of butter, a house for him and his family—this is primarily what it was.

This is for skilled people, not for mass immigration. I do not think we could ever, as I said this afternoon, put together a book that would answer all the questions on immigration. It may be possible, if this one is as successful as I think it is going to be, that we would put one out in co-operation with the Minister of Agriculture on the jobs available in agriculture and the jobs available in mining and forestry. I think this is just a start.

Mr. Spence: There is a great demand for workers in agriculture, Mr. Chairman. We visited the mining areas last year in northern

Ontario and there is a great shortage of miners too. We just cannot have all top personnel or skilled personnel; we must have some workers if we are going to progress in this province.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I could not agree with the member more.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in listening to the Minister I thought for a while that an attempt was being made in the immigration policy to match the immigrant to the needs for skilled labour or unskilled labour, as the case may be, within the province of Ontario. In reading a statement of the Minister in this publication which we all received a while ago, "Human Resources Development in the province of Ontario," we find in saying that to explore the potential of immigration from northern Europe, the director of the branch visited Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland and Germany; a system was set up whereby all Canadian federal immigration offices in these countries would be kept fully advised of the needs of Ontario employers.

I take from that that some inventory of the needs is being taken and constantly being kept up to date, and the immigration department advised of those needs. If one group is in surplus, then of course we say we do not need more of these particular kinds of persons, and yet that does not seem to be the kind of situation that exists. Are we not trying to match needs with supply in that sense, Mr. Chairman? I bring to the Minister's attention a phone call I had just this morning from Mr. Bill Jacks, who is a representative of the international brotherhood of electrical workers, and he was very concerned because he said that we are bringing in a great many electrical workers to the country here and into Ontario when already there is what he called a fairly large-scale unemployment in electrical workers right here in this area with which he is concerned.

I wonder if the Minister would want to comment on this problem? It just seems to me that we are not going at this thing in any scientific way at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think, if the hon. member recalls, last year we took off a report of The Department of Labour and our own department in co-operation with the federal authorities, the hon. Mr. Nicholson, and we checked with them on the needs in almost every province. I think, if you remember, British Columbia was looking for 26,000 people. At that time, we said we could use 33,000 in the province of Ontario and by the end of 1966 we thought there would perhaps be available jobs for 70,000 people.

Mr. Young: Were these categorized in any way?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, they were; they were listed in the categories that they reported to us. Now, to answer the question of the hon. member, we do have manufacturers contact us in our department at 950 Yonge street and say: "I need five bricklayers or 50 draftsmen."

I can recall the H. G. Acres company over in St. Catharines needed 116 professional engineers.

When I was on my way back from the Near East in October, I dropped into Ontario House and we had just hired the 105th man that day and the H. G. Acres people were sitting in our office interviewing the rest of them. So we are going after specific skills to fill specific jobs. I have a list of companies here that are on our list right now: Pressure Castings of Weston, Ashworth-Winchester, Queenston Quarries, Matthew Conveyors, Port Hope, University of Western Ontario, International Tools, Department of Education, Gairdner and Sons, DeVilbiss of Barrie, Canadian Tooling Manufacturers, Ontario Hydro. They list with us the type of people they want and we see through our immigration offices that these people are available on the files we have in our offices overseas.

The member mentioned that our director of immigration visited these other European offices. They were the European offices, of course, of the federal authorities, and working with the federal authorities we make known to them and give them a list of the people we could use if they are available. Many countries in Europe do not permit advertising for immigrants, as the hon. member probably knows. The U.K. does, and there are one or two other areas where they permit it. Japan does not permit advertising for immigrants of any kind. So that you have to do it through the consular offices in these various countries where advertising is not permitted. That is the reason why the director visited these various areas and acquainted them with the needs that we had at that moment. We will, of course, keep that list up to date as the needs develop, or as they drop we will change our requirements accordingly and notify our people overseas what our needs are as of today.

Mr. Young: They will try to turn the tap off at the appropriate moment then.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think if we have to turn the tap off, we can, but I think it is unlikely we are going to have to turn the tap off on skilled people.

Mr. Young: Would the Minister comment on this matter of electrical workers?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not familiar with Mr. Jacks' problem. We have people who are looking for electricians. I would be surprised if there was an abundance of electricians with all the contracting and all the work that is going on today. There may not be jobs right here in Toronto, and I think the hon. member knows that in the electrical union a man who comes over here, even with qualifications, has to spend so much time here before he gets what they call a blue ticket or a red ticket. As a consequence he may have to serve as an apprentice or go out of town to serve his time before he can get that ticket. I am not sure that I know what Mr. Jacks' problem is, but I would be very doubtful, Mr. Chairman, if there are many electricians of any quality floating around who cannot find a job.

Mr. Young: He claims about half those who are presently unemployed are fully qualified and he gives the number.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox, is it on the same point or—

Mr. Whitney: Very close to it, it is a matter of skilled labour and unskilled labour, and I could not find any other vote under which this could be mentioned. Yet I think it is worthwhile mentioning that in Prince Edward county we have two brothers who were formerly commercial fishermen, who then started building wooden fishing boats and other types of craft. Recently they have gone into building boats of steel. I want to quote briefly from the Picton *Gazette* of May 11, last Wednesday, in regard to their accomplishments as an indication of what can be done by personal initiative and as a result of the training received in our vocational schools:

It says here:

> Shown with the 36-foot cabin cruiser they built, are Mel and Raymond McIntosh and apprentice Raphael Hicks. Apprentice George Henley, sits on the side of the boat to give an idea of the height of the new boat. The craft has been built with welded steel and has a stainless steel bottom which will save rust, corrosion and painting.

It says further:

> In these days of aluminum, fibre glass and plastics, it is a pleasure to hear of boats built of steel, welded together for strength and stability. You will find them at the McIntosh boatworks in Picton where brothers Raymond and Mel McIntosh have been producing all-steel boats for the past four years.

Mel McIntosh acknowledges his brother is mostly responsible for the boatbuilding side of the business while he handles the dredging operations. He always used to build with wood until changing over to steel.

The demand for the firm's custom-built boat has grown to the point where the plant is constantly busy. This has also had the beneficial result of providing permanent employment for two welding apprentices, George Henley and Raphael Hicks, who were recommended by Douglas Baker, technical director at Prince Edward collegiate institute.

Among the vessels at various stages of completion at the Mill street plant is a 36-foot diesel-driven cabin cruiser, with a stainless steel bottom, which has been ordered by a Toronto customer. The bottom and sides of the large boat were actually built upside down, then lifted right way up, with block and tackle tied to a nearby tree. The decking and cabins have been installed and Mr. McIntosh is now waiting for the windows to arrive.

I might say that Mr. McIntosh, who designs his own boats, has just perfected a small vessel which he believes is superior to lighter craft of the same size. Perhaps the most interesting vessel at the works is a 30-foot cruise ship commissioned by the Great Lakes institute of the University of Toronto. Like all McIntosh boats, this one also has an all-steel welded bottom and sides. Technicians of the university are working along with them, and this boat that they will use will be most completely outfitted.

I do not wish to dwell further on this subject, but I do feel that it is a fine example of great local initiative, plus the fact that our educational programme is paying dividends, since this is something that has been developed right from the grass roots and I think in time this can become a great business. Consequently I feel it is worthwhile bringing it to the attention of this House.

Mr. Chairman: Since the member for Prince Edward-Lennox had started his statement I have been looking down through the vote to find out exactly where it came in. You have made your point, anyway.

Mr. Bryden: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, since the point has been made, if I might be permitted to ask the hon. member a question? I was rather interested in his statement.

The statement he read from the press said that this project had given employment to two welding apprentices. I am wondering how it is possible to give employment to two apprentices without giving employment to journeymen. Could he tell us what the ratio of apprentices to journeymen is in this enterprise?

Mr. MacDonald: I am afraid he is like the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, he might find that the Act was violated.

Mr. Whitney: Mr. Chairman, I simply wished to point out that apparently these people are doing a job, that they are just starting out and that there is a demand for what they are producing. I expect that in time they will expand greatly. Apparently they are doing a job when the University of Toronto goes to Picton to get what they want from, as you say, these amateurs. Certainly I think they should be given credit for that and no impediments put in their way.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the members if they will stay with vote 401, please.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, though you to the hon. Minister, I had been interested when the hon. Minister of Labour was giving his estimates, and if I understand correctly he had said that he was waiting for Ottawa to have a manpower study to show the manpower resources across Canada. During the questioning he said that he did not have actually at this point a knowledge of all the skills that are needed throughout the province. Then the hon. Minister of Economics and Development said that he did have this. I am wondering why the hon. Minister would have this and why The Department of Labour would not. When the Minister was answering us he mentioned that he got his knowledge of the needs around the province from industries that phone into his office.

I would suggest, sir, that is very helpful to those industries but it is not giving a completely broad picture around the province.

He also mentioned that he got it through The Department of Immigration and The Department of Labour, which I presume was Ottawa. But again, I think that if we are concerned about getting a concrete manpower study of the needs, the skilled needs, around this province, I do not think we have got it. I think that he is relying on federal departments which are not doing it properly and I think that he might agree with the hon. Minister of Labour who has said that he feels there is a need for it and he hopes that if Ottawa does not get on with this job then next year Ontario will have to start.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I could comment on what the hon. leader of the Opposition just said.

The report I am talking about, as you recall, was available about the middle of last year. Since that time, as you know, there has been a new Minister of Manpower, or will be, appointed in Ottawa. When that is done I understand there is to be a new approach to taking inventory of the skills required in all provinces. I would think that the report we had last July, I am positive we had it before last July, was available to my hon. colleague in Labour, but certainly we have not had any additional report since then except what we have been able to add to in our own department. But again, I think that the hon. Minister of Labour was referring to the proposed manpower meetings that we are definitely going to have to hold with the Ottawa officials just as soon as they have made a decision on who is in charge of the manpower programme.

This is definitely one of the first on our discussions with reference to the needs of this country, with particular interest in the skills. I am sure there is no difference of opinion. The figures I had, the information I had, was available to the hon. Minister of Labour. I am sure he has it, but I think we are talking about two different things. I think he is talking about a more complete and detailed report in relation to the one we had earlier, and one I think we will be working out in assisting the federal authorities and getting the information for this province. I might also point out that last year, as you know, we held a detailed investigation in three or four towns in Ontario to find out what the labour situation was and used that as the basis for part of the work we did with the federal authorities.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister—I really have two more questions. He has been to Japan. He also mentions about the office in Hong Kong. I have wondered if he has encouraged doctors to come over and settle in Ontario. For example, has he been to India, or is he thinking of going to India, in order to recruit professional men?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Answering your first question: When I visited the Far East, as you know, I talked to reporters before I left Vancouver and by the time I got to Tokyo and Hong Kong there was a big report in the paper that the Minister from Ontario was over to solicit 15,000 skilled people. Well, they were not waiting for me with garlands of roses, I can assure you. They were very perturbed about the fact that we were going to take away their skilled people. I assured them that this was not the intention. We said that we could use at that time 15,000 skilled people of various kinds; wood workers and so forth, and so on.

Now, insofar as doctors are concerned, I do not know what the medical profession would do with people from there. We have already had some discussion with the hon. Minister of Health on the doctors from various countries—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Better be careful about soliciting doctors.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say if they have the qualifications there is no reason why the federal authorities would not let them into the country. Where they practice is a matter for the local jurisdiction to give consideration, but I simply say that we are looking for skilled people from almost any part of the globe. As far as this province is concerned we would welcome the opportunity of talking to anybody who would like to come to the province.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate those sentiments from you and I wish we could hear them from more of your colleagues in connection with the restrictions which the college of physicians and surgeons has established in this province. It makes your problem extremely hard in getting skilled people when you have such restrictions to bar them from practising in the province.

May I ask, sir, and this may be just a particular situation, but I had lunch a couple of weeks ago with two young Japanese engineers who had come over here with the idea of working in Ontario. I asked them what kind of a reception they were getting and where they were going to get a job, and they said that they had been to the national employment service after they arrived and they had been very helpful in giving them a list of some industries to go to.

Well, I asked them if they had been successful to date and they said no they had not, but they were told that they should learn more of the English language and then they might be able to get a job. I understand one is a chemist and the other one is a mining engineer, but doing lab work. It struck me very odd that you get these highly qualified men coming over and then they suddenly face the reality that they are going to have difficulty about getting work.

They told me they were the first to come to Ontario. Whether that was correct or not I do not know, but I thought that if we are interested in getting skilled men, professional engineers, when they arrive here we should be doing far more to help them in that period of getting employment and should be giving assistance to them, rather than just having a list of industries that they have to find their way to.

I am wondering what the hon. Minister is doing, since you went to Japan, and obviously I would think you would agree with me that if we can get engineers and such highly professional people to come over you would want to welcome them and get them integrated—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the leader of the Opposition and the other members to restrict their questions and discussion to the Ontario phase of immigration.

Mr. Thompson: I am.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer this question for the hon. member.

Since I was there, as I said, the federal authorities have opened their own immigration office. I would think anybody emigrating here now would be able to go into that office and perhaps get all the details they require to find out what the opportunities were when they got here.

I do not know about the hon. member's two friends. If they talk and read English and read blueprints as engineers, I do not think that they should have any difficulty getting placed. I simply suggest that if they are still unemployed, have them drop into our immigration office and we will do all we can to help them get placed. I know that in the mining industry I have talked to the chairman of the board of one of the largest mining companies in Ontario who said, "If you can get me Japanese mining engineers, I will take all that I can possibly get." This was only a few months ago and I am sure, knowing the shortage in the mining industry right now, that they would be welcome in that industry if they want to go north.

So from the standpoint of assisting anybody who comes in contact with the hon. leader of the Opposition; send them in to us, we will be glad to help them.

Mr. Thompson: Apart from the fact that I just ran into these two fellows, is there some kind of information given to them so that they can contact this immigration office? Assuming that they had never met me, how would they know about this immigration office and this offer of help by the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We only fill jobs for firms that apply to us. The firms come to us and say, "We want X number of people." These people, no doubt, would be cleared by federal immigration and if they are coming to Ontario I would think that the federal immigration people would say to them that if they have any trouble to get in touch with the immigration department of the province of Ontario or with the federal immigration office in Toronto. The federal people here work very closely with our director of immigration. I am sure that there must be two sides to the story. I would like to know the other side.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves at a disadvantage by the fact that we cannot take full advantage of the auto trade pact in the tool and die industry. We find that the tool and die industry has more work than men available to do the work. Now they have attempted a recruiting job by sending personnel officers to Europe with several of your missions; they have offered salaries that go into five figures, and they still have difficulty in getting sufficient personnel. Has the department considered some type of subsidy to encourage certain skills to settle in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we do not have any subsidy programme here and neither do the federal authorities, except that they will prepay their transportation and let them pay it back without interest over a period of two years.

Mr. Newman: Actually there is a subsidy by the prepayment.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is just from the United Kingdom and perhaps one or two other centres, but it is not a general policy. With reference to the problem in Windsor, I think I know the company you are talking about because we are very closely associated with them and have endeavoured to help them. They have been over to see us and I get a letter from our friend in the tool and die industry down there about every week. His problem is that he is losing his workers to a higher paid job in Detroit; he tells me that he is busy training people, then they go to Detroit and get jobs there.

I might say that we have the same problem right here in Toronto with the Douglas Aircraft Company of Canada. They are trying to build more aircraft parts here and they are taking skilled staff away from some of the lesser industries. This has always been the problem, people gravitate to where they will get the best dollar and working conditions that suit them. It is a difficult job for us to keep his basket filled for him in Windsor, much as we would like to do it for him, but this is one of the problems today when there is an expanding economy.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, all we are doing by going over to Europe is stealing skilled help from Europe which in turn settles in Ontario and then is stolen by our American friends from us. We need a very vigorous educational programme to get all of this skilled help, and until we get the institutes of applied arts and sciences and technology spread throughout the province, we are going to be continually confronted with this skills shortage.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, this area of immigration and its relation to manpower is one in which I am very much interested because I cannot see the policy of the government very clearly from the remarks that the hon. Minister has made.

As I understand it, the hon. Minister is saying that at the present time in Ontario, so far as there is any inventory of skills, it is constituted by the requests which come to him from manufacturers in Toronto and establishments throughout the province. He then relays that information to whatever offices are available abroad in an effort to match up those particular jobs with the requirements of the industries.

I take it that he has also said that for practical purposes, at the present time, in the province of Ontario there is a general policy that all skills are in short supply, and that anywhere in the world, if a person has a skill — in the broad sense of that term — he is welcome to come to the province of Ontario.

I take it that he then said that in addition to the skill, the person must also have an acceptable education standard to come to the province of Ontario.

Then he related his remarks to what the hon. member for Kent East said in speaking about the mines and agricultural needs in the country. He indicated that this really did not have anything to do with the policy of his government, but had to do with what he referred to as "the untold numbers who come to Canada under the policy of the federal government." I was struck by the fact that those "untold numbers" last year were about 140,000 for the whole of the country.

Then he said on the chicken and the egg theory—that we had to have the skills here before we could bring any unskilled people into the country and this was a priority. I asume that what he meant by that is that during his time with the forecasts of the skills shortages in the province of Ontario, he will never have to face up to the question of bringing unskilled people in as part of the planned policy of this government, because there will always be a skills shortage in his view.

What concerns me very much is that the hon. Minister appears to be giving the impression that, with the exception, for example, of the nurse example in the Philippines—and perhaps the nurses in Hong Kong, and doubtless he can give us many more examples to clarify the policy of the province —what he is, in fact, saying is that there is no place in Canada at the present time for anyone from most of the coloured races.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say anything of the kind!

Mr. Renwick: I am not suggesting that the hon. Minister said that. What I am saying is that the net effect of his policy is, at the present time, that there is no wish on the part of the government of the province of Ontario to have anyone from any of the coloured races in the world, unless—and is this not the sieve through which the hon. Minister limits a tremendous number of people the opportunity to come to this country by saying that not only do they have to have a skill—which immediately limits the number of people who are available under the government's policy—but the hon. Minister also said that they must have an education standard in order to come to the country. This, therefore, limits more and more the number of people available, and automatically excludes the countries where the coloured people reside, from any policy that the government may have.

Let me give you an example—extreme, but very real. The mining example which the hon. Minister gave—from Italy, if my memory serves me correctly—in which he said that they were skilled miners, but since they had only the equivalent of a grade 4 or grade 5 education in the province of Ontario, he really did not want those miners to come because he had no way of making certain that they stayed in the mine, and he was concerned that they might come, say, to the cities—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say that I was concerned; I said that the federal authorities were concerned.

Mr. Renwick: If we have a shortage of mining skills in the province of Ontario, would that deter the hon. Minister from having those skilled miners come from Italy, for example? Or take the extreme example, but the very real—unforunately real—example in South Africa. At the present time undoubtedly there are some very highly skilled coloured miners who would be quite happy under some circumstances to get out of South Africa, but who probably do not have any education in a formal sense. I say to the hon. Minister, is the Minister interested in, say, approaching the South African government to see if we can get some of the skilled miners from South Africa? Or is the Minister, when he goes to Hong Kong, looking just for nurses who happen to fall within a peculiar category of skill where the colour bar does not operate? And when he was in the Philippines, was he looking for any other skills except nurses?

And are there any facilities that he is going to urge on the federal government to establish—facilities in many other countries in the world where the federal government does not have immigration offices, and by the very fact of not having immigration offices immediately imposes a barrier on people getting information about coming to the country? And just what themes does the Minister, as a supplement as he stated to the federal policy but peculiarly directed to the needs of the province of Ontario, what sort of themes does he put? And is it not for practical purposes the same in the province of Ontario as it has been at all times, that there are places for immigrants with skills if they choose to come?

There are people in the province of Ontario, the same as the immediate ancestors

of a large number of us in this House, who came to this country without skills. Is there not still a large place in a growing economic unit such as the province of Ontario for an affirmative policy by this government to bring unskilled people into the country, and to make certain that opportunity is given so this province is not even in the slightest sense tinged with the suggestion that there is a colour bar.

One of the ways this can be done is to provide an affirmative policy to stimulate immigration into the province of Ontario, and an affirmative citizenship policy to integrate them occupationally, language-wise and other ways into our economy.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness because what the hon. Minister has posed as the policy of the government of Ontario, in fact means that he is providing one thing and one thing only, and that is a service to industry. He is not in fact attempting to evolve an immigration policy co-ordinated with the federal government's immigration policy, which will be an immigration policy related to the whole of the province of Ontario—to its development and to its economic life. He is limiting his policy solely—and I say this quite advisedly—solely to the purpose of providing for the needs of the industry of this province and for no other purpose whatsoever.

I say this because I know the Minister is one of the last who would consciously have any prejudice against people because of their colour or where they come from. I think he has travelled too much to have that kind of prejudice. I would like him to try to enunciate, and as he enunciates, give us an opportunity to debate with him, as to whether or not in fact this government has any immigration policy worthy of the name.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member poses a number of questions. I will try to remember some of them, and answer the ones that I think are most important.

I said a few minutes ago grade 10 or equivalent. Let us talk about the miners. If a miner has grade 4 or 5 but he goes down a mine shaft, to me that is equivalent to grade 10. This is a policy I think which has been established in the last year by the federal government, not by the government of Ontario. As far as the province of Ontario is concerned, we can only look in the areas where the federal authorities will permit immigration to come from.

I can give you an example. When I went to Hong Kong I was looking for woodworkers for a gentleman up in western Ontario. I found there were some woodworkers down there, but found when I got back here, that the federal authorities were not interested at the present time in allowing that type of worker to come from Hong Kong. Why, I do not know, that is their problem, it is their prerogative.

All this province can do, as I have pointed out previously, is assist the federal authorities in getting immigration from any source. Our problem at the moment is not to go after mass immigration, that is the federal authority's prerogative; we can assist them in looking for particular people with particular skills. As I said earlier today, by bringing in 1,800 people with skills, we brought 5,000 of their families.

The very fact we have something like 53 per cent of all the immigrants, skilled or otherwise, who came to Canada last year indicates that Ontario is still wide open for anybody who can get through the federal authorities offices in the various parts of the world. I really do not care where they come from or what their colour is, what their race or creed is; if we are looking for those types of people and the federal authorities will permit them to come, then they can make their homes in the province of Ontario and the facilities are here for them to work with.

I think also it must be remembered that if you yourself left here today and went to Japan and you did not speak a word of Japanese, could not read a word in Japanese, could not read a blueprint, and as a lawyer you could not read a legal document, I think you would find it awfully difficult to make a living.

I simply say, sir, that when these people come here we must of necessity try to make sure that they at least can establish themselves here, get a job and provide for their families, so that they do not become a liability not only to the people here but to themselves.

This is one of the reasons I think the federal authorities are taking a good hard look at our past immigration policies and to my knowledge of immigration around the world, I think it is about time we looked at immigration policies. I do not blame the authorities in Ottawa, I think immigration is one of the most delicate problems that this country, or any country, has to deal with. This also goes for the problems they have had in the U.K. and the problems they have in many other countries where people have

not been educated to work in the environment that they find themselves. Certainly we have to provide the facilities for them when they get here, if they do not have the ability before they come.

Mr. MacDonald: What conceivable reason could there be for Ottawa barring woodworkers from Hong Kong—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know, I will let them answer that. They are barring the miners right now. I would like to find 250 miners. I have not had a chance to talk to the Minister of Immigration to find out why the 250 miners are not allowed to come in, but I would hope to find the answer to this.

Mr. MacDonald: Where are they from?

Hon. Mr. Randall: From Italy.

I want to clear up the question of the hon. member. Grade 10 or equivalent—this is no bar. If a man has a skill this is what we say we can use in Ontario—or equivalent. The federal authorities may decide a man does not need either grade 10 or a skill, and we have had many hundreds of thousands of those people over the years. I do not think that we have lost anything by it because I do not think we would be building as we are building in this country today if we did not have some of that sponsored immigration of people who do not have any particular skill and do not have a grade 10 education. I think we can absorb them.

But again I say, what we are doing in the province of Ontario is following the direction of the federal authorities and we must work with the federal authorities. They lay down the immigration policy. When they are prepared to discuss it and change it, we are quite prepared to make our contribution to it.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to pursue this somewhat because I think it requires considerable clarification from the government.

Would the hon. Minister give us a list of those countries which prohibit advertising for immigrants to come to Canada if he has it available?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have it here, but I will get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: The hon. Minister said the policy of the government, all that the government can do, is to assist the federal government. I do not recall exactly, but my understanding is that the province, in fact, has a co-ordinate jurisdiction on immigration matters and could, within a very broad area, adopt an immigration policy for the province of Ontario in all aspects. I am not suggesting that the province of Ontario should go off on its own in order to establish an independent immigration policy, I do not even know whether under the Constitution that is possible. But it is certainly clear that there is a wide area in which the province of Ontario could initiate an immigration programme in conjunction with the federal government.

I am thinking back to the government of the Hon. George Drew here, and the airlift which was organized in Ontario, organized by this government, to bring skilled people, or immigrants into the country at that time. It was pretty much an independent operation, done, undoubtedly, in conjunction with Ottawa, but it does seem to me that within that framework the hon. Minister has chosen to enunciate a policy on a very, very narrow front, and that is simply that if some company needs a certain skill, we will provide it, and then we have, to the extent that the study is made, the study which was available last July.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask the hon. member a question? Why would we get into any other kind of a policy, when the federal authorities are bringing in the type of immigration you are talking about? Why would we run in competition to the federal authorities when they suggest to us they are quite competent at bringing all the people into Canada that they think should come in. They have to clear them, whether George Drew brought them in, they still have to go through the federal offices. I simply suggest to you that we do not want to run in competition with the federal authorities in bringing every type of immigrant in. We say we can assist the federal authorities, but we do not want to get into competition with them.

I think the federal authorities are doing a good job of bringing in the kind of immigration you are talking about. All we are doing is supplementing their efforts by picking out the particular skills where these people can fit, and again I think I overlooked a point when you brought it up. You say we are only looking for skills, which comes first the chicken or the egg. I simply suggest to you I do not care whether the unskilled are here now or whether they come, we are going to need those skilled people either today or tomorrow and I think our job is to get the skills as fast as we can. As to the unskilled,

I am sure the federal authorities will continue to bring them in, as they are doing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we finished the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and the Minister of Citizenship a few days ago. We talked about the citizenship branch, and the immigration branch was clearly something which had nothing to do with him, and he so advised us. That is why we are having this discussion tonight.

I am beginning to see clearly now why there is no connection between the two, to the extent that the hon. Minister is interested in people coming if they have got, first of all, skills, and have a relatively high general education or educational equivalent in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Randall: One or the other.

Mr. Renwick: They probably have a facility in the English language, because of the countries from which they come, or a facility to learn the language. So I guess what the citizenship branch really does is nothing more or less than to have no connection with the immigration policy but simply fills the gap in the training and occupational integration of those who come in under what the hon. Minister has referred to as the mass immigration policies of the federal government.

Now surely there is a place in the province of Ontario for the immigration policy of the hon. Minister's department and the citizenship policy of this government to be related. Surely it is possible for people to come into this country, with skills or without skills, depending on which industry needs people. The hon. member for Kent East has spoken about agriculture and we have had this discussion about mining. Is there not some way in which this government could enunciate a policy which is not on this very narrow, limited front that the hon. Minister enunciates? Can he not enunciate a policy of immigration for the province of Ontario so that when he goes to discuss it with the Minister in Ottawa he will not simply be discussing this limited question of filling the specific skill shortages in the province of Ontario and taking nothing but highly qualified people? He could put forward a policy on the basis of which this government would co-ordinate its activities with the federal government on a general immigration policy, which I agree is a difficult policy question for the federal government.

But I do not think that the federal government is ever going to be able to elaborate and enunciate an effective federal immigration policy without some direct guidance and policy recommendations from this government.

Again, I recognize, and the hon. Minister recognizes the problem, and he says it is a delicate problem. The only thing that is delicate about the problem is the colour question. This is all. There is nothing delicate about any other part of the immigration problem. I would think that this government should get itself clearly on the record, by some direct overt act, of making certain that this province is not by even the faintest implication lending itself to the impression that it is in some way limiting immigration into this province because of a colour bar.

Now I am not going to talk any more tonight about the doctor situation and about other skills, but these are the reasons why we have a very real concern about this implication in the policy of this government. I would like to suggest—for example there are the African miners from the Copperbelt, from Rhodesia for example, one of the areas where the rich copper mining is taking place—that this government make a direct effort to fill the skill shortage in the mines. I am assuming there is one, I have no knowledge about it, but from what is said—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Can they get out of the country, do you know?

Mr. Renwick: This is what I would like this government to find out. If they can get out of that country, if they want to come, if they are skilled miners, I would like this province to at least make a specific gesture to eliminate once and for all the suggestion that there is a colour barrier to arriving in the province of Ontario and becoming part of this province.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, just to wind this up, I think the very fact that we have accelerated the activities of the immigration department in Ottawa speaks for itself. I can assure you that if we have an opportunity in the very near future to sit down and decide with the authorities what the immigration policy should be, we will certainly make our thoughts known to them. I am sure they will be receptive, as they have been in the past.

I would simply say that the hon. leader of the Opposition brought up the fact that there were two Japanese lads here, engineers that could not get a job. I just ask you, if one of these was a lawyer and we sent him

down to your office and he could not talk the language, he could not read a legal document; what would you do with him? You would have to have them trained somewhere before you could make use of them. Now this is one of the problems of people coming here. They may have a skill, they may be educated, but they have a language barrier.

These are some of the things that I think you have to recognize, that they have to go through a training period, either here or before they come. This may only happen in a few instances, but it could be the reason why some of the people are not coming that we would like to have from the areas that you mention.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in the areas that were mentioned there is actually, generally speaking, a fairly good level of bilingualism. There is both English and French depending which part of the continent one turns to. I think it is interesting, it is perhaps demonstrative of the point the member for Riverdale is making, that these areas have apparently not been explored at all, that traditionally we revert to all the ancestral homes for our labour importing and that this gives rise to the concern some of us have on this side of the House.

Now I would be perfectly frank, Mr. Chairman, I have no idea what the response would be. I do not know whether the cultural adjustment could be adapted, I do not know whether there is the willingness to come. But I think it is at least worth making the exploration so that we change our pattern of immigrant acquisition, and in that sense it perhaps could be commended to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I assure the hon. members that we will have it on the agenda on our next talk up in Ottawa.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is one further point that I would like to mention. I appreciate the attitude this hon. Minister always takes in regard to co-operation with Ottawa. I think that is constructive. On the other hand, I sometimes get the impression that he thinks that in this immigration field he must work through Ottawa. Now Ottawa does not have any more jurisdiction over immigration than it has over agriculture. As a matter of fact, the two subjects are covered by exactly the same section of The British North America Act; it is concurrent jurisdiction in both cases. The provinces and the federal government both have jurisdiction.

It is true that the section also goes on to provide that where there is a conflict the federal law will prevail, but in a subject of this kind it is pretty hard to establish a direct conflict. There really is nothing constitutionally to prevent the hon. Minister from exploring areas on his own account, and even trying to encourage people to come here on his own account, if he considers it acceptable to have them here.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 401.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is much here that we have not got around to yet. We have not touched regional development associations.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to deal with second readings, third readings, bills in committee and then perhaps the Budget debate, if there is time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock, p.m.

MEMBER'S CORRECTION

(May 10, 1966—evening session)

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
3291	2	50	Change to read: **Hon. Mr. Yaremko:** I may say to the hon. member that alcoholics anonymous this year received a grant of $195.75.

No. 113



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 18, 1966

Department of Agriculture Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3615

Edible Oils Product Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3615

Abandoned orchards, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3615

Questions to Mr. Robarts re OMSIP, Mr. Thompson, Mr. MacDonald 3616

Question of Mr. Wishart re Mr. Malcolm Griffiths, Mr. Renwick 3616

Question of Mr. Wishart re Tilco strike, Mr. Renwick 3616

Statement re committee for the international hydrologic decade, Mr. Simonett 3617

Third readings 3617

Township of North York, bill respecting, reported 3622

Department of Agriculture Act, bill to amend, reported 3623

Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, reported 3623

Co-operative Loans Act, bill to amend, reported 3624

Executive Council Act, bill to amend, reported 3625

National Radio Observatory Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported 3625

Provincial Parks Act, bill to amend, reported 3625

Regional development councils, bill respecting, reported 3625

Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-1963, bill to repeal, reported 3625

Ontario development corporation, bill to incorporate, reported 3625

Evidence Act, bill to amend, reported 3625

Fire Departments Act, bill to amend, reported 3625

Credit Unions Act, bill to amend, reported 3626

Land Titles Act, bill to amend, reported 3626

Duties of a consumer protection bureau, bill to establish and provide for, reported 3626

Establishment of the St. Clair parkway commission, bill to provide for, reported 3627

Third readings 3627

Crop insurance, bill to provide for, Mr. Stewart, second reading 3628

Territorial Division Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 3628

Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading 3628

Representation Act, 1966, bill intituled, Mr. Rowntree, second reading 3628

Private Sanitaria Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading 3628

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Ben 3628

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ben, agreed to 3649

Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor 3649

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3649

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Lakeshore teachers college, Toronto, and Bowen road public school, Bertie township.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, a brief explanation of this is that it provides the means whereby the guarantee of $1,000 to purchase seed and fertilizer was provided for those who lost crop last year. The Department of Agriculture Act covers the right to do this.

THE EDIBLE OILS PRODUCTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Edible Oils Products Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in explanation, this bill provides for identification on the package of all artificial dairy products. It is similar to the legislation that was introduced causing all products in margarine to be identified on the package. So does this, with other such dairy supplement products.

THE ABANDONED ORCHARDS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting abandoned orchards.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In explanation of this bill, I feel that this is a bill that is of great importance to the fruit industry in the province of Ontario. We have had several discussions with the various people involved, and the problem has been that in the past there have been some farmers who have neglected to look after their orchards. There have been other people who have bought orchards or farms on which orchards were located and who did not wish to continue to look after the orchards. The result is that they have become a source of disease infection for neighbouring orchards that are under intensive care. This bill provides that where a farmer or an orchard owner files a complaint, the provincial entomologist may examine the orchard and declare it to be an abandoned orchard.

Now, the criteria so established will mean that where an orchard has not produced fruit for sale for human consumption for a period of two years it will be described as an "abandoned orchard," and the owner will be advised that he has to destroy the orchard or clean it up. If he chooses to clean it up, there will be no further problem and the order will be removed, but it only pertains to orchards that are within 300 yards of those that are under intensive care.

I think that this Act will be welcomed by the fruit growers of the province of Ontario.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): May I ask the hon. Minister if this bill is going to the agricultural committee?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Oliver: And the others?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And the others.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. Minister how he defines an orchard. There may be a conflict of interest in this. I happen to have about five trees.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that we must have thought of the hon. leader of the Opposition in drafting this Act. The minimum requirement for an orchard is half an acre, with an intensity of 26 trees to the acre, which would mean that there would be 13 trees on half an acre.

Mr. Oliver: The Minister thinks of everything!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we try to. On the other hand, I think that the hon. leader of the Opposition, like all other good people in the province of Ontario, would not want to feel that his orchard was a menace to fruit growers.

Mr. Thompson: Certainly not!

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister.

Would the Prime Minister inform the House whether the government has studied the possibility of having the Ontario medical services insurance division offer group plans with a view to bringing Ontario's scheme within the guidelines set down by the federal government for a national medical care plan?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can put my question into the mill and the hon. Prime Minister can deal with both.

In view of the statement by the federal Minister of Health and Welfare that federal contributions for Medicare will be available on and after July 1, 1967, is the government prepared to make the necessary amendments in The Medical Services Act so that this province can qualify for such contributions?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would say first that both these questions arise out of a statement made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare yesterday in Ottawa, and that statement really added very little to the position of the federal government. Perhaps it reaffirms the position they have taken previously, but I would point out that there is no legislation in front of the House of Commons; there is no detail contained in this, and, of course, the statement and the inference that perhaps may be drawn from it will be very carefully examined by this government, as far as our medical insurance plan is concerned, and we will continue as we are doing at the moment to implement our own plan.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the hon. Attorney General. The first one is, will the Attorney General repay the creditors of Malcolm Griffiths the $3,000 put up by the creditors to return Griffiths to Canada from England to face charges under The Bankruptcy Act and the Criminal Code in connection with his bankruptcy, and have the Attorney General's department assumed this cost?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in crimes of violence and crimes of fraud where large segments of the public are affected it is the practice to have the offender returned from a foreign country at public expense. But where persons have placed themselves in a position in a private transaction the offender is not usually returned at public expense to face allegations of fraud. I should inform the House that the trustee in bankruptcy in this case has paid to the Treasurer of Ontario the sum of $3,000 to assist in the extradition of the person charged, and the money will, I anticipate, be used to help defray the cost of extradition, police escort and so on. The matter of the allegation of fraud is before the courts in Britain at the present time and I would rather not discuss the case further in that regard. Perhaps later when we determine the extent of this fraud, we might be in a position to speak further to the question.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my second question is, does the hon. Attorney General have any idea when judgment and the reasons for judgment will be handed down in the Tilco Plastics injunction proceedings instituted by the Attorney General; and, if not, will he request the chief justice of the high court of justice to give judgment with reasons as soon as possible?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have no advice or information as to when judgment may be handed down by the chief justice in this matter. I would not consider it advisable or necessary to approach the chief justice to request him to write his judgment. I am sure he is aware of the importance of the decision in this case, and I think I may leave it at that.

I would just add, as I think hon. members are aware, that the chief justice has been

engaged for some two weeks now in a murder trial sitting as the justice and I am sure this is a factor in the matter, but I do not think it would be advisable for myself to make an approach to him and ask him to proceed with giving judgment.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement concerning an important meeting which has been convened in the Parliament buildings, Toronto. It is the third meeting of the Canadian national committee for the international hydrologic decade. The Canadian national committee has been set up by the national research council to develop, guide and co-ordinate the Canadian hydrologic programmes for the decade, which runs from 1965 to 1975.

This committee will ensure the collection of data, co-ordinate the use of scientific personnel and equipment, and indicate the regional and international role that Canada will play. At its meetings this week, the committee has had an opportunity to visit and see at first hand some the IHD research facilities in Ontario. These included the research ship of the Great Lakes institute, the "Port Dauphine," water conservation works of some of the conservation authorities and research work at the University of Guelph.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for us to have this committee meeting in Toronto. The aim of the international hydrologic decade is to improve and assure the scientific base for water management programmes in which governments are investing millions, not only in Ontario, but in all provinces of Canada and in other countries.

This ten-year programme for an international study of the science of hydrology is sponsored by the United Nations through UNESCO.

Although Canada has been blessed with an estimated one-third of the world's fresh water supply, effective managment of these resources can only be achieved through adequate knowledge. This decade programme has stimulated activity in hydrology in Canada, and the country will reap many benefits from a better knowledge of our water resources, their availability and quality and quantity, and in more people competent to plan and manage these resources.

Altogether the Canadian programme is made up of 185 projects distributed across Canada. Many of these will be of assistance to us in developing the water resources of northern Ontario, while others will be directed towards the solution of specific problems dealing with the Great Lakes.

A prominent Canadian, Major-General H. A. Young, who I might say is with us this afternoon, is the chairman of the national committee. Major-General Young has an outstanding record in Canada's armed forces and in the civil service of Canada as Deputy Minister of The Department of Public Works.

Ontario members of the committee include, T. R. Hilliard, representing the Ontario government's programmes, Professor Hugh Ayers, University of Guelph, and Dr. G. B. Langford, director of the Great Lakes institute.

We are pleased to give the fullest support to this hydrologic programme and the national committee which is guiding it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 18, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Bill 19, An Act to repeal The Stallions Act.

Bill 36, An Act to amend The Telephone Act.

Bill 61, An Act to establish The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Bill 63, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Bill 64, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Bill 81, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I have a motion which I intend to present in connection with this bill. I may say that on our side we have been deeply disappointed with the patchwork type legislation which this government has brought in. We have been very concerned, sir, that we have some really genuine representation of the people by some of the Conservative members, but our disappointment was most sincere when we saw they absented themselves during the debate.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Is it not a rule of this House that motives cannot be imputed to other members of the House?

Mr. Speaker: It is a rule of the House that members cannot impute improper motives.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is this not being done?

Mr. Speaker: I would think perhaps that the member's remarks are not considered to be in that category—that is, improper.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that their absence has been noticed and was very much a fact.

We were concerned because we wanted to have the principle of democracy applied to this bill. We had felt that surely the chairman should be elected, and we felt a great deal of encouragement in this when we saw a number of the members, whose motives I certainly do not question, stand up and with the greatest sincerity said that they believed in this principle of responsible representation. All I say is, and I do not know why they were away, but there were a number of them away when it came down to the real decision-making aspect of it. Their voices were silent and were not heard.

We were concerned, sir, that another principle was ignored, which was to have proper representation. This bill has carved Metro up, not on an equal basis but just hacked away with some divisions completely out of proportion with other divisions on the borough system.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What is the motion?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Minister will hear it in due course. My, he is impatient today.

Mr. Thompson: We have been concerned, sir, that there was obviously discrimination toward a group of people of whom we are very proud because of the part they are playing in our society. Of course I refer, as you will recognize, Mr. Speaker, to the teachers. For some reason this government has decided that the teachers must be placed as second-class citizens.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: We were dismayed with the Minister of Education and the appalling defence he offered in connection with representation by teachers to make decisions for their community and for the education of the young people. We were deeply dismayed with the inadequate presentation that he offered in this.

Well, sir, I am not going to repeat all the things that disappointed us but the bill obviously, as I have said before and many others have said, has been a compromise on a compromise, has shown weakness and has shown that there is influence in this Legislature by certain members who have particular interest that they want to have pressed, because the borough system is certainly not on a geographical or on a population basis in representation. I could go into a number of other areas.

For these reasons, sir, we think that the government should have another chance to redraft this bill, should have a chance to think over the many wise proposals that we have made, and we know that amongst the government members there are those who strongly oppose some of the fundamental aspects, which the government is going to ride over roughshod. We are hoping that those members will pluck up enough courage to speak out about the conviction which they felt.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Therefore, sir, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Downsview, that Bill 81 be not now read a third time but be read a third time this day six months hence.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): You mean he is for amalgamation!

Mr. Singer: I am just against the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Thompson moves, seconded by Mr. Singer, that Bill 81 be not read a third time now, but be read a third time six months hence.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I would like to make a brief comment on this motion that has been presented to the House. We have noticed with interest the fact that certain members on the government side have spoken with regard to the democratic principle which was desirable as a basis for the establishment of the new Metro. We have noticed with interest the fact that they were not here when the critical hour of voting took place, but I have every reason to believe that everybody else will have noticed it too and they will take such action as they deem fit in light of this absenteeism.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Just like your own party.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): We were all here.

Mr. MacDonald: We were all here; never fret.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: How about your own front benches, if you are talking about that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: If the leader of the House wants to put it on this rather low political level, where is the hon. Prime Minister at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I did not want to put it on a low level, the people were not in their seats.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would ask that we have no more interruptions. The member speaking on this particular motion before the House on third reading may proceed.

Mr. MacDonald: Second, Mr. Speaker, we have expressed our basic objections to the principle of this bill.

Furthermore, we have presented an alternative. And it is not an alternative of straight opposition to the bill for the purpose of covering up divisions in our own ranks, as is the case in the motion that has just been put forward to the House by the Liberal Party. They can all be opposed to the bill but for a variety of reasons. However, Mr. Speaker, the critical thing as far as we are concerned in terms of an approach to this bill, is that you have 13 municipalities in the metropolitan area which are in the process of transformation to some new form of government. We are not happy with the new form that this government has imposed, even against the will of many people in their own ranks. But you cannot continue to live in a vacuum with all of the public controversy and chaos that has been attendant on the situation for the last year. This would continue if the bill were given a hoist. It cannot be a hoist for six months without having to come back to it. We have elections that are scheduled for this fall.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, one reaches that point in an Opposition where you have expressed your views, you have presented a constructive alternative, you have noted the fact that those in the government ranks who are to a degree in agreement with us have been silenced by what has been imposed upon them. Having done all that, all one can do is to say that the only way you can have a democracy work is to let the will of the majority within this House operate today and come back and fight it on another occasion. Consider the proposition of a six months hoist—it would leave the elections next fall a complete question mark—complete chaos, complete confusion. If there is anything worse than a bad kind of solution, it is utter chaos so that nobody knows exactly what is going to happen.

Therefore, regretfully, we are going to have to accept what the government has decided and we will not support the motion that has been introduced by the Liberals.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate until my friend from York South told us about the constructive alternative, creative decentralization, which would allow the member for Riverdale to remove air pollution just from Riverdale but from no place else. We have been waiting with anxiety to hear a positive explanation, a meaningful explanation, of amalgamation with creative decentralization, the so-called alternative the hon. member for York South puts forward. It has not been coming.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member did not listen to it when it was given.

Mr. Singer: He sounds like the peevish little boy who is not getting his own way and who said, "If you do not agree with me you are wrong."

The member for York South has been in this House just long enough, Mr. Speaker, and I have heard him say, often enough, that the only effective way of opposing a bill all the way through is to oppose it on this very sort of motion, the only motion that is available to the Opposition on third reading. So the objections of the member for York South make as little sense as many of the things he has been saying about Metropolitan Toronto.

They are confused, they are unable to decide on a direction in which they are going to move. They come up with a series of words which sound fine but mean absolutely nothing. And now as their last gesture they are going to vote in favour of the bill that they have been opposing for two or three full days of debate in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it makes some sense that the Opposition should use every arrow in their quiver, every bit of ammunition that they have available to them, to express loudly and forcefully to the people of Ontario our dissatisfaction with the form of bill that is brought here. It is equally important, Mr.

Speaker, that those persons who spoke in one way in this House and now perhaps are going to vote another way take their places when the roll is called and be recorded in *Hansard* in perpetuity as to how they have voted. It makes no sense for members to have spoken against this bill and now to vote for it.

For these reasons, I seconded the motion of my hon. leader and it will be very interesting to see now how my confused socialist friends who talk about creative decentralization are creatively going to decentralize themselves and do a complete turnabout in supporting the government in this motion.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview has contrived once again to drag the debate down to his own level. It is a level I do not mind operating on if I have to. I am quite ready to get into this kind of fight.

As we listened to his pious, sanctimonious utterances, let us bear in mind first of all, Mr. Speaker, that as far as our pious sanctimonious friends in the Liberal ranks are concerned they are opposed to this bill. The only thing they can unite on is in the negative opposition to this bill. Their reasons for opposition are diametrically opposed within their own ranks. They have diametrically opposite reasons within their own ranks for opposing the bill, but they can unite on this one negative point; so now, having found a basis for union, they now want to carry the matter to the ultimate in obstruction.

Speaking for ourselves, as my leader said, we have put forward our point of view. It has been voted down. The hon. member for Downsview, although it has been explained many times to him, cannot comprehend it. We do not take responsibility for the lack of comprehension of other members. All we take responsibility for, Mr. Speaker, is to put forward our own point of view. We have put it forward. We think is is a constructive, sensible alternative. It has been voted down.

We accept the fact that it has been voted down.

We fought this bill at every level — we fought it on second reading. We introduced amendment after amendment, in the committee stage, to patch up specific features in the government's bill that we thought were undesirable. And, Mr. Speaker, there have been occasions in the past and there will be occasions in the future when we in this group will fight a bill at every stage right through to the bitter end.

There has been legislation brought in here that we thought would be better not on the statute books. However, it is impossible for any responsible person—and I am now talking about a person who is facing a serious problem in a responsible way and not merely in a way that will help to cover up the divisions in his own ranks—it is impossible for any responsible person to say that we can let this thing slide for another six months.

There has to be some solution. We do not like the government's solution, but it certainly is better than no solution. Therefore, it is shear obstructionism, nothing more at this stage, to say that we will do nothing for six months. Six months from now will bring us into October, I think. Elections are scheduled in this whole metropolitan area on the first Monday in December, so we are not to do anything, according to our friends, until October 18. Between October 18 and the first Monday in December, they suggest, the whole area should be reorganized. The ward boundaries should be redrawn in the city of Toronto and the candidates for public office should adjust themselves to this new situation.

Our friends think that opposition to that proposition is ridiculous. I say that the proposition is ridiculous, and that is why we are opposed to a six-months hoist; we are prepared to let the bill go through at this time. We fought our fight on it, we made our position clear; now something has to happen. We would have preferred, as a matter of fact, that a division had not been forced. As a matter of fact, technically under the rule, the vote will not be on the six-months hoist; it will be on the third reading.

Mr. Singer: Oh, well, thanks very much.

Mr. Bryden: Well, we have our friend here—

Mr. Singer: It took a while to get down to that.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member is going to be surprised at what I am going to say. Our friend, the hon. member for Downsview, can never listen to what anybody says. His conscience pricks him so much in so many different places that he can never sit still for two seconds. But I was going to go on to say, Mr. Speaker, that since the matter has been placed in this way—if there had been a voice vote, we would have let it go through—we will stand up and vote in favour of third reading at this stage. In my opinion, that is

the only constructive or intelligent thing that anyone can do at this point.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I do not consider myself an obstructionist. And I want to say that, as far as I am concerned, I am in support of the motion, if only because on Monday, when we were starting to discuss part 7 of the bill, I pointed out to this House that the teaching profession had, belatedly perhaps, asked that they have an opportunity to discuss this with the government, and the government refused. I think, if for no other reason, since this does affect the teaching profession so strongly, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, if for no other reason I think this bill should not be proceeded with. I am in favour of the motion.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have never been so disappointed in my life. In all the years, Mr. Speaker, that I have been involved in municipal government, and for a short period of years here in this Legislature, all our work seems to have gone for naught with respect to a few of my friends on the opposite side. I am sure, I am positive, that the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Downsview have not examined Bill 81 in its present form, in depth. Because if they had, they would not have proposed that this great portion of the province of Ontario should not have available to it this new form of area government that will be available on January 1, 1967.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to beg the House to vote down this motion by the hon. leader of the Opposition and vote that Bill 81 today, immediately, receive third reading.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour that Bill 81 be read now a third time, will please say "aye."

All those opposed, will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour that the bill be now read a third time, will please rise.

I am sorry, the member for Forest Hill entered the House after the Whips reported. According to the rules, he is not allowed to vote; but if he wishes to state how he would have voted had he been in his seat at the time, I would be very pleased to accept it.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): I would have voted in favour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, please rise.

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Ben
Apps	Braithwaite
Auld	Farquhar
Bales	Gordon
Beckett	Nixon
Boyer	Oliver
Brown	Racine
Brunelle	Sargent
Bryden	Singer
Carruthers	Smith
Carton	Taylor
Cowling	Thompson
Davis	Whicher
Edwards	Worton—14.
Evans	
Ewen	
Gisborn	
Gomme	
Guindon	
Harris	
Haskett	
Henderson	
Hodgson (Scarborough East)	
Hodgson (Victoria)	
Johnston (Carleton)	
Kerr	
Knox	
Lawrence (Russell)	
Lawrence (St. George)	
MacDonald	
Mackenzie	
MacNaughton	
Morningstar	
McKeough	
Noden	
Olde	
Pittock	
Price	
Pritchard (Mrs.)	
Randall	
Reilly	
Renwick	
Reuter	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Simonett	
Spooner	
Stewart	
Thrasher	
Villeneuve	
Walker	

AYES

Wardrope
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yaremko—57.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 57, not counting Mr. Dunlop; and the "nays," 14.

Mr. Speaker: I declare third reading of the bill carried.

Bill 103, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Bill 104, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Bill 107, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Bill 108, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Bill 109, An Act to amend The Jails Act.

Bill 110, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Clerk of the House: The 43rd order; committee of the whole House; Mr. W. E. Johnston in the chair.

TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK

House in committee on Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the township of North York.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills) moves that Bill Pr36 be amended by deleting the words "or food stuffs" from the third line of section 1 of that Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. As a matter of fact, I had the same amendment written out here. The hon. member for York Mills perhaps had a little more influence, as to when this bill would be called, than I did. But my substantial question, directed to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, is: Why does he not put this in the general legislation?

In the general legislation, as the hon. Minister knows, there is a section that gives municipalities power to regulate or ban vendors of ice cream. What has happened in the municipality of North York, and several others, is that those people who have made ice cream in the past are now making a product called frozen milk, which the section of the statute does not embrace. So North York came forward and said, "It is within the intent of the section in The Municipal Act, it is within the intent of the powers given to us by the province of Ontario, that we can regulate or ban vendors of this type, so please will you amend the statute and allow us the powers that were originally contemplated?"

The government has now seen fit, because it is allowing this Act to come on for hearing in committee of the whole House, to go along with that request. Why can the general legislation not be amended? Why should Scarborough not now be able to take the same sort of action that North York is able to take, if they want to? Or Etobicoke, or any other of the 977 municipalities?

The government has come to the conclusion that this makes good sense for North York; it is within the intent of the general legislation. The general legislation did not contemplate anything called frozen milk when it was written, however many years ago. North York is now going to be able to take care of it; would the hon. Minister not amend the general legislation to do this for all the 977 municipalities in the province of Ontario?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): There are only 973 now.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry. The hon. member for St. George, who keeps a close count on municipalities, says that there are only 973 now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as amended?

Mr. Singer: Is the hon. Minister not going to answer?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister have no comments to make on the point that was raised?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What is the use of discussing this matter now, when the amendments to The Municipal Act are not before the House? In the due course of time we can debate this when those amendments are before us.

Mr. Bryden: We are asking the hon. Minister—admittedly he does not have to answer—but we are asking if he would consider including this point as one of his amendments. If he does not, we will not be able to debate it at the time.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member for Downsview asked me the same question and

I can only say "yes." I will give consideration to anything; I always consider everything that he says.

Mr. Bryden: That is all the hon. Minister ever does; that is the trouble. Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of the proposed amendment but there is a point that worries me a little bit. Is it in order for a private bill to be amended in committee without notice having been given of the amendment?

Mr. Chairman: The rule, I am informed, says that if the amendment is substantial, then notice must be given.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill Pr36 reported.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT

House in committee on Bill 24, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 24 reported.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 46, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

On section 1:

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to compliment the hon. Attorney General on the principle of the bill, although I would point out that there are some shortcomings. One is that the bill, although it provides for bail, does not specifically provide for or empower the police officer to release the prisoner on his own recognizance.

One of the difficulties in large centres is that it is difficult to obtain bail for an accused, especially during the late hours of the night or the early hours of the morning. And often, if it were possible to obtain bail, the person in custody is too embarrassed to make the necessary telephone calls asking either his family or some friend to come down to the police station and post bail. I think it would go a long way toward ridding our system of this iniquity if section 1 were amended to empower the police officer to release the accused, or person in custody, on his own bail.

Most of the persons who end up in city jails overnight, and who require bail, are those who are charged with driving offences, or what may be commonly called misdemeanours or summary conviction offences. As a matter of fact, too many of these people have to spend overnight in jail and then have to appear before the magistate the following morning.

If they were permitted to depart on their own recognizance, they would not necessarily have to appear the following day and they could make arrangements to take the day off to appear in court.

Many people lose their job when they are charged with a driving offence because they are kept in jail overnight. Then the next morning they have to appear in court and cannot notify their employer that they are going to be absent from work; and the employer cannot make arrangements to have someone else do this employee's work. The result is that the person finds himself fired.

I would, as I did in committee, strongly recommend and suggest to the hon. Attorney General that this particular section be amended by—I will have to write that out, will I not, Mr. Chairman? I move:

> That subsection 1 of section 15 of the Act as amended by section 2 of Bill 46 be amended by adding after the last word thereof, "and such bail may be the person's own bail."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Ben moves that subsection 1 of section 15 of the Act as enacted by section 2 of Bill 46, be amended by adding to the end thereof the following words: "and such bail may be the person's bail."

Shall the section stand as amended?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have some doubt as to the order of the amendment. The bill was fully debated in committee and reported back to the House.

Second, I would say this: If one looks at section 2 and the effect of it, he would clearly observe that we have gone a long way in enlarging the section for the benefit of persons taken into custody by a police officer, brought into a police station by a police officer. We removed the words, "by recognizance, condition or his appearance within two days," which was the law, and substituted therefor "condition for his appearance or by counsel or agent." This has enlarged the section so that a person does not now have to undertake to return in person within two

days, but may appear by agent or in person if he wishes.

The effect of this amendment, as I sense it and as I hear it read, is that it would give the police officer the jurisdiction to grant bail by recognizance in very wide terms. I do not think we can go that far. Certainly it is an enlargement that I had not contemplated in this legislation which I think we cannot contemplate at this time. To put the police officer in the position of the person adjudicating whether this person may be released on his recognizance—as I think the sense of this to be—in putting the police officer in that position, I think we have enlarged the section to meet the difficulty which it did cause and the hardship which it did cause in its previous form, and I cannot support such an amendment as is offered by the hon. member.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to comprehend the hon. Attorney General's thinking in this matter, and I cannot understand why he should object to a citizen of this province who has been apprehended for some offence to be permitted to go back to his family overnight, without the necessity of having to put up bail.

I ask the Attorney General, why such a great emphasis on money. What difference does it make to this province if a man is released on his own bail, or he is released on $1 bail, or he is released on $25 bail, or $50 bail? Is it not a fact that a person may be inconvenienced by not having the $1, or the $25, or the $50 available to him and still be an upstanding citizen in this community who may have suffered a temporary misfortune? Does money mean so much to this government that the absence of $1 in a man's pocket may mean the difference between freedom and incarceration? Does the Attorney General deem that to be a principle that he is going to stick to—that the almighty dollar is going to decide?

Surely, if under this section a police officer can release a person in his custody on $50 bail, or $25 bail, the mere failure to have that $25, or that $50 in one's pocket should not compel him to spend a night in jail on those hard cots, with no mattresses, improper toilet facilities, and probably the banging of cell bars by some drunk in an adjacent cell. He has to appear the next morning, and as I say, he loses his job because he cannot notify his employer. Does that $25 or $50 mean so much to the Attorney General of this province? If it does, then I say it is a shame.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Well, Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this point, I would like to point out that the additional words which have been suggested by the member for Bracondale in fact do not change the meaning of the section at all. The provision in here is that the police officer in charge of the station may grant bail without fee, and of course, he may, if he chooses, take cash bail, or he may take property bail, or he may grant bail on a person's own recognizance.

The addition of the words suggested by the hon. member for Bracondale do accomplish one thing, and that is out of abundant precaution they point out to the police officer that he can grant the bail on the person's own recognizance. But I would not want anyone to think, after the remarks that were made by the member for Bracondale, that in some way or other this section affects the right of the police officer to grant bail without putting up money. A person charged can, if the police officer wishes, give bail by his own recognizance, and we will support the amendment, but only on the ground that it is out of abundant precaution and does indicate to the police officer that he has that alternative. He has it in any event, but as I say, for purposes of making certain that the police officer is aware that he is not restricted to requiring cash or property bail, but can give bail on the person's own recognizance, we would support the amendement.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I thank the member for indicating they are going to support the amendment, but perhaps he was not listening when the Attorney General stated he was not prepared to go as far as I had indicated, namely, permitting the person charged to be released on his own recognizance.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the amendment, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Sections 2 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 46 reported.

THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT

House in committee on Bill 48, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 48 reported.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

House in committee on Bill 62, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 62 reported.

THE NATIONAL RADIO OBSERVATORY ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill 80, An Act to amend The National Radio Observatory Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 80 reported.

THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

House in committee on Bill 87, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 87 reported.

THE GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 88, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962.

On section 1:

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, it is probable that the hon. members of this House are going to say that I have no grounds for my fears.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): If there is any objection to this, in view of the absence of the hon. Minister, we will keep this bill over until he is present.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS

House in committee on Bill 89, An Act respecting regional development councils.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 89 reported.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS GUARANTEE ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill 90, An Act to repeal The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 90 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

Resolved:

That (a) every guarantee executed under the seal of the Ontario development corporation and signed by the Treasurer of Ontario and given or purporting to be given under the authority of section 9 of The Ontario Development Corporation Act, 1966, is binding upon the province and is not open to question upon any ground whatsoever;

(b) The Lieutenant-Governor in council may authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to guarantee payment by the province of any debentures, bills or notes issued by, or of any temporary loan made to, the Ontario development corporation under the authority of The Ontario Development Corporation Act, 1966, and every guarantee given or purported to be given under the authority is binding upon the province and is not open to question upon any ground whatsoever,

as provided in Bill 91, An Act to incorporate the Ontario development corporation.

Resolution concurred in.

THE ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

House in committee on Bill 91, An Act to incorporate the Ontario development corporation.

Sections 1 to 24, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 91 reported.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 93, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 93 reported.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

House in committee on Bill 95, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 95 reported.

THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 96, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 96 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

Resolved:

That, the Ontario government stock, together with the interest thereon, issued to the accountant of the supreme court by the Treasurer of Ontario, under subsection 7 of section 60 of The Land Titles Act, as enacted by section 15 of The Land Titles Amendment Act, 1966, shall be charged upon and paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 98, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Resolution concurred in.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

Resolved:

That, when section 16 of The Land Titles Amendment Act, 1966, comes into force, the amount of interest received by the Treasurer of Ontario under subsection 1 of section 18 of The Land Titles Amendment Act, 1961-1962, in in respect of the preceding calendar year, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund to the accountant of the supreme court to be credited to the land titles survey fund,

as provided in Bill 98, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

House in committee on Bill 98, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Sections 1 to 28, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 98 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

Resolved:

That, the money required for the purposes of The Consumer Protection Bureau Act, 1966 shall, until March 3, 1967, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, as provided in Bill 100, An Act to establish and provide for the duties of a consumer protection bureau.

Resolution concurred in.

CONSUMER PROTECTION BUREAU

House in committee on Bill 100, An Act to establish and provide for the duties of a consumer protection bureau.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on section 1(2) (d), one of the duties of the consumer protection bureau is going to be to enforce legislation for the protection of consumers. Really I would have thought that was the main objective of this statute, and 101 the statute that follows it. Is there any real validity in having 1(2) (d) in the statute at all if, as the hon. Attorney General has told us, Bill 101 is not going to be heard of again for at least another year?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, first of all, as I pointed out in my remarks I believe on second reading, it is not likely to be another year before the legislation under Bill 101 comes into effect. Second, we need time to prepare the bureau itself, to get it set up and establish and equip it. It is true that the subsection to which the hon. member refers is designed for the enforcement of protection under the consumer legislation. We have other consumer legislation but, generally, I think it is fair to admit that most of that consumer protection is in specific Acts such as The Used Car Dealers Act, and others.

But there is certainly a virtue in this language and in this Act in that the bureau will be set up, it will be ready. While I cannot forecast that Bill 101 may come into force in this session, it may very well be in force much quicker than the hon. member anticipates.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by the hon. member for Downsview, the hon. Attorney General now indicates that the reason why he is not passing Bill 101 is because Bill 100 will require some time so that the bureau can be set up. Well, Bill 101 provides, if it were passed by this House, that it would come into force on a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in a proclamation. So there is no validity in the point the hon. Attorney General makes, that for some reason or other this bill must be delayed until a further session of this Legislature.

I would like to ask the Attorney General whether the remarks which he made in the committee on legal bills—that the government might perhaps bring this legislation forward in this session, that is, Bill 101—is or is not the case. Is he now saying, in fact, that this bill dies on the order paper the way it stands?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, we are debating on Bill 100 and I have no remarks to make on Bill 101 at this time.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General may say he has no remarks to make on Bill 101. The whole point of the remarks of the hon. member for Downsview was that Bill 100 does not make sense in the absence of Bill 101.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Speaking to Bill 100, I submit it does make sense. It enables us to set up a bureau which will be in readiness to act when Bill 101 comes into effect.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 100 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

Resolved:

That, the Minister may make grants to the St. Clair parkway commission, which shall be paid, before March 31, 1967, out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 102, An Act to provide for the establishment of the St. Clair parkway commission.

Resolution concurred in.

ST. CLAIR PARKWAY COMMISSION

House in committee on Bill 102, An Act to provide for the establishment of the St. Clair parkway commission.

Sections 1 to 24, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 102 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the committee of the whole House rise and report certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment, and one bill with amendment, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment, and one bill with amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor is expected to be in the House some time this afternoon to give Royal assent and, in those circumstances, I would suggest to the House and I hope I might secure agreement, that those bills which have been through committee of the whole House might now receive third reading.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motions:

Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the township of North York.

Bill 24, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Bill 46, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Bill 48, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Bill 62, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Bill 80, An Act to amend The National Radio Observatory Act.

Bill 87, An Act to amend The Provisional Parks Act.

Bill 89, An Act respecting regional development councils.

Bill 90, An Act to repeal The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 91, An Act to incorporate the Ontario development corporation.

Bill 93, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Bill 95, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Bill 96, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Bill 98, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill 100, An Act to establish and provide for the duties of a consumer protection bureau.

Bill 102, An Act to provide for the establishment of the St. Clair parkway commission.

CROP INSURANCE

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill 112, An Act to provide for crop insurance.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 105, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

In the absence of Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health), Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves second reading of Bill 84, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE REPRESENTATION ACT, 1966

In the absence of Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister), Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves second reading of Bill 92, The Representation Act, 1966.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I have some comments I wish to make on this matter.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, it might be more satisfactory if we held the bill until the hon. Prime Minister was here.

Mr. Bryden: That is quite satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

May I ask the House leader if it is intended that this bill will go to any standing committee or will it go directly from here to committee of the whole?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is my understanding that it will go to committee of the whole House.

THE PRIVATE SANITARIA ACT

In the absence of Hon. Mr. Dymond, Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves second reading of Bill 111, An Act to amend The Private Sanitaria Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The fourteenth order: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, when this debate commenced there was a lot of discussion between the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) and myself with reference to what was referred to as The Penitentiaries Act of 1961.

Reference had been made by the Minister to the debate on his estimates, which is re-recorded on page 895 of *Hansard* of February 24, 1966. I offered to read excerpts from that debate, but was dissuaded from so doing. Now I feel compelled to do so for no other reason than to finally impress upon this House that not only did this government do nothing with reference to one aspect of the Fauteux report it could have implemented, but in truth it did not even know of the existence of legislation which would have permitted it to do so.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that in February of this year when discussing the hon. Minister's estimates, I brought to the attention of this House the existence of The Penitentiaries Act, 1961, and paragraph 61 thereof, specifically.

In the Act this particular section is captioned: "Sentences of less than two years," and it reads as follows:

> The Minister, with the general or special approval of the Governor in council, may on behalf of the government of Canada enter into an agreement with the government of any province for the confinement in penitentiaries, or any other institution under the direction or supervision of the service, of persons sentenced or committed under the criminal law of Canada to imprisonment for more than six months, but less than two years, but any such agreement shall include provisions whereby such persons shall be confined at the expense of the provincial government concerned.

When I asked with reference to this particular section of the Minister, he gave some evasive answer. I quote from page 894 of *Hansard*:

> *Hon. Mr. Grossman:* I would first like to understand the hon. member's question. Is he suggesting that because of the

Fauteux report that the hon. Minister of Justice is prepared to make arrangements with the province of Ontario to take over some of our institutions and some of our responsibilities? If so, he is completely wrong.

Mr. Ben: I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the new Penitentiaries Act, 1961, authorized the Minister of Justice, with the approval of the Governor in council, to enter into an agreement with the government of any province where the confinement in federal institutions of persons who are sentenced under the criminal law is less than two years. Does the hon. Minister deny that the Penitentiaries Act, 1961, contains such a provision, or does the hon. Minister deny that he has any knowledge that the Act contains such a provision?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am denying that the Minister of Justice has failed to take advantage of that and offers us this proposition. That is all I am telling you.

Mr. Ben: Is the hon. Minister saying that he should continue to wail about having prisoners for short terms and they should come and relieve him of this burden rather than that he go to them saying: "Let us enter into a contract"? Is that what the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In 1961, I think it was, we passed a bill here, an Act to implement the Fauteux report, and we are waiting for co-operation from the federal government. All the Minister of Justice did, I think, was use that to relieve one of the Maritime provinces of a situation which they could not handle there. We would be quite pleased—and I have spoken to the Minister of Justice—to two Ministers of Justice—to implement the Fauteux report—by mail and I have seen them personally, and they will not do it.

Mr. Ben: I am not speaking about the implementation of the Fauteux report, I am asking the hon. Minister whether he has any record that either he or any of his predecessors in office made overtures to the federal government to implement the provisions in The Penitentiaries Act which would enable this government and the federal government to enter into a contract whereby the federal government would take over responsibility for prisoners serving less than two years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this will answer the hon. member. On June 8, 1964 I sent the Hon. Guy Favreau, the Minister of Justice at the time, a letter. I asked when we could expect implementation of three of the recommendations made in the Fauteux report. The recommendations were: No. 31 —The provincial government should be responsible for the care and treatment in penal institutions of persons sentenced to imprisonment for maximum terms of six months or less; persons sentenced to imprisonment longer than six months, should be confined to penal institutions operated by the federal government. Does that answer the hon. member's question?

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister did not touch it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did not touch what?

Mr. Ben: My question.

The debate continued in that vein. As a matter of fact, there is a remark here imputed to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). The remark did not originate from him, but it is imputed to him at any rate.

I had implied in this House that the department did not know of the existence of The Penitentiaries Act, by which it could have relieved itself of the burden of looking after prisoners sentenced to more than six months and less than two years, but we received these evasive answers. The talk continued to go back to the Fauteux report, the Fauteux report, the Fauteux report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I took the trouble to obtain *Hansards,* that is the House of Commons *Hansards,* with reference to the discussion of The Penitentiaries Act when it was introduced by the then Minister of Justice, the Hon. Davie Fulton. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, to this House, that in 1961 the Tories were in power in Ottawa and it seems strange that I find myself in a position where I have to applaud the Tories and at the same time malign them and prove their inadequacies. The Penitentiaries Act was introduced for second reading on June 12, 1961. I will pass over good parts of this, but I do want to draw to the attention of the Minister that the purpose of this Act was, in fact, to implement much of the Fauteux report. I will dwell only with the part regarding the responsibility for prisoners sentenced to more than six months, but less than two years. I quote from page 6620 of the House of Commons *Hansard*:

The next feature that hon. members

will observe in comparing this bill with the present Act is that the bill authorizes the Minister of Justice, with the approval of the Governor in council, to enter into an agreement with the government of any province for the confinement in federal institutions of persons who are sentenced under the criminal law to less than two years. In the absence of such authority, persons sentenced to less than two years could not be detained in a federal institution.

The House will recall that in 1958 we had a Dominion-provincial conference related to prospective changes being made in Canada's correctional system. This conference was called for the purpose of discussing with the responsible provincial Ministers the problems that arise in connection with the implementation of the Fauteux committee's recommendations, and other recommendations that we had developed as a result of our consideration of that report. At that time it was stated as a matter of policy by the federal government that we were prepared to accept the Fauteux committee's recommendation that the federal system should assume the responsibility for persons sentenced in Canada to terms of more than six months.

I think that recommendation was: "sentenced to terms of more than one year." We outlined the problems that would confront us in accepting this proposal and the planning which would be necessary if we were to put it into effect. I refer to planning related to the improvement of our own federal system in order to bring it to a point where it was of such a standard that we could say that it was as good as, or better than, any existing provincial system, and that therefore it would be logical and proper for us to accept this additional responsibility and planning that would be necessary in order to enlarge the facilities of the federal system so that we might be physically able to take over that extra responsibility.

At that time I indicated to the provinces that if they agreed that this approach was correct, we would base our penitentiary planning on the first assumption, and would press on with the necessary reorganization as rapidly as possible, but that in view of the tremendous physical problems with which we were confronted under the responsibility that we then had, it would, in fact, be several years before we could expect to be in a position to take over the increased responsibility consequent upon the inclusion in our institutions of prisoners sentenced to the shorter term.

I said, however, that although it might be a matter of years, as it will be, before we would be in a position to implement this recommendation in full, nevertheless, in individual cases where a particular province or particular provinces might find that they had a situation in which they were confronted with the necessity of substantial expenditures of their own part in order to modernize perhaps their own prison system, where they were reluctant to undertake this large-scale development to the provincial system, we might be prepared to enter into individual arrangements with them under which we would assume, by virtue of agreements then to be entered into, the responsibility for prisoners who would otherwise have been part of the provincial system.

This would have two results. First, it would save the province concerned large outlays on their system which they might find it difficult to make, and which might in part at least be wasted because, within a matter of a year or two, we would be taking over their system. Second, it would have the result that by our assumption of this responsibility under these individual agreements, we would be in a position in which we would be able to plan any development of the prison system in that province so that it would conform with our overall plan for the ultimate overall federal system.

I have reference now to this part of our understanding with the provinces, namely, our understanding that we will be prepared, in advance of the overall acceptance of the additional responsibility, to enter into agreement with individual provinces to solve their problems. I should emphasize that the purpose of this change, to which I have just drawn attention in the new bill, is not designed to implement in full the understanding reached at the Dominion-provincial conference of 1958, but rather is merely an inter-measure designed to provide authority under which this basic change in the law can be made on an overall basis.

Arrangements may, nevertheless, be made between the federal government and certain provincial governments whereby inmates who are now the responsibilities of provinces may be detained in federal institutions at provincial expense.

The hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, had no knowledge of the existence of that legislation and not one piece of correspondence passed between this government and the federal government even inquiring what would be the terms for such an arrangement, how it could be worked out or what the prospects would be of implementing that particular clause of The Penitentiaries Act. In the meantime, this government has been spending money on reform institutions, putting up new institutions which, as the then Minister of Justice stated, would be assumed by the federal government.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that at the time The Penitentiaries Act was passed, as a result of that 1958 provincial-Dominion conference, both this government and the federal government were of one party. Yet there was a complete lack of knowledge in this government that this existed. They made no overtures to implement that aspect which would have made it unnecessary to expand prisons in this province and make those high capital outlays for facilities which surely are going to be duplicated by the federal government.

I wanted to bring that to the attention of this House, Mr. Speaker, so that we will have an end to this nonsense of the Minister getting up and stating that no one is doing anything about the Fauteux report, the Fauteux report, the Fauteux report. The fact is that this government has been doing nothing. In Ottawa they did take action on the Fauteux report and they made it possible for this government to relieve themselves of the responsibility of providing facilities for short-term prisoners; but they failed to do so.

Last Friday, I was discussing the inconsistencies between what the Minister and this government say and what they do. I think the inconsistencies are so manifest that one wonders whether the Minister is being told the truth about Millbrook. The government report on Millbrook purported to show nothing seriously amiss. Yet, within the previous two weeks, a mentally ill inmate who stabbed a guard was beaten. There were continuing reports about dissatisfaction and low morale among the custodial staff. Two inmates were reported to have "unusual control" over the administration. Surely perhaps "unusual influence" would be more aptly true. It was said that guards were being hired and expected to control some of the most unruly men in the province, with little or no formal training. A former guard said that the so-called training programme was baffling in its inadequacy. One guard got two-and-a-half days training, but quoted "a five-page brief handed to all new guards calls for the first four weeks of employment to be devoted almost exclusively to training."

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the department to say what it is doing, it is quite another to see what it is doing. The guards at Millbrook have no formal grievance procedure. The guards who protest are given the option of either resigning or being fired. The implication, according to the examiner, "is that Millbrook officials do not want The Department of Reform Institutions to know reasons or conditions which cause employees to quit."

The two-week-long, so-called investigation by Dougall and Penfold was regarded as a joke by many staff members who resented the intrusion.

It costs a taxpayer about $8 a day to keep an inmate at a reformatory. What does Kellogg—now, let us hope, a reformed character—think of the Ontario reformatories? He believes that time and money were completely wasted on him. He says, "I did not get my rehabilitation from any institution."

On March 14, 1946, Mr. Speaker, a Department of Reform Institutions was proposed in a bill tabled in the Ontario Legislature. Under its provision an entire section of the department previously administered by the Provincial Secretary was to be transferred to the new department. In a two-sentence description of the move that was amplified later during consideration of the bill, the then Premier, George Drew, said:

> We are setting up a department to deal with certain institutions hitherto under the administration of the hon. Provincial Secretary, and this new legislation is intended to stress reform rather than punitive methods in these institutions.

The new department took over the former army basic training centre at Brampton as a reform school for first offenders under 20, and initiated a training school at Guelph for guards for the reformatories in the province.

Things had begun well. The reform school at Brampton was to be a temporary establishment for youths who were not confirmed criminals and was to be in use until it was possible to erect permanent quarters. The proclaimed intention was that the inmates should spend most of their time in classrooms.

In the school for guards it was proposed they would receive instructions on their duties and responsibilities and their attitudes towards the prisoners that would equip them

for the intelligent performance of their work. Forward steps were being taken which were expected to bring results in the rehabilitation of prisoners in Ontario reformatories. A. R. Virgin, director of Ontario reform institutions, said tests were being applied to all prisoners to see what their aptitudes were; then a course of treatment and training would be given which, it was hoped, would not only interest the prisoner but would enable him to hold down a job. A special counselling service was provided and the young prisoner was to be given extra attention. Educational facilities were to be enlarged. Vocational equipment was installed and, as far as was possible, trade courses were co-ordinated with the academic work.

The guards were to be given sufficient training to enable them to better handle and understand those they would look after. It was said that, if the results were as expected, the prisoner would not emerge from the reformatory with a chip on his shoulder. The reformatories were to be genuine places of reform instead of postgraduate centres for criminals. "If the plans were put into complete effect," commented the Toronto *Globe and Mail* editorial on March 20, 1946, "the results would pay in fewer crimes and, in the long run, lower reformatory costs."

But, has the hope and the optimism of those early years been justified? Well, just look at the record today. Hon. members will find the answers there. Cost of crime is still spiralling. We are creating more institutions. Present population is larger, the rate of recidivism is no lower.

The Ontario Department of Reform Institutions began in March 1947, to provide training courses for prison guards. This was in March of 1947. The first course was given at Guelph, with 250 workers in reform institutions attended training class. I do not know the figures for last year, although there has been an increase in the guard staff from 442 to 945.

The full-length course given at Guelph reformatory took a month and consisted of informative lectures on various aspects of prison work and the policies of The Ontario Department of Reform Institutions. Writing about this in *Canadian Welfare*, the late Professor Stewart Jaffray, of the school of social work, indicated that the training courses would become a permanent requirement for staff engaged in Ontario reform institutions. "The benefits of such training had already been noted," Dr. Jaffray said, "in terms of more alert appearance and bearing and increased interest, morale, and efficiency in all institutions."

When I read to hon. members, on February 24, the syllabus of training for guards as outlined in The Department of Reform Institutions manual, the hon. Minister promptly responded that that was only "the introductory training," "only a small aspect of their training." Hon. members will remember the hon. Minister never got around to detailing what the bulk of the training consisted of. If the hon. Minister would like to do so now, we would have the opportunity of comparing his department's programme today with what it was visualized. The hon. Minister did not want to trouble us with this information earlier. Well, it is no trouble as far as I am concerned, no trouble at all.

The hon. Minister and I disagreed about what was an adequate educational level for guards and other officials. The Minister was prepared to settle for a low level of formal education for guards because, as he pointed out, a formal education is not an infallible guide to intelligence, aptitude and general suitability. My position is that a formal educational level may not be the best or the only standard of suitability but it is the best we have. It may be only incidental that those with less education can be hired and kept for less money by The Department of Reform Institutions. But what did Professor Jaffray say? He said:

> The reform institutions will become reformed only when the department employs, on an increased scale, young men with social work training or the nearest thing to it. It will be necessary also to make the work more attractive by increasing salary scales for guards and improving their working conditions.

How many people at the custodial level, the most important level as far as the prisoners are concerned, have social work training? Would the hon. Minister answer that question?

Another hon. member of this House has already pointed out — and this is also on February 24—that of the 52 active parole officers listed last year in this province, only one is a university graduate; and 44 have an academic achievement of grade 12 or less. I will repeat Dr. Stewart Jaffray's words again:

> The reform institutions will become reformed only when the department employs, on an increased scale, young men with social work training or the nearest thing to it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ben: The caseload of these parole officers averages 45—at least 10, and probably 15, more than it should be. As the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) has pointed out, in many cases it is over 50, and in two cases it is 75 and 96. About three per cent of the total budget of Reform Institutions is spent on rehabilitation; and this is in the parole service and in the grants to the John Howard society, Elizabeth Fry society and others. And yet, to quote the Minister, "We do everything possible to help them." "There is an extremely strong programme at the moment; money is no object."

Money is no object, he says—"The department is hiding its light under a bushel. We just go ahead and do our job." That is the way the Minister looks at it. But try to reconcile those statements with reality, with the parsimony of the department, the bleakness of the institutions, the astonishing amount of obsolescence and inefficiency throughout the entire system, and the repeated and damning indictments that have been laid at the door of this government concerning this system.

How has the pay scale of guards increased in real terms since 1946? In 1946 the range for guards was $1,340 to $2,860. This year, it is $4,050 to $7,200. Since 1946, the average weekly wage in Ontario has increased from $32.59 to $96.91. Since 1949, alone, the base period for the cost of living index, the cost of living has increased from 100 to 144.1. This gives an idea of how much better off the guards are today than in 1946. And you will remember that the wage scale paid in 1946 was considered then to be extremely inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, in proceeding this way, I am simply taking up the invitation of the hon. Minister himself, who asked on February 24: "And why should not somebody start telling the story of this department?" Well, I hope the Minister is happy now to have it told. It is taking some time, and what I have to say is not geared to the short attention span of the Tory members, but I hope other members of this House are happy to have it told.

On September 2, 1952, commenting on Prime Minister Frost's announcement of a Royal commission to probe the escape of four men from the Don jail, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* stated editorially:

> It is essential that the terms of reference be wide enough to clear up this vexed jail question once and for all. It is painfully apparent that there is something wrong with the system of jail administration in itself.

Speaking about salaries, the newspaper commented:

> The salary weakness is even more flagrant with respect to the rank and file. Men of spirit and character can readily get employment at far higher remuneration than is paid to guards in the Don jail. There is little inducement to make prison work a career and establish a record for promotion with so little return in hand or in sight. There should also be an inquiry into how guards are appointed.

This statement, as I stated, Mr. Speaker, was made in 1952. It could be printed in today's paper, or tomorrow morning's paper, and would be just as applicable to the situation of the guards in the reform institutions of this province—as it was over ten years ago to the guards in the Don jail.

Today, 14 years later, would the hon. Minister tell us what inducement The Department of Reform Institutions offers to men of spirit and character, particularly the rank and file level of prison work? Will he tell us how this flagrant salary weakness has been corrected? Will he advise us how the weaknesses in the system of jail administration, so painfully apparent 14 years ago, has been eliminated? Will he inform us how The Department of Reform Institutions today can be exculpated of a charge of painful stupidity and irresponsibility in discharging its duties to the prison population and the public?

The *Globe and Mail* continued in the 14-year-old editorial:

> But action should not cease with investigation over the carrying out of any recommendations. Toronto needs a new jail properly designed for the purpose it serves. There should be no delay in getting such a structure built. How it should be paid for and by whom can well be left to later consideration, if there is actually any real argument in this matter.

Despite the *Globe and Mail*, I can appreciate the hon. Minister's difficulty in doing what it proposed—having the city build the jail without funds, which seems more than a minor consideration. But, of course, the same old jail, despite the new wing, still stands; and The Department of Reform Institutions, of which the Minister claims to be so proud, has done nothing about having it replaced although its deficiencies are even more notorious today.

Every grand jury reports on the inadequacies of that old Don jail. And the hon. Minister should not tell us, as he already has, that Toronto has the same opportunity as everyone else to participate in the regional jails plan the Minister is putting forward and talking about so much; despite the fact that, in three years, not a cent has been spent. He should show a little leadership in this respect! Show us a little fight!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It does not look as though he is fighting now.

Mr. Ben: On May 25, 1953, the Toronto *Daily Star* noted that this province's treatment of first offenders was grossly at fault, that the reform element in the best reformatories was inadequate; that sentences for similar offences varied greatly in different courts; that many did not fit the crime; and that the need of society and the person convicted were still not being responsibly and intelligently met by this department.

In 1950, one out of every 2,000 of the population in England and Wales was in jail. In the same year in Canada, one out of every 139 persons drew a prison sentence. I asked the hon. Minister to supply me with figures as to what the comparison would be today and he reported back that his staff, after a great deal of effort and endeavours to supply me with this information, was unable to. I am not criticizing the hon. Minister for that; I applaud him for the effort his department put into trying to answer my question.

How has that system changed? This province's treatment of first offenders is still badly unco-ordinated. The reform element in reformatories is even more inadequate. Sentences for similar offences still vary greatly in different courts, and the needs of society and the persons convicted are still not being responsibly and intelligently met by this department.

A number of years ago, Mr. Coughlan told the legislative committee that under Britain's probation scheme, 75 per cent of first offenders placed on probation were not convicted again. In contrast, over the preceding 20 years, the Canadian prison system has failed to rehabilitate 70 per cent of those committed to its charge. This statistic is virtually unchanged today. This is the system we are invited to admire by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. This is the system the Minister leaps to defend against criticism. What is the most practical key to the efficiency of any system if not the number it rehabilitates?

The Ontario system—pretentiously called the "Ontario plan"—is a failure. The Minister only shows the desperation of his position when he rises in this House to defend it. His outbursts of irritation are revealing. His system has had the test of experience and application and it has failed to meet that test. The system is a failure and, what is more, the Minister knows it.

Mr. Coughlan believes that Ontario must inaugurate a probation plan similar to that of Britain, or embark on a big programme of prison building. What has Ontario done? I think you have guessed it—we have been building more prisons.

The British system not only rehabilitates many offenders; it also saves the taxpayers large sums in prison maintenance, to say nothing of the reduced cost of crime. Let me quote exerpts from a paper entitled, "Human Beings Within the Law" delivered by Arthur Maloney, a good Tory, to a meeting of the John Howard society of Ottawa, April 9, 1959. Mr. Maloney had this to say:

> The public has to be educated to support the changes that are needed. The best way to approach the taxpayer is to convince him first of the economy that will result from the reforms that we recommend. People connected with the John Howard society have often been told, and are fully aware of, how much cheaper it is to have a man outside of a prison, than it is to have him inside; how much less expensive it is to have a man on probation, than to have him in a reformatory; how much less costly it is to have him on parole than it is to have a man in the penitentiary.
>
> You hear the figures variously described, that the cost of keeping a man in a penitentiary is anywhere from $1,700 to $2,000 a year, whereas the cost of having him on probation or on parole would not be much higher than $250 a year.
>
> But, in addition to the simple arithmetic of what it costs to maintain a prisoner, there are other relevant economic factors. There is what the individual who is not in prison does.
>
> I was very surprised when I read some facts and figures prepared by Mr. Dan Coughlan, our chief probation officer in Ontario, when he demonstrated over the last few years how many deserted wives and families were supported by husbands and fathers who were on probation, and the amount of the income these men were thereby able to earn. A massive relief problem and a real burden on a heavily

taxed state would have been the alternative if these offenders had been in prison.

It was a very surprising revelation to me to know that the figure involved runs into thousands and thousands of dollars.

Those are the material dividends, but the moral dividends are even greater in terms of rehabilitation and reinstatement of the individual in society.

In Britain, Mr. Speaker, a man found guilty of an offence is held in custody while a probation officer makes a presentence report. The punishment is designed to suit the individual as well as the crime. The probationer is periodically checked and, in a good many cases, it is found that the offender, for the first time, has to live up to his full responsibilities in life.

Thus a good start is made in developing a good citizen instead of an habitual criminal, Mr. Speaker.

In 1946, George Dunbar said that Ontario was expanding its prison facilities: "Not so much because there are more lawbreakers now, but because our programme of segregation of first offenders and young persons from the chronic lawbreakers demands more space and accommodation."

Why are we expanding them today? We are expanding them simply to keep pace with the growing prison population. The all-important principle of segregation in prisons and reformatories, the separation of inmates according to their willingness and ability to reform, is not receiving more than perfunctory attention.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Let us take it as read.

Mr. Ben: That would apply for the other members, but I am not satisfied myself that the Minister who made that remark, the hon. Minister of Mines, can read.

I have some comments to make about the Minister's term in office as Minister of Reform Institutions, too.

Remember what Kellogg, the reformed character, said about Guelph; he said: "I feel sorry for any young fellow going into Guelph; you can't beat the place. Guelph is the ruination of many men." And it still is!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): But they reform them.

Mr. Ben: They do not reform them. What conceit! What utter, consummate gall for the Minister to say that Guelph reforms anybody when they have 70 per cent who are reconvicted. Oh, what utter gall and consummate conceit.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member was never in there—I do not think he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Ben: Well, at least I—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister was there, and he too knows nothing about it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Is that so? Read the record. I wish I had had the hon. member with me at times during my term of office.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, The Department of Reform Institutions in its failure to emphasize segregation according to the willingness and ability of prisoners to reform, is like someone who adds fuel to a dangerous fire and then asks to be congratulated on the high cost of the fuel. That is what this department is doing.

Mr. Dunbar also said: "The programme of segregation is going very well. We try to keep the 16 to 18-year-olds separate from the 18 to 21 group, and that group separate from the still older ones."

Does this not sound as if a better job of reform was being done 20 years ago in Ontario prisons than is being done today?

In 1946, 20 guards selected from various reformatories and prisons were being trained at Guelph reformatory in a course designed to enable them to conduct physical training among the inmates of juvenile and adult prisoners and reformatories. How much physical training is conducted today daily at Guelph, Millbrook, at Brampton and at all other reformatories under the aegis of this department—especially Millbrook? I would like to know how much physical training they give in Millbrook, Mr. Speaker.

Physical training is no incidental aspect of a properly constituted reform programme. When the body is lethargic the mind is not at its best. Regular exercise, drills of a suitable length and an adequate variety not only help sharpen the wits, but help to improve outlook and morale. I am not talking about the sort of exercise that would put a man with a heart condition in a gravel pit, or the sort that would have prisoners mindlessly transferring piles of rock or snow from one useless location to another, merely to keep them occupied.

This sort of thing is psychological torture in the extreme, it is enough to drive a man mad or reduce him to the level of a drivelling idiot. A system that employs such methods of control has demonstrated its bankruptcy. Such work adds to desperation of imprisoned men. It does not reform them, but leaves them embittered towards society, if not dangerously hostile towards it upon their release.

It was also in 1946 that Mr. Dunbar said that his motto should be "segregation, education and salvation." Mr. Dunbar had the right spirit, but his achievements must be far less substantial today than he expected in his most pessimistic moments. I remind you again that a more appropriate motto for the system today would be "incarceration, intimidation and subjugation." This is no rhetorical trope. It is an apt description of the reformatory system in this province as far as any adult who has the misfortune to be committed to it is concerned.

Mr. Dunbar obviously was sincerely proud of the reforms he was attempting to introduce to the Ontario system and his occasional lapses into euphoria must be excused by us today. They were a measure of his concern with the system. If his hopes and expectations were disappointed, it was not for lack of will and ideas. Mr. Dunbar gave a focus to penal reform that has not been experienced in this province since his time, but he was to be frustrated by events and subsequent Ministers.

Mr. Dunbar said in 1947 that the famed Borstal school of correction in England did not begin to compare with similar institutions in Ontario during his time. He said that he had visited all the institutions "they would show me" during an overseas tour the preceding year and had not seen anything to compete with Guelph, Burwash, Galt, Bowmanville or Cobourg. What an elysium the prison system of Ontario must have been in Mr. Dunbar's day.

Mr. Dunbar was scornful of the system employed in the original Borstal school. He said:

> The main industry was the manufacture of mail bags. Would that seem as if any steps were being taken to re-establish the inmates after their release? Seventy-five per cent of the people I saw there were doing this work. Boys and repeaters were working side by side in another institution making these mail bags.

Compare the system then in effect in the Borstal schools, the system Mr. Dunbar regarded with such contempt, with the system in effect in so many institutions in Ontario today.

Does the manufacture of licence plates do anything more to rehabilitate a man than the manufacture of mail bags? Does the useless, inane and depressing manual labour rehabilitate him? Have we any reason to be proud of a system that so often, and with such damaging long-term consequences, throws together the young criminal and the time-hardened criminal—a system that, in its very outlook and procedures, so often blights our hopes for reform?

A former member of this House once urged the Minister to establish a penal code which would compel civic jails, such as the Don jail, to observe the same standards of accommodation as those institutions controlled by the department. God help us if such a code were enforced today. But what was the Minister's answer? He replied that when the government's long-term programme was completed there would be no such institutions as the Don jail, but in their place would be industrial farms. How long is long-term? Twenty years? Forty years? One hundred years?

Mr. Dunbar, when he introduced this 20-year plan, must have been under the mistaken impression that it was to be completed at the end of 20 years. This government's viewpoint is that that they do not start the programme until the lapse of 20 years. The Don jail is still with us after more than 20 years of Conservative rule, despite the fine spirit of those early years. The hon. member for Etobicoke (Mr. Braithwaite) has called it a deplorable institution. It is a deplorable institution. In the whole range of reform interest and activity, one is forced to ask: What has happened to the early vision in this province? What has happened is the story of what has happened, not merely to The Department of Reform Institutions in 20 years, but to this government.

Let me take you back to 1949 and to a newspaper story in a Toronto newspaper that appeared on April 1 of that year. It began, and note the date—April 1:

> In contrast to heated exchanges which have prevailed in the Legislature recently, the discussion on the estimates of the Reform Institutions department last night developed into a contest among the Opposition members to lavish praise upon Reform Institutions Minister Dunbar and his staff.

Agnes Macphail (CCF, York East) said

she had waited for many years to see something constructive done to reclaim lawbreakers, particularly the younger ones, and thought the department's work on the whole was excellent: "The business of reforming youth has finally been taken out of the hands of military and police personnel and put in the charge of teachers and psychologists—"

note that, Mr. Speaker, "teachers and psychologists."

"—who are using scientific methods in their work."

While not content with Mercer, she welcomed Mr. Dunbar's announcement that this institution would be moved to near Ajax, where there would be plenty of space for the inmates to grow flowers and raise poultry.

Well, how is that plan coming, Mr. Minister?

By the way, after 17 years, Mr. Minister, where are the poultry and the flowers? The grand jury, as I recall, was not strolling through the flowers and among the poultry when it made its last report on Mercer, Mr. Minister. I am quoting again:

The programme on the whole is revolutionary and at last we are on the right track, she said.

Well, so much for her hopes.

There was another member of the House at the time, who joined in the congratulations. He said that it was quite apparent that a new approach is being made to the problem. Another member said, I quote:

I have always looked upon the Minister of Reform Institutions as a hard-boiled individual but now realize he is most humane in his approach to the problems of the unfortunates that come under his care.

Mr. Speaker, it must be superfluous for me to invite you to contrast all of this with the situation today.

The inference of what I have read must be clear to any hon. member of this House. To many, the contrast between the facts and the realities is a little difficult to understand, so sure are they of the hon. Minister's good intention, and so content are they that everything should be left in his hands. I am not questioning the hon. Minister's good intentions, I have already made that clear. What I am questioning is his understanding of the problem and his ability to cope with it.

Although the hon. Minister is terribly cocksure and knowing about this tremendous problem, I believe he does not understand it at all. The hon. Minister's claim to a high-minded approach rests on the tenuous promise that we are making progress in the reform field in this province. I am trying to show the discrepancy between his words and the facts. I am trying to show how disturbingly we are falling behind.

On July 15, 1949, when William E. Hamilton was sworn in as Minister of Reform Institutions, succeeding Mr. Dunbar, the former Prime Minister, Mr. Frost, had this to say about Mr. Dunbar's record. He said that under Mr. Dunbar an entirely new concept of reform had been brought into effect through what was known as the Ontario plan. It was Dunbar, he said, who initiated the programme which would eventually replace the outmoded county jails with industrial farms. Note that, Mr. Speaker: industrial farms, where prisoners could be kept busy and be taught work that would be of use to them upon their discharge.

Mr. Speaker, how eventual is eventually? Are new stone and steel institutions this department's reply to the vision of those years? If the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions today is experiencing some difficulty in persuading the people of Ontario to accept his regional jails plan, should he not question his basic assumptions? Is it possible that they are wrong? Does the Minister believe these institutions are the right answer? Does he really believe they are part of a so-called Ontario plan?

If he does, if he intends to proceed with his plan, and if this government survives long enough to implement it, if any of us survive long enough to see it implemented, then I predict that it will take another generation to undo what the Minister is planning to do today.

But forget for a minute, Mr. Speaker, the big question of whether these regional jails are really desirable in their proposed form. Let us take it for granted, for the sake of debate, that stone and steel institutions really are the answer. When the Minister announced this plan at Sudbury almost three years ago—not at Kingston, as he has told us; that was only a slip of the tongue—he gave the impression that the government was all fired up about this scheme and was off to a flying start. What has happened since?

Well, it was not long before the Minister was quoted as saying that "unless the government offers a greater inducement than at present the proposal will fall through." It sounds like the old story, does it not, Mr.

Speaker? Back to Mother again. And what has the government actually done in three years? It has emerged with two signed agreements. The Minister says that nine of 35 counties have been "looked after," whatever that means. And how much money was spent last year? Not a cent. How much money will be spent this year? Also not a cent.

I raise this again only in illustration of the fulsome remark of the hon. member for Yorkview about "the tremendous progress made by this department over the past year." The hon. member for Downsview has already offered his opinion that "this whole plan of county and regional jails is producing absolutely nothing despite the great fanfare of publicity, numerous newspaper announcements, and big speeches." Well, I believe that time and circumstances will change our opinion about these regional jails. I believe that absolutely nothing for this plan could be the best result.

To return to Mr. Dunbar, virtually the only criticism of his approach—and we are not talking about what was achieved—was that the parole system was inadequate. Is it adequate today? Would the hon. Minister lay all the essential facts before us in one terse report? I know he has touched upon this question already, but would he tell us how effective the parole system of this province is in rehabilitating former prisoners? Would he tell us what proportion of the prisoners under his control are on parole today? Would he tell us, in a single, compact report, what staff and what facilities, and at what expense, are employed in the parole system of this province?

Finally, would he compare the system here, in all respects, with the other and effective systems throughout the world, particularly in Britain and the Scandinavian countries? I am not asking for detailed comparisons with the United States which in this field is as retrograde in many respects as we are in Ontario and Canada.

I would like to see a recapitulation of some of the information already provided to us by the Minister with more satisfactory explanations than he has given so far. Let him turn his research team loose on this subject.

He has told us, for example, if I understand him, that a five-man parole board dealt with 1,764 prospective parolees who appeared before the board in the fiscal year just passed—which by rough calculation means the board dealt with an average of seven prospective parolees a day in a five-day week, just on the question of whether to give or not give parole. If that alone was the job of the parole board, five men would have their hands full doing justice to it—reading detailed and expert reports, interviewing the man, discussing him and carefully assessing his character and his eligibility. Giving no more than an hour to each man, which seems little enough, this means seven straight hours of work daily by these five men on this work alone.

But wait, Mr. Speaker, only three of these men are full time and so three men are doing most of this work. And, if I understand the Minister, 976 of the 1,764 applicants were granted parole. The release of these men would surely mean additional reports on their progress during the year, as well as reports on others on parole.

A work load which was heavy to begin with now appears to be becoming unbearable. The proposed increase in members of the parole board I would suggest is long overdue.

Surely the members of the parole board must be exceptionally well qualified as well as dedicated and energetic men. Fortunately, the hon. Minister was able to find one such man among those who worked in his election campaign; and we can presume that that man at least is qualified, although he does not seem to have any background in this field. But the hon. Minister reassures us, all you require for this job is "good common sense." Dr. Jaffray said that social work training is a vital prerequisite for men employed in this area. But okay, so the hon. Minister just happens to disagree with Dr. Jaffray.

So let us accept his standard. Five men of "good common sense" doing a vital and gruelling job. Boy, it must take a good salary to attract such men! But, no, no; the Minister tells us that four members of the parole board receive only $7,800 to $9,500. That does not seem like enough, however, considering the way they are working and all that common sense. It makes you want to take a closer look at other salaries.

When you do, what do you find? The hon. Minister tells us that the parole board is backstopped by two rehabilitation officers, class 4, who receive $6,900 to $8,200; and 69 rehabilitation officers, the backbone of the system, who receive, in No. 2 category, $4,800 to $5,750; and in No. 1 category, $4,200 to $4,800.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would forgive me if I

ask him does he have much longer to go, because I think he has spoken well over three hours? I do not want to do him the discourtesy of leaving while he is speaking, but if he is going to be much longer I will have to make some arrangements with my office. Is the hon. member going to be much longer? I will be right back.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member for Woodbine points out that "these are hardly better than sweepers' rates"; and I agree with him. And what does the hon. Minister reply? He replies that, "the salaries are under review." This, of course, is the sort of answer this House has been getting and accepting from this Minister for three years, answers that answer nothing at all. Let me give you some examples:

Standards for guards: The hon. Minister admitted that he could not define them but he knew a good man when he saw him.

Vacancies: The Minister says he has seven vacancies for rehabilitation officers right now and has hopefully added another 13 positions in this year's estimates. A member asks how he expects to fill them on these salaries and the Minister replies that he is an optimist.

Staff training programme: A member asks what is being done. The Minister in one short burst says something about a "McMaster certificate course," about courses and seminars conducted by the universities and other agencies and services, about regular conferences and that is all. I think the Minister should break it down for us, he should give us some information. I do not believe he should reply in such an evasive way.

The Minister tries to convey the impression that he is faced with unreasonable malcontents in this House and that I, in particular, am just a bloody nuisance. Why does the Minister not stop this sort of thing? Stop begging the question, stop fobbing us off with statements that he "needs more research," that "it is a matter of study," that "it will of course be investigated by the new advisory committee"—which by the way the Minister tells us has not even been set up yet so he cannot say when it will report.

This government has had 20 years, it has had 20 years for research and study and advice, and it is further behind now than when it started. Frankly, I have no hope whatever that this department as presently constituted will ever come to grips with this real job.

In his reply to other questions, would the hon. Minister also tell us what percentage of the boys and girls in Ontario training schools are mentally deficient and explain what is being done in this regard?

In 1949, 17 per cent of the children admitted to training schools in Ontario were mentally deficient. Last year 37.5 per cent had an IQ below average. The report of The Department of Reform Institutions for that year urges that such schools not be made a dumping ground for boys and girls who properly belonged in other institutions.

One of the churches of the world recently informed its members that for church purposes it would henceforth recognize the age of 12 as the age at which a child could be adjudged a reasonable human being. The age formerly for that church was seven. Yet, in 1965, 19 per cent of the children in training schools were under thirteen.

In 1951, the higher salary schedules for the staffs of the provincial reform institutions were being studied at Queen's Park in acknowledgment of the fact that good salaries are essential if the department is to attract good men. It would be useful to find out just how much higher those salaries are today, taking into account the deflated dollar, the higher cost of living and the other factors which would give a realistic comparison.

We do not want to be told how many times the salaries have been increased in the various ranges since 1951. We want a meaningful comparison. We want it proven to us, if they can, that a creditable improvement has been made in this respect.

Let me put more questions. Fifteen years ago the staff at some institutions was not at full strength. Are we at full strength today? If not, why not?

What is the proper proportion between staff and inmates at the various institutions? It obviously is going to vary depending upon the degree of security the department believes is required.

Did the hon. Minister really believe he was acting in the best long-term interests of the reformatory system in this province when he went before the select committee on youth to plead for a lowering of the educational level for reformatory staff? Or was that an expedient to relieve an embarrassment of insufficient numbers coupled with an unwillingness to spend more money in this field?

Does the hon. Minister believe a 14 per cent increase in his estimates this year is any more than a sop to a public that is becoming increasingly aware of the needs and of the true state of the system? How does the pay at federal institutions compare with the pay

at provincial institutions? Is it still higher than it was 15 years ago?

In 1951, the Deputy Minister, Mr. C. F. Neelands, said that, in provincial reformatories, the proportion of instructors, academic teachers, physical training supervisors and the like, was greater than in federal penitentiaries. The emphasis, he said then, was more on training than on guarding prisoners. What a difference from the situation today.

In 1953, Mr. Coughlan, director of probation services for the department, himself told the Legislature's special committee on reform institutions that Ontario's reformatory system does not reform. "Seventy per cent of the inmates in Ontario institutions become repeaters," he said, and yet probation systems elsewhere were placing 70 per cent of convicted persons on lawabiding paths. "There is no adult probation system to speak of in this province," he said.

Will the hon. Minister who sneered at the statement of the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) when he spoke of a high of 90 per cent in some jurisdictions go for 70 per cent? He knows very well that Mr. Neeland's commentaries about the Ontario system 13 years ago are truer today than ever before. He knows also that the present system punishes the taxpayers. It costs $1,500 a year to maintain an inmate of a reformatory, and $2,000 a year to keep someone in prison, as compared with $250 annually for probation.

In 1951, Colonel Hedley Basher, who succeeded Mr. Neelands as Deputy Minister, optimistically predicted that $24 million would be spent in the next ten years in renovating reform institutions that were then almost filled to capacity. Colonel Basher could not have anticipated the manner in which construction costs have multiplied since. But would the hon. Minister tell us how much has been spent since 1951 in renovating reform institutions, and how full these institutions are today?

About 15 years ago, a Minister of reform institutions, Mr. J. W. Foote, expressed the hope that "we may soon have a probation system which will rehabilitate many offenders without the necessity of their being committed." How many offenders today are being rehabilitated without being committed? The Department of Reform Institutions is strangely silent about this aspect in its annual report and it is silent about the situation in so many areas it would like, for obvious reasons, to keep out of public debate.

Corporal punishment is still another of the distasteful subjects The Department of Reform Institutions would prefer not to talk about. Corporal punishment is still practised in Ontairo institutions, which are hardly leaders of the world in their enlightened approach to penology. In the United States, by comparison, corporal punishment has been banned in all but one of the states, and prisoners are segregated as to punishment. I might say that this statement about corporal punishment being banned in all but one of the states was made by Mr. Foote in 1952, and it is quite conceivable that all the states in America have abolished corporal punishment.

Mr. Foote was another of the Ministers of Reform Institutions in this province who at least provided his department with the sort of admirably articulated leadership necessary if enlightened reforms are to be introduced. One searches in vain through the speeches and statements of the current Minister for at least the kind of words from him that would encourage us to believe he understands the real problems of his department and is trying to do something about them.

What is wrong? Is he paralyzed by the contrast between the brave talk and the miserable record of the past 20 years? Is he convinced that the way to succeed in government is to speak softly and carry a little stick, or no stick at all?

Mr. Foote, during his term, tabled in this Legislature an admittedly generalized concept of a stimulating and progressive programme for the treatment of convicts which included replacing the common jail with the modern industrial farm, expanded academic studies, vocational training and physical drill, employing scientific methods, improving the classification of prisoners, and intensifying, in a systematic way, the effort of personnel to rehabilitate ex-prisoners.

What do we hear from the current Minister about bold new programmes, about improved classification, about improved methods of rehabilitation, about expanding academic studies and vocational training? We hear virtually nothing. And why do we hear nothing? Because the hon. Minister can tell us nothing.

In 1952, following a riot at Guelph reformatory, the former Premier, the hon. Mr. Frost, described Guelph as "one of the models of its kind in North America—a great place where every opportunity for reform is given, a place where a man can learn a wide range of trades as well as having the best facilities for recreation and sport." I wish the present Prime Minister would pay a visit to

Guelph. By the way, when did the hon. Prime Minister last visit Guelph?

In the field of reform, as far as female ex-prisoners are concerned, the Elizabeth Fry society has been doing good work since it was organized here 15 years ago. But it obviously needs more leadership and government support. Replying to the hon. member for Yorkview, the hon. Minister admitted that there was no increase in the estimates for the society and other groups last year but that their supplementary grants were increased. He asked if the hon. member suggested that "we just go out and give money even though they do not ask for it?"

I suggest to the hon. Minister that if these organizations were to be a truly effective arm of the government's rehabilitation system, they would need far more help and support than the government is giving them now. They are doing good work voluntarily, and they certainly deserve our thanks for it, but you will find, if you take the trouble to ask, Mr. Minister, that they would welcome additional support.

The conditions of Ontario jails is an obvious embarrassment to this government but it has no reason to believe that it stifled discussion about them by its bold, and so far empty, talk of a regional system. Fifteen years ago, and then again, 13 years ago, C. F. Neelands, with all of the persuasion he could command, was urging upon the Ontario government as "Ontario's most urgent need" the removal of jail prisoners to regional district farms. Note that, Mr. Speaker, regional district farms; which would give an opportunity for better work conditions and treatment programmes. Well, where are those farms today? We are not going to have farms of the kind urged as Ontario's most urgent need by Mr. Neelands. We are going to build bigger jails. This is this department's prescription for this province: Bigger and better jails.

In 1953, the Legislature's select committee on reform institutions branded the Ontario county jail at Whitby as the worst it had seen, the chief grounds of complaint being the obsolescence of the buildings and the inadequacy of its accommodation. How much has been done in Whitby since, Mr. Speaker? And what about the London jail, the Don jail? Let us recall what the Toronto *Globe and Mail* said editorially at that time. It said:

> Much of what may be said of the Whitby jail has been said many times of the Don jail and of almost all the other county jails in Ontario. The condition of these places is a reflection upon the system of administration. The deficiencies of our jails are well known.

That was in 1953, Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago. The condition of these places is as well and unfavourably known today.

Toward the end of 1953, an article of some length was written in a Toronto newspaper by a gentleman whose name is known to the hon. members of this House. I will give you that man's name in a moment, but let us consider first what he said in that article which was a study of the efforts of a committee called the penal reform for women joint committee, to obtain for women the same slim rights of parole, probation and segregation he described as being "enjoyed" by male inmates.

Five women probation officers were then working in the Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa areas—three of them in Toronto. The committee urged the appointment of another six. It would be of more than incidental interest if the hon. Minister would inform us how many women probation officers work in these three areas today.

The committee noted that more than 60 per cent of the women convicted were first offenders, the most hopeful category from which to select probationers. It stated:

> Many women now sent to jail are there because magistrates or judges hesitate to use probation because of the lack of a supervising officer, other than those who work with the men. Because of the lack of women probation officers, many of these women go to prison. The recommended increase in probation officers is based not only on a possibly increased rehabilitation rate, but on a saving of dollars and cents for the province.

What is the relative cost of imprisonment and probation for female offenders? Is the normal caseload for a probation officer 30, as in 1953? What is the saving to the province?

The committee went on:

> The committee feels that the cell blocks, barred windows, cage doors . . . and workshops of Mercer make a prison, but they are not useful reform measures. A new institution to replace 80-year-old Mercer, planned on the cottage system, with facilities for an enriched programme along academic, vocational and recreational lines, is urged by the committee.

> While admitting that much has been done at Mercer in the way of decorations and furnishings to make the institution more comfortable, the committee believes that classification of prisoners has been unscientifically handled. It recommended employment of a clinical classification team including a general physician, a psychiatrist, a psychologist and a social worker.

I grow weary of pointing up this sort of thing. We still have the old Mercer; we have no cottage system; and Mercer's classification system is little better than it was.

The articles, in its condemning implications, as far as this government was concerned, was written by William Kinmond.

Let me give the House more figures. During 1953, 398 persons thought to be mentally ill were kept in jail waiting mental examination. During 1965, 725 persons were transferred to a mental hospital or other institution. We do not know how many were kept in jail awaiting examination because that statistic is not recorded.

More than 100 years ago, Thomas Haliburton made the statement that things cannot and will not remain as they are. Well, he had never seen The Department of Reform Institutions of this province, which has for too long remained as it was. There has been a seeming paralysis of will in that department, a drying up of imagination, a refusal to face contemporary facts. That department today is formally committed to perpetuating a system acknowledged 20 years ago by the government party's own adherents to be long outmoded and long inadequate to the needs.

Nevertheless, many ideas were being explored in those early years. During 1954, Ontario was exploring the idea of rehabilitating older prisoners by placing them in private homes. In a broadcast at that time, the Minister, Mr. Foote, said that this system had been tried in one United States city where 450 prisoners had been successfully placed in private homes.

What has happened in Ontario since? What has happened to all of the many excellent ideas that were being put forward by reform-minded people in this province in the late 1940's and early 1950's. What has been the reason for the reform department's lack of thrust in the years since? Government intransigence? Lack of public interest? Lack of innovating ideas, initiative or conviction in the department? You are in a position to draw your own conclusions.

In 1954 the *Globe and Mail* gave editorial encouragement to a plan to use labour in reformatories for tree planting and cultivating:

> If nurseries could be attached to reformatories, under the supervision and management of Lands and Forests specialists, there might be a large increase in available tree stock. The opportunity should be followed up. This method would help much.

What happened to that? Nothing, and another good idea bit the dust, as is usual with this particular department.

It was with Colonel Hedley Basher, an exponent of what has been called the "old, punitive, almost purely custodial method of penal reform," that the reform institutions department of this province reverted to a kind of provincial dark age in penal reform. We are still in that dark age today. Dunbar, Foote, Neelands, Wardrope, Virgin, Coughlan, Drew—these were the exponents of modern correctional methods. But they lost their fight in this province and the reactionary element—Basher, Graham, Dougall, Penfold, Frost, the present Prime Minister and the present Minister of Reform Institutions, have prevailed.

"My predecessors made progress in their day," the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions told us on August 24, "and I am making progress in mine."

The change in outlook occurred about the mid-1950's and its effects were soon apparent.

In 1956, the Canadian association of social workers charged the reform institutions department of this province with ineptness, militarism and neglect. It charged that Ontario training schools do not have proper facilities; that Ontario reformatories do not reform; and that the province has no effective rehabilitation system. The Toronto branch president of the association said there were serious defects in the department, and she suggested a thorough investigation by a "competent person or agency." That investigation was never made.

Nevertheless, I must concede that in one area, in one only, the department has shown vigour and imagination and worked to some effective purpose. This is in its training schools programme. It is a commendable programme, in most respects. And it is, as we know, a programme in which the Minister enfolds himself and tries to enfold us, whenever a criticism is made about the great neglected area of adult reform.

In 1957, the *Globe and Mail* charged that it was:

> —difficult to believe that resignations of staff to which the Minister referred are due to external criticism rather than to frustrating conditions within his department.

Of course, now the hon. Minister blames the Opposition critics for resignations.

In 1959, a Toronto *Telegram* series by reporter Val Sears on lashings administered in Ontario reform institutions stirred a storm of public protest.

In 1959, the Fauteux report recommended that the federal government take over all prisoners sentenced to more than a year in jail, and it was expected that sentences between six months and a year would virtually disappear. Today, that report gathers dust because the hon. Minister knows nothing about The Penitentiaries Act. "We tried," says a former Minister of Reform Institutions, who now has another portfolio in this House.

In 1959, the then Minister of Reform Institutions said that the province would set up diagnostic and research centres. The then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Wintermeyer, said an item of $25,000 for rehabilitation was hopelessly inadequate. Well, what do we spend today?

The then Minister said that duplication within his department would be eliminated and then, although little or nothing positive had been achieved, although the Fauteux report remained unimplemented, the public furore died and the department slipped back it into its old way, a way that has had the test of experience and application and a way that has failed.

What has been the record of the department in recent years? In August, 1963, the present hon. Minister was appointed. On March 12, 1964, that Minister stated his department was studying ways and means of aiding the Harold King farm at Keswick.

How was it aided? On March 6, 1964, the Minister announced the appointment of Dr. Taduesz Grygier as director of the new research section of the department. On July 5, 1964, the department announced it would set up its fifth and sixth forestry camps in Dufferin county and the Parry Sound district. On July 8, the Minister said there were no forgotten men held on immigration charges in Ontario jails. On August 20, it was pointed out that the Ontario taxpayer's bill for crime is increasing. It costs more than $2,500 to maintain a prisoner for a year in most of the province's reformatories. Probation costs would be approximately a tenth of that.

On the same date, it was shown that The Department of Reform Institutions had failed to rehabilitate more than 90 per cent of the men in Ontario reformatories once released on probation. This is nothwithstanding the Minister's denial of the statement made here by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). The Minister, as the House will remember, has claimed: "We do everything possible to help them, we have an extremely strong programme at the moment, three per cent of the Budget does not bear any relationship to the problem we have."

Well, I certainly agree with the hon. Minister on that one. Three per cent of the Budget bears virtually no relationship to the problem you have.

On February 12, 1965, the Minister introduced legislation transferring from his department to judges the power to commit a juvenile to training school. On March 12, 1965, the Minister was criticized editorially for suggesting that surprise visits of hon. members of this House to reform institutions be restricted. On April 2, 1965, the hon. Minister stated:

> One sometimes finds junior personnel who have been exposed recently to a formal training programme more familiar with later correctional trends than some of their seniors. This kind of situation creates obvious difficulties.

That was his quote. That, Mr. Speaker, was the understatement of the year.

On April 7, 1965, the hon. Minister said Canada is not going to forge ahead on penal reform until the federal government creates a separate department to handle reform institutions. That is the mother complex again.

On April 7, 1965, the same date, it was charged in this House that there had been deliberate suppression of evidence at an inquest into the death of a prisoner at the Guelph reformatory. On July 13, two inspectors from the department arrived to investigate charges of brutality at Millbrook. On November 1, 1965, The Training Schools Act was proclaimed.

And that, sir, is the record of this department under its present and former Ministers. This is the department that the hon. Minister claimed on August 23 was hiding its light under a bushel until he came along. A department that is "just going ahead and doing its job," a department that is supposed to have "had a year of solid progress"

and a department that claims it has very positive plans.

Mr. Speaker, Ruskin tells us that the great principle of success in every direction of human effort is, "know what you have to do and do it."

"I believe," he said, "that failure is less frequently attributable to either insufficiency of means or impatience of labour than to confused understanding of the thing actually to be done."

Mr. Speaker, the great failing of the reform institutions department of this province is that it does not know what it is doing, With all of the resources that this department can command in the richest province in the nation, the reform institutions department has failed to develop an enlightened and progressive penological programme. Despite the evasions and the self-justifying steam of words that arise from that department it is impossible to conceal that fact.

What I have said here by no means exhausts the long bill of particulars that has been drawn up against this department and this system by many men of competence and goodwill who have studied them. Intellectually and in terms of human dignity, ours is an indefensible system. It should not be beyond our ingenuity to devise a more humanly productive system. The people of this province in the final analysis are the victims of this self-contradictory reformatory system, a system that has no clear-cut sociological goals and one that is at odds with itself.

With the continuing upward spiral in crime and the numbers committed to our reformatories and jails, there has been a downward spiral in our rehabilitative techniques. At some time we must come to grips with the real issues again. I believe there should be a public inquiry into this system. I believe that all of the activities of this system—police, courts, incarceration, reform, rehabilitation—all of them now administered by a weird, tripartite setup which, if it ever had succeeded could be put down as nothing short of miraculous, should be co-ordinated under one entirely new department, a department whose main goal would be that of reform.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will forgive me, I know he would not want me to keep the Elizabeth Fry society waiting. I have listened with a great deal of interest. I will read the balance in *Hansard*. I hope he will forgive me for leaving.

Mr. Ben: I have a copy for the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will take a week off some time and read it.

Mr. Ben: The next part does not deal so much with your department.

An hon. member: Is this part two?

Mr. Ben: The other evening, Mr. Speaker, I was indelicate enough to refer to a debate in this House as clap-trap. But it was clap-trap, Mr. Speaker. This evening I would like to address this House on something that is not clap-trap, a proposal I have already made for the merger of The Department of Reform Institutions and The Department of the Attorney General. I would ask you to bear with me if at times I seem to wander during these remarks, but there are things I have been wanting to say for a long time and all of them relate to this general matter of crime in our society.

This is an enormous subject and it is beyond my capacity to do justice to it. What I hope to do is to discuss some of the interrelated aspects of crime, some of the hard facts of crime and consider, at least in part, the success we are having in Ontario in coping with it.

The most appropriate, in fact, the only place where we can truly study crime is in our penal institutions. Certainly we can observe its ravages in society. Every day's newspaper brings us fresh evidence of crime, but to understand crime we have to understand the criminal. And the only opportunity we have to understand the criminal is when we have him under control.

I have spoken many times about what I believe has been our failure to use this opportunity in Ontario. It is a failure amply demonstrated by the condition of our penal institutions and our statistics on recidivism. But it is part of a larger failure, or rather, one more failure in a succession of failures. And these failures are seen, step by step, in almost any inveterate offender's case history of incarceration and crime.

At present in Ontario we deal with crime and the criminal in an extremely disjointed way. I believe this is one reason why we are meeting with so little success. Our police, who are under the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), investigate the crime and apprehend the criminal. Our courts, which are also supervised by The Department of the Attorney General, try him. He is then handed over to another government agency, The De-

partment of Reform Institutions, which has the duty, not of vengefully punishing the criminal, but of re-educating him and equipping him for a useful role in life.

I have spoken before, and will again, of the failure of The Department of Reform Institutions to meet this overriding challenge. But that is not my major concern at this time. What does concern me is the fatal flaw in the concept of a system which so neatly separates punishment from crime.

However inconvenient it may be in terms of the mechanics of administration I believe that separation is a serious mistake. Its virtual effect is to deprive three logically related agencies of the mutually reinforcing relationship necessary if they are to do their job. It is, in effect, a fatally disabling break in the chain.

I believe we have tried this system long enough with poor results and that logic now dictates a change. What I am suggesting is a sweeping change in our provincial administration of justice. I propose that we abolish The Department of Reform Institutions as it is known today and establish a new department of justice responsible for the investigation of offences, the apprehension and trial of the accused, the preparation of presentence reports, the sentencing and confinement of the accused and all attempts at reformation and rehabilitation.

The effect of this would be to merge the present Department of Reform Institutions and The Department of the Attorney General in a new portfolio under a single Minister with comprehensive authority and unified control.

There is nothing radical in this proposal. A persuasive precedent has been set by Ottawa where The Department of Justice is responsible not only for legislation but for the activities of the RCMP, the penitentiary service, the national parole board and the appointment of judges to our superior courts.

The object of such a change is a very simple and effective one, the object of co-ordination. Such a change would give a single, unified direction to the entire system and permit the meshing of its various parts. Admittedly this would make a tough portfolio but it does not follow that it must be an unwieldy one. The secret of success, as with any tough and worthwhile job, is to find the right man or men. I am sure this government would be the last to admit that it has not got the right man or men.

As a lawyer in the courts over the past few years I have been concerned with the administration of justice in this province. I have asked myself: Are the magistrates in Ontario really required to have anything more than the right political background for the job? After they are appointed are they given continuing direction from The Attorney General's Department or The Department of Reform Institutions about the manner in which they are performing that job?

Are they taken, for example, on regular tours of the jails and reform institutions so that they may get a better idea of the nature of the places where the guilty will serve their terms? Are they aware of the importance of presentence reports; and how many of them insist upon receiving them before they sentence a convicted man? Has the government commenced training magistrates to staff special courts for juveniles? Should such courts be established, as recommended to the select committee on youth? Do custodial officers in the institutions receive copies of the presentence reports to equip them to understand the men in their care? Do the instructors in the institution study these reports so that they may be knowledgeable in their efforts to reform?

How many prisoners who require psychiatric or pyschological treatment are given the treatment they need? When a prisoner is considered for parole, does the parole board consult the police who investigated the prisoner's offence? Are the views of the convicting magistrate sought, or the views of the worker who prepared the presentence report?

In matters of parole, are there discussions with the prison psychologist or with social workers? Does the parole board obtain a prerelease report to determine whether the surroundings into which the prisoner will be released will be conducive to his rehabilitation, or is there a good chance that he is being returned to a life of crime? I have learned the answers to most of these questions, and they place our system in an extremely unfavourable light.

Consider the system. The police who make the investigation and apprehend the accused are employed by the local municipality or the provincial government, and their efforts are often wildly unco-ordinated, to say the least. It is a scandal that the magistrates, who are appointed by the hon. Attorney General, frequently have no qualifications for office and no claim to the appointment—other than the claim of their affiliation with the party of this government. They are given virtually no instructions or

direction. Few have seen the insides of many of our institutions and few have any idea whatever of what the so-called Ontario plan involves.

What is the result? We get a system operating without coherence and without direction, in an appalling vacuum of ideas. Few of the magistrates ask for presentence reports —ask any court reporter. And if any of them discuss special cases with the savants of The Department of Reform Institutions, it is one of the best-kept secrets of this age. Because few presentence reports are prepared, few, if any, are seen by the custodial staff at the institutions. All these people have to guide them is the charge sheet. One might as well hand them a grocery list.

It is obvious that, if a prisoner had previously been on probation, there should be a probation officer's report. This gives you the sort of information you must have if you are going to make intelligent judgments about him. Are such reports ever sent to the institutions? A probation officer informs me that it was his practice to send reports, on juveniles who had broken probation, to the institution concerned; but he stopped doing it when he learned they were never read.

This is the so-called Reform Institutions Department. Society is not well served by this department when it overlooks or slights such all important aspects of reform. This is why a new approach and a new system of administration is so desperately needed in this field. Such a change is a first step towards the abolition of prisons, as we know them today, and the replacement of them by other institutions of the type visualized in the original, and much misunderstood, Ontario plan.

But there is another and deeper aspect of this matter of crime in our society. This relates to the morale of society itself. I have tried to make this point before, and I am afraid I am not making it very well because I seem to have some difficulty in making myself understood. Yet it seems simple and straightforward. As far as the criminal is concerned, I believe that to deal with him we must try to understand the forces that make him, if we are to get to the root causes of crime.

Many far more qualified than I have tried to determine these causes, and there is a very clear agreement in the results of all such research. The causes of crime, putting aside such matters of perversion, which are better understood and dealt with by psychiatrists, include such things as lack of education, lack of a wholesome home life, bad influences, subnormal intelligence, and lack of guidance. All of these represent a staggering problem to society today. But if this problem does not receive greater attention from government now it will be even more baffling at some future time.

What is the background to this great problem? Maybe the reason I am having trouble making myself understood is that I sound like a tedious moralizer whenever I strike this strain. But I believe that our young people are confused because of lack of leadership from their elders, and when we look for the effects of this lack of leadership we can find it, at a glance, among the young.

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to join the members of the House in any inspirational crusade on behalf of public morality, but I sometimes think we are so preoccupied with so-called practical affairs that we are letting the fight for ideas and ideals be lost by default. It seems to me that a more sedate age of 60 or even 30 years ago raised some public men who were unafraid to give public leadership in the realm of ideas. Such leadership is even more important today.

We are all aware of the great social revolution taking place in our own country and throughout the world, and we know that amid the pressures of that revolution we are being confronted with what appears to be a decline in our finest standards. Perhaps this —to mention the one aspect I am concerned with here—has something to do with our rising incidence of crime.

This is an accelerated age. Each new generation, a philosopher warns us, is a generation of savages who have to be educated to the civilized life. What are we doing to provide standards for our youth? Are we demonstrating the value of our standards for these young people, or are they providing us with theirs?

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that we are being challenged in the most fundamental ways and too often these challenges are not meeting an intelligent response. Half the population of this country is under 25 years of age. One-third, the paper reported today, is under the age of 16. And these half-educated young people, many of them so naive and so cocksure, are having a profoundly shaping influence on our customs, our attitudes and our way of life.

Their crude tastes have already largely determined the content of our radio and television. Their every whim is frantically catered to by advertisers. Their new-wave permis-

siveness and their flaunted promiscuity are pandered to by sophomoric columnists and commentators, who know a bandwagon when they see one, and who have never really grown up themselves. And we know what sort of treatment is accorded any discussion of public morality and ethics by the more adult segment of the population; it is dismissed by these young people as bombast or puritanism, or worse. We are told, with no mincing of words, that our standards are primitive and that they are the heralds of the new age.

Should this bother us a little bit, or should we accept it with the quietism of the sage? I think it should bother us. It seems to me that too many of us have lost our way, and our will, and our sense of purpose. Where in this country are the voices calling for more work and more sacrifice, instead of for more vacuous recreation and entertainment and more money and security and comfort? Where is the leadership, the inspiration, the real intellectual excitement?

We are going through the most revolutionary period in the history of mankind and the pressures of that revolution are being felt at every level of public and private life, on the farm, in the factory, in the home, in the office, in the medical laboratory, in the field of communications, in international relations, and in domestic affairs. How are we responding to these challenges? What is the level of public debate?

Mr. Speaker, forgive me if I raise a prim finger and tut-tut a little bit about one or two of our recent debates. In one of them, we, in this most underpopulated of countries, talked about the need for birth control—not about the undoubted right of anyone who accepts it to practise birth control, but of the great flowering of social advantages in this country from the widespread practice of birth control, particularly among the unmarried young.

One party in this House, sir, expressed exuberance about the prospect of a pill in every pocket; and in almost the same breath grave concern about the high infant mortality rate and the high incidence of venereal disease. What is the logic? Where is the principle?

The same party in another place wanted South Africa thrown out of the Commonwealth because of its treatment of Negroes. It now wants Rhodesia kept in the Commonwealth, by force of arms if necessary, for the same reason. Where is the principle there?

Look at the larger picture. It will cost $234,500 for the Metro government to run the computer that controls the traffic lights, about $100,000 more than the city will spend on its mental health programme. Where is our sense of proportion?

The United States government is spending $1 billion on new educational programmes for deprived and handicapped children, Canada will spend nothing. Where is our sense of common humanity?

In the old people's homes in Metro we will spend more for tobacco and haircuts than for reading matter. We are helping to foster senility in these places, not retard it. You can chronicle this sort of stuff indefinitely; there are too many such vignettes of contemporary life.

A woman tenant protesting that a Negro teacher was not the sort of person who should be admitted into the apartment building in which she lived was charged and convicted a few weeks later of keeping a bawdy house in her own apartment.

The alcoholism and research foundation refuses to assist the government with its views about alcoholism and drug addiction and youth because it does not want to enter into the realm of politics.

A leader of a party in this House advocates what is tantamount to anarchy in decrying the use of injunctions in labour disputes.

Now only an idiot would suggest that such facts as these are sufficient, in themselves, to suggest a decline in the standards of our politics or in the moral quality of our public life. But they do convey an impression of a weird set of standards and a kind of stultifying mediocrity which a direct acquaintance with our politics does little to offset.

What many vignettes suggest to me is that we are not giving sufficient leadership to our young people. Too many of them grow up in an ugly jungle of concrete and clapboard, jukeboxes and junk, promiscuity and prophylactics; too many of them are barren of incentive and inspiration and ideas.

And where should they look for leadership if not to those who lead? Who else have the duty of expressing our deeply rooted convictions and beliefs in the public sphere? Many people are properly cynical about today's politics. There are politicians who are splendid exemplars of our public life; but too many have lost every claim on public confidence and respect.

All of this suggests that the temper of society as a whole has a direct bearing on the rising incidence of crime. When we consider the penal institutions we have to consider the adult offender, the juvenile offender, the social environment and our own roles here.

As for the juvenile offender—the term "youthful offender" is becoming a popular substitute—I believe we must do something to remedy the glaring failures in our correctional system.

Ontario figures on juvenile delinquency are appalling. Of the juvenile recidivists alone in Ontario last year 586 were second offenders, 366 of whom had received suspended sentences on their first appearance. Each of these 366 youths were on probation when they relapsed into crime.

Why? You cannot blame the probation officers and you cannot blame the director. They do their job as well as they can, but there are not enough of them to do the job. The obvious answer for The Department of Reform Institutions is to give this department the men it needs.

Does anyone still doubt that they need more staff? Consider the fact that there were 7,036 offenders discharged on expiration of sentence, 374 released by the national parole board—that meant they had sentences of longer than six months—985 released by the Ontario parole board. The job of rehabilitating all of these fledging criminals fell to the department's rehabilitation officers, a total of 58 men.

Now, Mr. Speaker, most of the hon. members of this House know what a bar graph is. Well, the bar graph for juvenile offenders for 1964 looks much the same as that for 1965, it is an ascending scale, in fact it is quite a stairway. Under the age of seven there are still about 100. When you hit 15 there are well over 2,100. There were less juveniles charged in 1965 than there were in 1964, and yet there were more juvenile offences committed and there were also more juveniles committing offences.

We have got to look into this juvenile situation. Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Metropolitan Toronto police department interviewed 9,537 juveniles for violation of The Juvenile Delinquents Act? Although this is beside the fact, boys are worse than girls; 8,356 were males and 1,181 were females. The interesting thing is what comes next. Only 3,750 of that 9,537 were referred to juvenile courts. It seems that 5,769 of these were cautioned and released to parents, while 18 were referred to other agencies. The rate of recidivism among these juveniles is 43.6 per cent.

Let us break it down. The offender with a previous offence but no court referral amounted to 1,048. Offenders with a previous court appearance, 2,507. Repeaters on probation, 515. Juveniles who were interrogated but no offence committed, 3,232.

The Toronto metropolitan police made 4,331 inspections which they call supervision of places where youth congregates; and gentlemen, would you believe it that shopping centres, of all places, took the gold star. Twenty-five per cent of all the inspections went to shopping centres. If you want the exact figures, that is 1,479. Dance halls, contrary to popular belief, only demanded 68 inspections. Parks and beaches, of course, because of their expanse, were second only to shopping centres, although I still have to see a shopping centre that is as Cherry Beach used to be. I presume that there are more of them perhaps.

Swimming pools only demanded 35 inspections. The poolroom, that den of iniquity and at once laboratory of physics and fistics, took 308. Bowling alleys ran at a pretty close second, at 238 inspections.

The most popular pastime of our youth today seems to be petty thievery. They also enjoy causing disturbances, it would seem. At any rate, there were 1,258 who committed theft under $50. Then we had 899 who were picked up for shoplifting and 913 who were simply having a good time and got arrested for causing a disturbance.

Wilful damage is also away up there at 761. Offences against The Child Welfare Act amount to 836, but these are a little too broad to pin down.

Apparently our children need some basic training in honesty. Should we raise the minimum age for juveniles to 18 years? Should we demand parental responsibility? Should we sitting here, most of us parents, face up to our responsibility in this regard?

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, when you look around you, you think it would appear that our children are nothing more than chattels. I have four kids, I have four cows, I have three mortgages. What else do you have? We tend to think of them only as possessions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a far-ranging plan must be considered for our youth. If this province can afford to spend over $24 million on reform institutions to belatedly handle the effects of what it has neglected, why can-

not we, who are responsible for the allocation of tax moneys, provide the citizen with a better and more secure investment for his tax dollar? We do not—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the hon. member adjourn the debate?

Mr. Ben moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor to come into the chamber to give Royal assent to certain bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Assistant Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 19, An Act to repeal The Stallions Act.

Bill 24, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Bill 36, An Act to amend The Telephone Act.

Bill 46, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Bill 48, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Bill 61, An Act to establish The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Bill 62, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Bill 63, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Bill 64, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Bill 80, An Act to amend The National Radio Observatory Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 81, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill 87, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Bill 89, An Act respecting regional development councils.

Bill 90, An Act to repeal The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 91, An Act to incorporate the Ontario development corporation.

Bill 93, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Bill 95, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Bill 96, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Bill 98, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill 100, An Act to establish and provide for the duties of a consumer protection bureau.

Bill 102, An Act to provide for the establishment of the St. Clair parkway commission.

Bill 103, An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Bill 104, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Bill 107, An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act.

Bill 108, An Act to amend The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act.

Bill 109, An Act to amend The Jails Act.

Bill 110, An Act to amend The Industrial Farms Act.

Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the township of North York.

To these Acts the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the consideration of the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 o'clock. p.m.

No. 114



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 19, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 19, 1966

First report, standing committee on health and welfare, Mrs. Pritchard 3653

Fifth report, standing committee on legal bills and labour, Mr. Bales 3655

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading 3655

Tabling report re training for correctional officers, Mr. Grossman 3656

Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko 3656

Introducing members of the Indian advisory committee, Mr. Rowntree 3656

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 3657

On notice of motion No. 26, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Welch, Mr. Spence 3690

Recess, 6 o'clock 3701

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, South Plympton public school, Wyoming, and St. Clement's private school, Toronto; in the west gallery, Fonthill public school, Fonthill, and Waterloo-Oxford district high school, Baden.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre), from the standing committee on health and welfare presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill 53, An Act to amend The Public Health Act;

Bill 79, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act;

Bill 84, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act;

Bill 85, An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 45, An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of nursing homes.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a matter that was dealt with somewhat in the committee on health and welfare this morning and that is the alleged critical situation at the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton. The question was raised by the hon. member for Wentworth, who read to the committee the grand jury report regarding the Ontario Hospital—

Mr. Speaker: Order! May I ask the member if this particular matter to which he is referring was referred to the committee? Was it discussed in the committee?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: But was it referred to the committee? I see the matter was not referred to the committee by the House, but the member referred the matter to the committee, is that it?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I think if you will give me just two or three minutes the point will be made that many members, including myself, and citizens of Hamilton, were under the impression that the committee was to deal with the subject of the hospital in Hamilton, and when we met this morning we found that it was not the case. The subject was dealt with briefly—

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We will have the point of order until I ascertain a little more knowledge of the member's point.

Mrs. Pritchard: Mr. Speaker, I explained this at the meeting this morning. It was my mistake that it was at the committee. I had no power and nothing can be referred to the committee that is not presented from this Legislature, but I had felt in view of the publicity received something should be discussed. It was not referred to the committee at all.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): May I make a comment on the point of order, Mr. Speaker? It is certainly new to learn that no matter can be dealt with by a standing committee unless it has been specifically referred by the House. All of these committees have general terms of reference; they have no written terms of reference and one can deduce their terms of reference only from their titles. This one is the committee, I think, on health, welfare and education.

Mr. Gisborn: Health and welfare!

Mr. Bryden: Health and welfare! Committees have frequently looked into matters arising in the general areas to which they

have reference. This has certainly happened in the past and it is entirely novel if it is now to be held that nothing can be even looked at by a committee unless it is specifically referred by the House. That would be a complete departure from established procedure.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, just to finish my point, that the matter was raised in the committee this morning, and it was dealt with. One of the members apparently does not feel it was dealt with satisfactorily. It would seem to me proper that on the motion to adopt the committee's report he should be allowed to make some reference to what he considers inadequate operation of the committee in what was before it this morning.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the member out. However, I think it is a matter for the chairman and the committee to settle.

Mrs. Pritchard: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member who wants to speak is not a member of the committee.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It does not make any difference.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the reports of committees come to the House so that members who are not on the committee can know what is going on in committee and I raised the question with the intention of moving an amendment to the report in relation to the action of the committee.

The question regarding the Ontario Hospital was raised in committee this morning by the hon. member for Wentworth, who read to the committee the grand jury report regarding the Ontario Hospital at Hamilton. In my opinion the subject received short shrift, because the chairman, the hon. member for Hamilton Centre—as she has indicated—declared she had no authority to bring the subject before the committee. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 3, during the estimates of The Department of Health, I read to the House an article from the Hamilton *Spectator* which alleged that the administrative situation at the Hamilton hospital was critical.

In view of this, and subsequent press statements, the hon. member for Hamilton Centre, who is the chairman of the standing committee on health and welfare, stated to the press that she would bring the matter before the standing committee on health and welfare, and just to emphasize it, Mr. Speaker, she said on May 5 that the situation must receive a full airing.

On the following day she said, and I quote:

> That she would meet later today with Health Minister Matthew Dymond to determine whether members of the hospital staff would be asked to appear before the committee. "Now this has to be arranged carefully and properly"—

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a special meeting of the committee on health and welfare should be authorized by this House to clarify expeditiously the situation at the Ontario Hospital at Hamilton, with the Hamilton staff and any interested persons being invited to make representations.

I invite the members of the committee and of the House to read my statement regarding the press article in *Hansard*, May 3, and I would refer them to the quotes from the authoritative sources. One statement is by Mr. Leonard Mittley, the chaplain for the last two years at the hospital, that the deterioration in the staff situation has put the doctors' morale at rock bottom, and further, I quote, that "isolated rumours of brutality and occasional ones of cruel disciplining by attendants who should not be doing this job." I think this gives reason for the desire of the hon. member for Hamilton Centre to have the question heard.

Again, specifically, Dr. Henderson, the executive director of the mental health division was quoted as saying: "Naturally we are very concerned with the situation that has developed in Hamilton."

Then again, Dr. Buck, the provincial director of Ontario Hospitals, admits that the infirmary is not up to standard, and it is not fair to expect part-time and semi-retired doctors to run it. I think that gives reason for consideration of a meeting of this committee to thoroughly air the situation in the hospital at Hamilton.

Again, Eric Sabourin, branch president of the civil service association is quoted as saying: "There are isolated incidents in which attendants who lost their temper under trying conditions were using unnecessary force. These specific reasons, among many, are enough to justify the committee looking thoroughly into the situation."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would have expected—and I do not blame the hon. member for Hamilton Centre, the chairman of the committee, for being enthusiastic about the possibility of having the problem aired thor-

oughly in the committee—I would have expected she would have asked in her report to have the committee deal with it.

Mr. Speaker: Now that I understand the member's position on this matter, I have given him the opportunity to explain it in the House and this report has been reported to the House. But I am still of the opinion that it is up to the chairman of the committee and its members to determine if they want to discuss this in their standing committee. However, if the House has not referred the matter to the standing committee, it is not reported. It is up to the chairman and the committee to decide among themselves if they wish to have a discussion only. I do not think it has anything to do with an amendment to this report and therefore, I would inform the member that I will not accept any amendment to the report at this time.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, in all deference, sir, your instructions are contrary to what we have received from the chairman that she has no authority to bring—

Mr. Speaker: I find that an amendment at this time to the report would be out of order, because the matter was not referred to the committee by the House, nor did the committee take up this matter. Apparently it was not referred to it and they themselves did not ask for it, and I cannot see where an amendment would be in order. If I am wrong in this matter, I will inform the member to that effect at a later date.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, may I put the amendment so that you are fully aware of what the amendment—

Mr. Speaker: No, I would say that the amendment would be out of order. I anticipate that the amendment is out of order before the member gives it.

Mr. Gisborn: Would the Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I will look at the amendment, if the member will give it to me later.

Mr. Bryden: Can he not still move an amendment even if you then rule it out of order, Mr. Speaker? Can the hon. member not make his motion and you can make your ruling on it when you have the opportunity? It seems to me rather unusual to rule out something you have not seen.

Mr. Speaker: I anticipate what the amendment will be and, believing it to be out of order, I do not think that the member should give it at this time.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if your anticipated ruling—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I declare the matter closed.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills), from the standing committee on legal bills and labour, presented the committee's fifth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 94, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 99, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to provide for the establishment of uniform standards of quality, grading and manufacture of tires sold for motor vehicles and for safe use.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day: On Wednesday, February 23, during the presentation of the estimates of my department, the hon. member for Bracondale said:

> Mr. Chairman, allow me to read to you the complete schedule of training provided for new correctional officers as outlined in the department's own directive.

After which, the hon. member proceeded to read an outline of the basic training course. I rose on a point of order and stated:

> The hon. member is entirely wrong. That is the introductory staff training. There is further training and I will have that in my answer for him tomorrow. But just to correct the record here, he made the statement that that is the total staff training. The research of the hon. member has failed him there.

The next day, February 24, still during the debate on my estimates, I informed this House as follows:

> I am very pleased the hon. member also raised some questions about the training, and I told the hon. member yesterday that what he was reading was in fact only the introductory training, and I think he said that if I could point out to him that this was only a small aspect of their training he would apologize.
>
> I have here quite a lengthy list of the complete training. I will not trouble the House with it at this time; if they would like it, when we get to the staff training in the estimates, I will be glad to read it to them, but the introductory training which the hon. member referred to the other day is only a very small proportion of the training undertaken by our staff.

However, when we reached the vote in the estimates, where this matter would have been appropriately dealt with, the hon. member undoubtedly forgot to raise the question and I must admit that while it was among the vast array of material on my desk, I also overlooked it.

On May 13, the hon. member for Bracondale again made reference to the staff training course and criticized me for not having provided this information. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table in this House at this time, a summary of our five-week staff training course for correctional officers, which is in addition to the basic training referred to earlier.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the report of the board of governors of the University of Toronto for the year ended June 30, 1965.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which was directed to the hon. Prime Minister, but the House leader is a congenial person and I am sure that he will try to answer it: Is the hon. Prime Minister aware that the hon. member for Halton was quoted as saying that a provincial election is a "sure thing" next year, "probably in September," when he was speaking to a meeting in Oakville?

If so, would the House leader inform the House whether the hon. member was speaking on behalf of the hon. Prime Minister when he made the remark?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): The answer to the question is "no." I can only comment that the hon. member for Halton no doubt made the statement, if he in fact did so, in the same spirit that the hon. leader of the Opposition speculated in a similar fashion yesterday.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Unfortunately, the press report left out the words, "in my humble opinion."

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, if I might take the attention of the House for a moment, I would like to refer to some guests who are with us in the Legislature today.

In 1955, voting privileges were extended by the province to Ontario Indians. This made them eligible for a wide variety of provincial services and programmes in the same manner as these are available to other citizens. In subsequent years a number of provincial Acts and regulations have been amended to include Indians, band councils and reserves. Credit for these progressive changes is due in a large part to the work of a small Indian advisory committee appointed in 1955 under the Minister of Public Welfare.

At this time plans are underway for large-scale development programmes designed to bring increased opportunities to Indians and to strengthen the reserve system so it will be on a par with other communities. In doing this, Indians will not only be consulted, but they are to have a large part in the formation of programmes and the manner in which they are carried out.

With this in mind, it was decided to reconstitute the original Indian advisory committee, increase its membership and redetermine its terms of reference. The committee is now assembled for this purpose.

In the Speaker's gallery today, we have the continuing chairman of the Indian advisory committee, Mr. Elliott Moses, of the Six Nations reserve; Mr. Lorenzo Big Canoe, vice-chairman of the Georgina Isle reserve; Chief Flora Tabobadung, Parry Isle reserve; Mr. Melvin Hill of the Tyendinaga reserve; Chief Wilmer Nadjiwan, Cape Croker reserve; Chief William Meawasige, Serpent river reserve; Mr. Ralph Bruyere, Couchiching reserve; Chief Fred Greene, Shoal lake reserve; and Chief Thomas Archibald of the New Post band of Moosonee.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members of the House would wish to extend a welcome to the gentlemen who are with us today and

to wish them continued success in their meetings.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. E. Johnston in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*continued*)

On vote 401:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, with regard to item 5 in vote 401, there are two of these grants which I would like to raise, the first one rather briefly.

I was interested to learn recently of this project of an economic atlas for Ontario. As I understand it, originally it was going to be something of an academic project and then the concept was broadened to involve a somewhat more utilitarian purpose so that it could become a research tool for those engaged in the day-to-day studies of market evaluation, industrial location and planning problems in Ontario.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister two questions. I notice that this year we have a grant of $7,000. What exactly, in the businesslike, utilitarian way the Minister approaches problems, does he anticipate will be the value and use of this atlas out in the workaday industrial world? Secondly, when does he expect that it will be available?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Is it correctly named in the estimates?

Hon S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Yes, it is. The atlas, of course, was an inheritance from the former Minister. It was started some time ago.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): I cannot hear you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Turn your hearing aid up.

The atlas was inherited from the former Minister and it is to be completed, as I think we mentioned earlier, this year. For the past three years the Ontario government has provided financial assistance to the geography department of the University of Toronto to help underwrite the cost of research involved in preparing an Ontario economic atlas. The research work for this project, which has been done mainly by the undergraduate and graduate students of the University of Toronto, has been one of the most comprehensive attempts ever undertaken to explore and analyze the geographic patterns of economic activity in this province.

Some of the reasearch has already been of use to the provincial government departments and when the project is completed, and we say towards the end of this year, it should be a valuable reference in economic and geographic classrooms, in government departments and libraries, for market researchers, other businesses, and the general public.

The $7,000 for research in 1966 and 1967 is going to be the final instalment in a series of Ontario government grants totalling $28,000 to complete this. In addition, assistance was given in the hiring of summer personnel in 1965, to get it completed, and negotiations are now underway regarding the publishing of the arrangement. The ten sections of the atlas are entitled: aggregate economy; population; manufacturing; metallic minerals; construction; recreation; agriculture; administration; wholesale and consumer trade; transportation and communication; and, of course, the editor of the atlas is Professor William Dean of the department of geography, University of Toronto.

Now, this, I think, is a full and detailed explanation of what it is going to be. When it is available this year I am sure it is going to be of considerable help not only to the government of Ontario, but to those in industry who would like to make use of it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I take it we are discussing the estimates in vote 401 and we are using the figures taken in 1964-65 as the basis for our arguments in discussing these estimates. We are taking the projection for 1966-67 and so we have no record of what is being spent in 1965-66. Is this factual, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: What do you want to know?

Mr. Sargent: Well, that is the point. What do we want to know? We have no idea what has been spent in 1965-66. We are taking matters of spending millions of dollars that you spent two years ago, and we do not know what you spent last year. You are asking us to base our estimates on next year's spending and I want to say that it is no secret in this House, I believe, that in the Opposition we have the greatest regard for the hon. Minister and his ability to do

a job, but we think he is in the wrong slot here. There is no secret about this whole department.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Where would you suggest I go?

Mr. Sargent: We should never have the department in the first place. You are taking millions of dollars to project the image of this party. You have got your hands into the public till, as it were, and you are using this money to build an image for the party. There is no real reason for the existence of this department at all.

Now, here we have an amount on this vote of half a million dollars more—on 401—than you had in 1964-65. You have a grant of $760,000 to the Ontario research foundation. Amounts are to be paid out at the discretion of the Minister, and regardless of how able that hon. Minister is, I suggest to this House that this is a ticket to buy votes any place in Ontario that the party sees it expeditious to do so.

Now, we have in the supplementary grants, Mr. Chairman, an amount of $3.25 million granted to the Ontario research foundation, which apparently is actual now. It has been spent, has it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was discussed in last year's budget. It is not in this year's budget.

Mr. Sargent: I did not hear that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was discussed in last year's budget, it is not in this year's budget. That was spent last year, and was answered for in the House the same time last year.

Mr. Sargent: We have a supplementary in this year's budget.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right, but I say it was discussed in last year's budget.

Mr. Sargent: So you have already spent the money and you are asking us to approve it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was approved. It was approved in the supplementary budget that the hon. Provincial Treasurer presented after the estimates, or during the estimates last year.

Mr. Sargent: Well, no matter how you look at it, Mr. Chairman, and hon. members of the House, this is a lesson in futility, to ask 106 normally intelligent people to discuss things that have already happened, that we have no control over. We are just going through the motions of democracy to say: "Well, we have discussed them, but nothing is going to happen anyway."

Now, a thing that bothers me as a taxpayer is an item here someplace in this vote, $24,000 for the economic council of women.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is not in this vote. Would you stick to the vote and I will try to answer your questions?

Mr. Chairman: Order. May I inform the member that the member for York South is speaking on item 5? Let us try to keep a little order here. Let us stick to item 5, following which, then we will go on the other items.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I deem it my right to speak on vote 401.

Mr. Chairman: The fact is the member for York South has not finished. Would you care to let him carry on?

Mr. Sargent: Would you wish to finish that vote?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may just explain, and perhaps I can explain it through you to the hon. member for Grey North. As I understand it, we have completed 401, item 1, number 2, number 3, number 4. We are now on item 5, grants either to the University of Toronto for a geographical atlas, to the regional development association, or to the association internationale des etudiants en sciences economiques et commerciales.

Now, I have dealt with the first one, I have no intention of dealing with the third one, because I have nothing to add, but I have a great deal I would like to say on the second one, and if we are on 401-5, maybe I can have the floor back, because I think the hon. member was not talking about anything on 401-5.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr Chairman, may I ask a question? May we deal with the university grant for the preparation of the map?

Mr. MacDonald: If you are on the atlas, fine; let us be orderly.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you. I would like to get some clarification from the hon. Minister if I could, Mr. Chairman. Did he say that this atlas was going to be a comprehensive study throughout the province of

Ontario? And it would include, I presume, such things as population growth and agriculture, would it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is what a geographic atlas is and I am not an authority on an atlas. If that is what it is, it will incorporate all those facets that we would like to see, that it would be available to set up information in our own statistical department that we will talk about a little later on.

In other words, it will be a full inventory of the things that people would like to know about Ontario—its people, its population, its input, its output, all the things that I think the economists would like to have in order to guide the economy. And I might say other provinces have the same thing.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. It would include such things as population growth, agriculture, am I right?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would think so.

Mr. Thompson: And this would be a completely comprehensive study?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: Then may I ask, through you, Mr. Chairman, what exercise in futility the Lake Erie regional development association must be pursuing? Because in talking to them, one of the projects which they pride themselves on doing—and I understand there is a close co-ordination with your department—one of the projects which they pride themselves on is the encouragement of a compilation of an atlas of an area. The work is being done by the University of Western Ontario, through its geographic department. It consists of 43 maps, covering such topics as population growth, agriculture, power, and so on, and it is going to be used in elementary schools.

I think, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that this indicates the thing that we are really concerned about and that is one of duplication by government and, secondly, the fact that as we come to the next vote this surely symbolizes completely the fact that these poor regional development associations are going off on their own, duplicating work which the government is doing anyway.

I think that there needs to be very much a direction from government to regional associations as well as an emphasis by this department on practising in its own department the first word of the department, "economics."

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer the hon. leader of the Opposition's question.

We have had requests, as you know, over the years from the various regions for a more concentrated analysis of the potential in their area. The one that was mentioned the other day, yes, they have made application to us and said, "Can we have 'X' number of dollars to look in this area and gather together the potential of the area?" —similar to what we are talking about in this master atlas that we just discussed a few minutes ago.

Out of this master atlas undoubtedly we will have sufficient information to compile the kind of information that perhaps the Lake Erie development association is asking for, which we will not have to spend as much money on as they anticipate. That may not be fact, but all I suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition is that the regional development associations, the regional development councils, are going to be asking for the very information the hon. leader of the Opposition brought up.

We believe that the atlas in general we are talking about will provide a lot of that. But we also recognize that in each region there must be a miniature available amount of information in a similar form so that the Lake Erie development association or northern Ontario development association can utilize that information to develop the potential in their areas. Where the government can help them, we believe, is in acknowledging the fact they need more information and if we do not have sufficient of this with what we have on the books now, then we will appoint universities or consultants or do it ourselves through our own department to gather the information for them in each and every region.

Mr. Thompson: Is the hon. Minister assured that the Lake Erie regional development association and the people who are developing their atlas have been in touch with the University of Toronto geographical department to see that they co-ordinate together? Is he assured that they have done that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not assured they have done it to date but I can assure you now that we have the development association set up as we have the council set up and the branch set up in our own Department of Economics. We are not going to duplicate the work, which could be duplicated if we did not have a development programme such as we have outlined. This is

one of the things we hope to do. We would like to know what research is going on in the province, by whom, by how many people, and how it can be co-ordinated so we are not duplicating the effort. This is one of the things we want to do.

I might mention that when I first took on the chairmanship of the Ontario economic council, one of the first chores we had was to take inventory of the number of people within the province, within industries, within associations, and within the federal government, who were working on research problems in the province. It was surprising, because I think there were something like 22 different operations going on and undoubtedly there was duplication. This is one thing that I would hope the developing councils, working with the staff we have set up, would be able to overcome.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, would it not be clearer to those who intend to use this work when it is completed if it were called an economic atlas?

Hon. Mr. Randall: My advice is it may be called an economic atlas. We will take a look at it; I think it is a good suggestion.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman—if I can presume for one moment to usurp the position of the hon. Minister and comment on the last question, for a reason that I will explain to the Minister. I learned of this project and I had a very interesting hour or two with Professor Dean no more than a month ago, and I can inform the hon. member for Brant that it is called the Economic Atlas of Ontario, so the estimates are actually a little inaccurate in their wording.

Second, with regard to the question the hon. leader of the Opposition has raised, I share with him the apprehension in regard to duplication, indeed in the next few moments I will indicate to what extent I share it. But I think in this instance his fears are not necessarily valid.

As I understand it, the group working with Professor Dean of the University of Toronto is made up of not only staff members here but students. There have been ties with other universities, including Western, though Western is not directly involved in the project here, but they each know what they are doing. I suspect, as the Minister has indicated, what we are going to have in the economic atlas is an overall picture of Ontario with a more detailed study done for the Lake Erie regional development area by the University of Western Ontario. But I feel quite confident from my discussion with Professor Dean that there is pretty close collaboration and certainly knowledge of what each one is doing.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want now to turn to regional development, something that has become a rather major concern in this session of the Legislature, and by earlier decisions it was indicated by the Chairman that this was the appropriate point to deal with the matter, and so I raise it. I would like to sketch in a bit of historical background because I think it is interesting to recall that the predecessor, or the antecedent, of this particular department, The Department of Economics and Development, was The Department of Planning and Development as was set up in the year 1950. In the Act which established The Department of Planning and Development, there is this quotation which indicates its functions, its terms of reference:

> The Minister shall collaborate with the Ministers having charge of the other departments of the public service of Ontario, with the Ministers having charge of the departments of the public service of Canada and of other provinces, with municipal councils, with agricultural, industrial, labour, mining, trade and other associations and organizations, and with public and private enterprise, with a view to formulating plans to create, assist, develop, and maintain productive employment and to develop the human and material resources of Ontario, and to that end shall co-ordinate the work and functions of the departments of the public service of Ontario.

I think anybody would agree that that really was a giant task. It is not only co-ordinating the departments of this government, but the departments of this government with the municipalities, the departments of this government with Ottawa, the departments of this government with all other provincial governments. This, if anything, was going to be the granddaddy of all co-ordination.

The interesting thing is that this function of co-ordination, at least within the province of Ontario, in the process of time devolved upon the regional development branch here in the department at Queen's Park, which was to be the co-ordinating agency for the regional development associations across the province.

As was pointed out by Dr. Krueger in his report, prepared under the sponsorship of the Ontario economic council—and it will

be evident to any member of the House when he pauses for a moment to consider it—it is impossible for one branch of one department to co-ordinate all of the departments in the government, let alone that broader co-ordination with Ottawa and other provinces, and so on. In other words, this was setting an impossible task. The original terms of reference of the department had devolved on the regional development associations and they simply could not do the job.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, basically, the move that has been taken by the government is to rescue this extremely important function from one branch of this department and to invest it in a Cabinet committee, chaired by the Prime Minister, and with one full-time person who is not going to be a chief, as was designated in the Krueger report, but is going to be a secretary—but, I assume, is going to be a full-time person. Here you have, at least in my view, the administrative machinery, if it is used fully, to achieve the kind of co-ordination that was originally envisaged over the last 15 years.

That is the reason why I am rather puzzled as to exactly what the government is planning to do. We have the hon. Prime Minister's statement spelling out the design for development. We have the hon. Minister following it with his statement in regard to the regional development councils to replace the regional development associations. In both these statements and in subsequent public statements the Minister has made across the province, he has indicated that this kind of co-ordination is now, in turn, going to be co-ordinated with a decentralization of all government departments, or most government departments, into areas of the province which would have the same boundaries, so that we can rescue ourselves from the chaos of some 30 to 40 different administrative units across the province of Ontario.

Therefore, Mr. Charman, I think it is appropriate that this government indicate at least its thinking so far, if it really has done any planning and research as to the nature of this breakdown. My question is prompted by still another revelation of what appears to be a bits-and-pieces approach to this, that was carried in yesterday morning's *Globe and Mail*. This was an announcement by the Minister of Health in regard to regional advisory councils across the province of Ontario, and interestingly enough, the Minister of Health is quoted as saying:

> The province is divided into 11 regions for health insurance purposes and the councils most likely will follow the same pattern.

My question is, here is the hon. Minister of Health establishing 11 health regions for health insurance as well as for a decentralization of the regional advisory health council—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): May I be permitted to correct you? I said hospital regions.

Mr. MacDonald: Hospital rather than health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: All right, hospital rather than health. My basic point is not disturbed at all. What is the relationship between the 11 regions that the hon. Minister of Health has now just designated, and ten existing regional development associations we have?

If I may just do a bit of speculating—if what the government has done is to take that real monstrosity in our regional development associations, namely, the one for northeastern Ontario, and split it in two, so that the ten become 11, I would think that there is some rationale emerging in the government's approach to it. Northeastern Ontario development association is one that stretches all the way from the Soo east to North Bay, and north up to Moosonee. I have always felt that if we are ever going to get around to reassessing the boundaries of the regional development associations, here is clearly one that should be split in two. Northeastern Ontario, as we normally think of it, along what I, for my own convenience, have described as the ONR portion of northeastern Ontario, is a unit by itself.

I submit to the hon. Minister, for his consideration, if the government is still grappling with this, that the area west of the county of Nipissing, from Sudbury through to Sault St. Marie, is another area which has some homogeneity, but it certainly has nothing to do with Moosonee. The sooner we get some rhyme and reason into these boundaries the better, which raises my next question.

What thinking has the government done in terms of revising boundaries? Because I remind the hon. Minister that this government tends to take the stand that we are far ahead of the province of Quebec. In terms of having acknowledged the existence of this problem, we are, we started ten years ago.

But we really have done very little in this ten-year period. These regional development associations, as I said in the House many times before, have been withering on the vine and events of history have caught up with us, and, indeed, outdated the kind of divisions that we had at that particular time.

It is significant that in Quebec, coming into the picture later, they are not taking old historic county boundaries, because in many instances these old historic county boundaries have no relationship at all to the economic realities of today. When they spelled out their ten regional development areas, they delineated them in the press release that accompanied the announcement, so that they even broke, in some instances, townships, indicating that one part of it would go into a particular area, and another part—sorry, I think I am wrong in getting down to townships, but certainly counties are split, so that one portion of a county may be in a regional development area, and the other portion in another regional development area, because that is in fact where it really belongs, in light of today's economic realities.

So what is this government doing with regard to the revision of boundaries? What is this government doing, for example, in terms of designating regional capitals? If I may pick up with the resolution that the hon. member for Russell raised, in rather a narrow and parochial sense with regard to the city of Ottawa—seeking a building there that would house all provincial government buildings. If we are really going to decentralize provincial administration within common boundaries for regions across the province of Ontario, I submit that the time has come now for this government to clear its thinking, in terms of what revision of the existing boundaries there should be and which departments are going to be decentralized.

I would concede, as does Dr. Krueger and everybody else, that there are some departments for which there would be no particular purpose in terms of decentralization, but for most of them there will be.

And finally, what is going to be the regional capital? In fact, a further refinement that they have in the province of Quebec—are there going to be sub-capitals, where you may have sub-regional offices, as inevitably has developed in certain parts of the province, in terms of providing local services?

Now, I have many other questions I want to raise, but perhaps before I get them all confused with this one set of questions, with regard to the boundaries and decentralization, the fulfillment of the objective which the government has now proclaimed during this session, I wonder if I can invite the hon. Minister's comments on this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Prime Minister made it very clear in his statement what the objectives of the new programme were going to be and I think I have also on occasions, following the Prime Minister, set out the objectives of our department.

I do not share the worry that my hon. friend does about how the programme is going to operate. I am quite sure that we are capable of setting up a staff, as we have outlined, to get the work done, to look after the recommendations we receive, not only from the member himself and other members in the House, but also from the people involved at the grassroots level. I have no hesitation in saying that we will have a properly staffed programme all the way through the piece.

Now, if you have any doubts on that, all I can say is you will have to wait until this time next year, and then if it is not done, you can criticize.

On the matter of boundaries, I said to the hon. member for Brant, when he made his presentation the other day, that we recognize that perhaps the boundaries have to be changed. It is obvious they have to be changed, and I have pointed it out as I think I pointed it out in the conference a year ago February. If we take the counties of eastern Ontario, let us say we take four counties side by side, running north and south, it is obvious that the industrial sector of that county is down near the St. Lawrence river.

It may be possible, as the hon. member says, that the counties running north and south may be called region No. 4 now, but it may be possible in the not-too-distant future that the county will be cut right in half and the northern section, which may be agricultural, or tourist, will be region 5, and the industrial area be region 4, and we will cut into maybe half a county.

This is envisaged, and insofar as drawing together the boundary lines and putting in all of the departments of government, I think the member himself, in checking the comments of Dr. Krueger, will see it may be absolutely impossible to make all the departments confined to a single boundary line. I do not think it is possible at the moment, but on the other hand, this is what we are

going to be working for. I am quite aware of the problem of boundaries.

Now insofar as Quebec is concerned, I have no comments on that. They started as you say, a few short months ago. Perhaps they have looked at some of the errors that we and other provinces have made and they have started off with a programme that is going to work. On the other hand, there are some very knowledgeable people in Quebec saying: "Well, do not take away from the muscle of Quebec and decentralize industry to the point where you weaken the muscle of Quebec, and put it where it is uneconomic."

This is one of the major problems, I think, that we would have to look at. I think in many areas of Ontario it is obvious—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, if I might just interrupt at this point. The problem that the hon. Minister has put before us in those words, is surely the basic problem of regional development. If in fact the Minister has some doubts as to whether the purpose of his department is to encourage industry to go into these more backward areas, if he still has some doubts about that, I do not see how he can continue with the programme that has been outlined in the grand design.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I do not think that I said that at all. Let us be very clear on this. I think you would be the last one in this House to say: "Let us put your life savings in a machinery plant up in Moosonee." Am I right? I am not being facetious, I am simply saying that there may be areas where industry would be uneconomic, but there may be other potential in there that should be developed, and it is obvious that industry should be placed where it can be economically sound, where it will do something for the area, and do something for the people.

It may be when we get through we can have industry in every part of the province. At the moment, there are some parts of this province where undoubtedly it would be uneconomic to put industry in there, unless you want to subsidize it, and if it is your money, you would have to make that decision.

I simply say that if this government is going to spend any kind of money in regional development, let us spend it where it will do the most good, if it is in farming, if it is in forestry, if it is in fishing, if it is in agriculture, let us make sure that is where the money goes. Certainly we do not want to start a farm at the corner of King and Yonge, because somebody says they would like to farm in the city.

Again I hope I do not sound facetious, but I am trying to be as clear and as concise as I can in my thinking, so you can follow the pattern. Now I must go back to boundary lines and suggest to the hon. member I agree with all that he has said. I have read the Krueger report and I agree with Dr. Krueger. He himself has had some doubts on some points, and has been fair enough to say perhaps it will not work. All I said is the Krueger report, like the Goldenberg report, is something we will work from. Perhaps it is the first good bible on regional development. Out of that, we will take the best of it and see what we can do with it. We cannot perhaps adopt all of it immediately, maybe we will adopt some of it later on. But the boundary lines, as I told the hon. member for Brant the other day, certainly is one of the first jobs of the regional development departments to analyze and see how quickly we can pull those boundaries together to make them economical.

I think the third point the hon. member touched on was the value of the regional development associations. It was again one of the problems I inherited.

We found very knowledgeable people out in the field, very enthusiastic people, who wanted to do something in the grassroots area and I think with the hon. member, they did not have the direction that they perhaps should have had.

Again I say when I inherited this programme, I took a look at it, I have not rushed out like a fire-engine to start doing something before I had the facts or you would not have the Krueger report to talk from today; we held a conference and the members of this House attended the conference.

Again I say you heard what people from all over the world said about regional development programmes. You had the benefit of that experience and we have taken all that information and all these facts that we have been able to gather and have put together what we think is a regional development programme that should work.

Now, we do not think it is all cut and dried, we are not that confident that everything is going to work until we try it out. But I am quite prepared to give any comments or any suggestions we get very serious consideration—boundaries, recommendation from the regional development associations, now called the regional development councils. I still say with the programme we have set up and

the association we have with these people, the communications we now have with them —a closer communication—that some of the problems which perhaps leave the hon. member feeling that we are not going to accomplish all we set out to do, I can assure him that we are going to achieve these objectives. This is what the goal is. Again I will say we are leaving ourselves wide open for criticism if we do not follow some of our own objectives. If we follow these objectives and they do not work out, we will be the first to admit it, and I am prepared to try something else. But I have confidence we have a good plan and if we work it as we intend to work it, we can get results with it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to thrash around unduly on this aspect of the question, because there are other equally important ones that I want to explore.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question before we leave this point?

Mr. MacDonald: I am on this point.

Mr. Sargent: But I want to ask the Minister if he has thought of the merit of putting teeth into regional development so that you can tell industries where they will locate? If you do not do that, you are defeating the whole purpose. Regional development is not working and we must start somewhere along the line at getting some way of decentralizing industry. The government is not doing it and the programme is bogging down because the Minister has no teeth in the legislation.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Is that Liberal policy?

Mr. Sargent: I think it is good for the outlying parts of the province to think of something that will really work. It is not working now and the Minister knows that.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, as I was going to say a moment ago, I do not wish to thrash around on this aspect of the question at much greater length. The Minister has indicated they will get the staff and they will tackle the job.

My first protest, however, is that the Minister was saying this a year ago. And this is a year later. Now he—

An hon. member: And his predecessor before.

Mr. MacDonald: And his predecessor before. Now, he says, "Come in next year and if I have not done anything, criticize me." The Minister has announced a programme and it is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that it is a programme showing no basic research. At least in the province of Quebec, when they announced their ten regional development associations, they had done enough research through various agencies of the government that they knew which were going to be the regional capitals, they knew what were going to be the boundaries.

The hon. Minister has a blueprint. It is not a design for development, it is a design for political propaganda for the next provincial election, that is all it is. So far we have had nothing but a vague sort of statement.

Before I leave this, I would say to the hon. Minister, if the government is really serious on this, some time very soon—conceivably even before next year so that it can give some guidance to those across the province of Ontario—if the government is going to do something by way of altering the existing boundaries, we should have information on what that alteration is going to be. May I ask, who is doing the study on this? Is the Ontario economic council doing the study? Or is it the people in the Minister's department who are doing the study? Who is doing it?

A second question that I think we should have answered in this House so that we know exactly where we stand is: Which departments of the government are going to decentralize their administration within common boundaries across the province of Ontario? I think we are entitled to know. There may be one or two where there is no purpose in seeking decentralization, but for the rest of them, there is.

If the hon. Minister of Health is setting up 11 regional areas for hospital insurance and for his regional advisory councils, he knows now that they are coincident with the boundaries that this Minister has decided and the Cabinet as a whole has accepted. Has the hon. Minister done that? If he has, please let us in on the secret.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I answer that first question? We held a conference last February. As I said before, we got the data we wanted to set up a programme, we set the programme up to the best of our ability, and have the legislation through the House now and the money appropriated and a branch set up to operate it.

Insofar as the departments planning now, certainly they are aware of what the government intends to do in regional development.

When the hon. Minister of Health and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the hon. Minister of Labour and the hon. Minister of Education had plans in the last few months, we talked about those plans. They could not stop their programmes waiting for this programme to be all cut and dried and the blueprints stamped and just let us follow it blindly.

I think this is one of the things we will have to do. We say we know what we want to do. We will have to sit down with the other Ministers. If they have 11 regions in health now and there should be ten, there is lots of time for us to get together when the blueprint is properly laid out and discussed and analyzed by all the departments, to see if we can operate with 11 or whether we should go back to ten.

Mr. MacDonald: Who is going to do that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It will be done through our department, and the chief economist. We will have assistance from the Ontario economic council, certainly. Anybody involved in regional development will have a say in what we are going to do. Certainly this is communication, this is what we have to do.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, I am not finished and I want to stick with this until I am finished.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: That is fine, about half an hour from now I will be finished; I will give the hon. leader fair warning.

An hon. member: The hon. member is touchy today.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I am not touchy, except that we must pursue this realistically.

Let me draw to the hon. Minister's attention, this: The hon. leader of the Opposition raised yesterday the conflict between the community planning branch, which is responsible for the physical planning, and the regional development association, which is responsible for economic development. In fact, they are both responsible to a considerable degree with both aspects. It was interesting that the Minister got up and said, "I concede there may be some conflict here. Some time I will get together with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I will work this out."

Then, just a moment ago, for example, he gets up when I say, "Who is doing this job of working out the boundaries and who is going to decide what departments will be fitted into them?"—and says: "My chief economist, people within my own department."

Mr. Chairman, the thing I draw to your attention is this: The hon. Prime Minister, in his design for development, said, "The guiding force in this development is the Cabinet committee."

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. And the hon. Minister on two issues has risen in this House, and one would never have gotten the impression that a Cabinet committee existed.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask a question? The hon. member interprets this entirely wrong. I said we will do the planning work and present it to the economic committee or to the council, the committee of Cabinet, and also my colleagues in Cabinet. We will not make the decisions, I did not say that at all. I said somebody has to do the planning and the boundary work and if we look at it and we say, "This is what the boundary should be," it is obvious that I am not the authority in government to say this is what it is going to be and tell my colleagues they have to fall in line.

We will do the leg work. Somebody has to do the detail. The hon. member brought it up a few minutes ago himself. He said, "How can the Minister do all this work and look after all the rest of his department?" We say we are setting up a department to do it and when we gather the facts we will take it to the Cabinet and they will make the basic decisions. Now, let us make ourselves clear.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, but is the department going to analyze the boundaries for the regional development associations, and at the same time establish some administrative order, instead of the chaos, in all of the overlapping boundaries of all the other departments?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would hope so.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister would hope so?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would hope so, sure.

Mr. MacDonald: But, you see, where does the Cabinet committee come into it? Surely the Cabinet committee is going to be the co-ordinating body?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Right, when they get the information to co-ordinate with. How can they co-ordinate if I do not give them the facts?

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, it is the department that is going to go around and survey The Department of Health, The Department of Highways, The Department of Public Welfare, and The Department of Municipal Affairs, and find out what the present decentralization of their administration is. The Minister is going to work out at least a proposal, a draft proposal, for co-ordinating that all within the boundaries.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have already had discussions.

Mr. MacDonald: You have already had discussions?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we have.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will leave that until next year. The only thing I submit is that this should have been done before we had the announcement of the design for development, because the design for development without that elementary basic work being done is nothing but propaganda, it is nothing but headline hunting. It is significant that in the province of Quebec, before they made their announcement, they had done their research work. They were not talking off the top of their heads; they were delineating the boundaries.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are not talking off the top of our heads, either. We have done a lot of groundwork. The design for development was not dreamed up overnight. The design for development is the result of a lot of work we have done since the conference a year ago February; I have said that in this House a half dozen times. If you want to continue to ignore it, fine, but that is entirely up to you.

Mr. MacDonald: But, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I simply say that we will gather the facts and present them to the Cabinet committee, and they will make the decisions on boundaries.

Mr. MacDonald: The design for development anticipates regional development councils whose boundaries will be coincident with the decentralized administration of all the government departments. You have not done that, therefore you have not done the elementary job.

However, I leave the point there. All I am trying to show is that so far we have a sham; there is no substance to it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is your opinion; we do not agree with it.

Mr. MacDonald: If you want to fill in the substance and take another 12 months—I know that this government operates on the principle of in the fullness of time things will be achieved. All I am saying is that your pronouncement has no meaning unless you have done this basic, elementary kind of study and it is clear that you have not, although it is interesting to learn that it is your department that, presumably, is responsible for doing it and submitting it to the Cabinet committee.

Mr. Chairman, let me go on to two or three areas. I was interested in the hon. Minister's comment when he inadvertently described the Krueger report as a "good bible" on regional development associations. If the Krueger report is a "good bible" on regional development associations, I wonder why this government sat on it and kept it secret until those of us in the Opposition had to go and dig it out.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have already explained that to you; that was commissioned by the Ontario economic council as an independent body, and when that main report was received—and you have friends on the board of the economic council and they probably told you about it—it was not acceptable as a whole. They wanted further information on it and they asked for a further report. When the further report was received I gave it to my Cabinet colleagues, not before.

You were with some friends and you had a copy. I do not object to you having a copy; there is nothing secretive about it. But why should we publish it when it was not fully approved by the Ontario economic council? There was no reason to submerge the report or hide it. It was not a report made for public use until we had got the final information from the economic council and had given it to the Cabinet committee. You were fortunate in getting a copy and that is all right with me. I could not care less.

Mr. MacDonald: If there was no reason to keep it secret, why did you?

Mr. Thompson: Before you move into your next point—I do not want to lose track of one of the remarks the hon. Minister made previously to the hon. member for Brant and

to the leader of the New Democratic Party, and I have heard this thrown up a lot of times. You take the example of Moosonee and you say: "If you want to invest in some industry up there"—and with that there is a kind of washing your hands of all regions that are outside of the golden horseshoe.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said one industry up in Moosonee.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, well let me put it this way then. I know of a situation of one of your representatives perhaps having misinterpreted the philosophy that is behind the remark: "You want to invest up in Moosonee." He was up in the north and he explained that because of the distance from transportation and from central market areas that secondary industry might be impossible in the north. I want to tell you that the people, in the area where I was, were mighty incensed at this kind of washing of hands of the north, and I am sure that if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs had heard this representative talking like that he would have been irritated.

So they took me around—I think it was in New Liskeard—where the people themselves had started secondary industry which utterly refutes the kind of excuses that this representative was making for the lack of interest that this government was taking in regional development in the north.

I like to get again at the philosophical basis of regional development—before we move into boundaries, because I agree with the leader of the New Democratic Party—surely, when you are building a house, before you can even start the co-ordinating services, you have to have a design and it is clear, very clear, that design for development—you have not got any design because you do not have any boundaries yet. I agree thoroughly that this is strictly a political sham and I think—

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask the leader of the Opposition a question? If he is going to build a house, does he ask himself, first of all, what he is going to build it for?

Mr. Thompson: Certainly I would, but—

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, but my point is this, before you come out with a design you have some blueprints; the hon. Minister is saying that they do not have a blueprint but to give them another year and they will have one. Yet the hon. Prime Minister of the province proudly stands up and gives us that high-falutin pamphlet that he has. But behind that, I do not think that he has a philosophy about regional development. I remember last year when he was going up to Ottawa just at the tail end of the last session, I was very interested in a release which he put out about economic development—it was a background paper—and these are the points that he made at that time.

He was going up to Ottawa about designated areas and one point was that he thinks regional development is primarily a provincial responsibility. He wants to allocate development funds within the province. Federal programmes should not be implemented without extensive consultation and consent from Ontario. He thinks industry in designated areas may siphon off resources from other favourable growth areas. The area development agency should concentrate on technical assistance and advice.

The real point that I think is significant is this, that the hon. Prime Minister thinks that industry in designated areas may siphon off resources from more favourable growth areas. Surely as you study that sentence, you begin to realize that what he is talking about is the evolution of the horseshoe keeping on, the economic growth of the horseshoe and that he is going to do nothing for regions. That, frankly, to me is why he is not taking a strong lead in an economic council and a Cabinet economic committee, because I do not think that he believes in regional development. I am hoping that the hon. Minister would make to this House a much stronger statement. He is a man who stands up and says what he believes.

This sort of side-stepping in saying: "Well, I would not develop up in Moosonee." What would the hon. Minister do in areas such as Haliburton and others? What are his plans there? And where would he develop industry? Where is the "tree line," so to speak, for economic development? Where would he start to develop industry?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Where it is economically viable and will do something for the economy in that area.

Mr. Thompson: Let me ask the hon. Minister this: What about New Liskeard?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think there are certain industries that will fit in New Liskeard, but perhaps there are certain industries that

will not. New Liskeard is an area where perhaps light industry will fit in, but there may be difficulty putting heavy industry in up there because of transportation costs—the metal going in and the metal coming out.

When an industry is all through producing something, it has to be sold at a competitive price and the less we are going to have fixed prices from coast to coast, as they do in state-run economies, we must recognize that when a man puts his money into a concern that the product that comes out of there must be saleable, or the first thing you know it collapses and there is more harm done than good.

The hon. leader of the Opposition continues to point at Sweden and I agree that they have done a fantastic job. We had a man from Sweden at the conference, but just the other day on television the Prime Minister of Sweden was being questioned by one of the backbenchers in his Cabinet as to why he did not put industry in his town and the Prime Minister said to him: "My young friend, it would be far better to develop the growth areas we have than to use the money to do something better in that area or bring the people to where the work is so that we do not have two half economic operations going, one here and one somewhere else."

Even in Sweden, which is socialist planned and on a very good order, I think they recognize there are many areas where industry will not fit and the people must be given some other kind of help or they must be moved where they can best fit into the economy and make the most money and increase their standard of living. And I think this is what we have to do in Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: Could I just ask you—you make the statement that in Sweden this fellow said to a young man—

Hon. Mr. Randall: A member of Parliament.

Mr. Thompson: —it is recognized where the growth areas are and bring the people to them. Is that your philosophy?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I have already expressed my philosophy and I say there are many areas in Ontario where we can take industry, which we are doing. When I come to the trade and industry branch I will give you a list of the 178 industries that came into Ontario last year and where they located. They were certainly not at the corner of King and Yonge. Everybody seems to feel when they come to see us, if they could only get an industry of some kind in their town, they solve all their problems. I want to assure you, they do not solve all their problems—in fact, they may compound the problem.

I can go back to the Operation Bootstraps in Puerto Rico, when the Americans found they could put industry in there and pay $1 an hour. What happened? The problems that they had with juvenile delinquency, with health, with morals—everything else went to pieces. They had a great deal of trouble trying to fit industry into an area that never had industry before. Now, they have solved those problems and I am sure we can solve them here but industry must go where it is economic for the area and economic for the man making the investment.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue this subject. I am very interested in the line of argument that the hon. leader of the Opposition has raised because there is no doubt in the wide world that this government is on the horns of a dilemma.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think so.

Mr. MacDonald: Regional economic planning is in basic conflict with the Tory philosophy.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, when the hon. leader of the Opposition a few moment ago said: "What are you going to do by way of planning decentralization?" the comment of my friend from Kent West was: "Is that Liberal philisophy?" He saw the difference if you did not.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, that is his opinion; he is entitled to it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not only his opinion. When I raised the question of economic planning and discussed the Krueger report during the Prime Minister's estimates, the hon. Prime Minister got up and he dismissed it, all very casually. He said: "Look, let us face it, there is a difference in philosophy between you and me." In effect, he was saying: "I am in favour of a free enterprise philosophy and therefore what I do by way of economic planning is the absolute minimum—only because I am driven by events into it." There is a conflict between Tory philosophy and regional economic planning.

However, what made me interested in listening to the hon. leader of the Opposition is that this is the progressive façade of

the Liberals that means nothing in reality. Because the Sharps and the Winters are basically Tories in favour of free enterprise and they will never do it, and no Liberal Party has ever done it anywhere in this country. Indeed, the Liberal parties of the Ross Thatcher type are even more anti-planning—they like to put it as anti-socialist—than anybody else.

Mr. Thompson: But the designated areas.

Mr. MacDonald: The designated areas are only a bit of a piecemeal approach to economic planning. This is a patchwork kind of approach. However, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to waste my time firing ammunition at a spent force. Let us get back to the government itself.

What I wanted to raise with the hon. Minister are three areas, and I raise it in the context of information that is from this "good bible," the Krueger report. I do it for the purpose of finding out what this government is doing in terms of reconciling this conflict—basic areas of conflict, illustrative of the kind of conflict that exists at the present time.

I was about to start on one a few moments ago when we got sidetracked once again, and that is the point that the hon. leader of the Opposition raised yesterday with regard to community planning branch and the regional development associations.

On pages 28, 29, and following in the Krueger report, he points out that the community planning branch, which is in the department of the Minister of Municipal Affairs—it used to be in The Department of Planning and Development back in 1950, then it was switched to The Department of Municipal Affairs—is theoretically responsible for physical planning, zoning, zoning by-laws and all things of that nature. But as Dr. Krueger points out:

> According to The Planning Act it is the responsibility of the planning board of such an area "to investigate and survey the physical, social and economic conditions in relation to the development of the planning area"—

Thus it is clear that the community planning branch is concerned with both regional economic and regional physical planning. In others words, part of the job that you are supposed to be doing is over in The Department of Municipal Affairs. The Krueger report goes on to point out that in the department's community planning branch they have done preplanning studies—in fact, they have done preplanning studies of a major regional nature in the St. Lawrence valley, in the Niagara peninsula, in the Oshawa-Hamilton area, in the Sudbury district and the Waterloo district.

He also goes on to point out that they did a study in the Niagara peninsula and after the community planning branch had done this study and the regional development association in the Niagara peninsula wanted to get a copy of it, they could not get it from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. What kind of utter nonsense is this?

Hon. J. W. Spooner: (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Never heard of it.

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean, you never heard of it? Because about one year ago, after it was refused for a long number of weeks and months, then the Minister released it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not know the instance but if I did not release it at the time that I was asked for it, the request must have been premature, because there are lots of those around.

Mr. MacDonald: Just like our request for the Krueger report—it was premature, but the fact of the matter is that I have talked with people who were on the regional development association in the Niagara peninsula and they spent weeks, and months, to get this study out of another department of the provincial government. But then the irony of it—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Can I call your young lady, Miss Adams, this afternoon and ask her if she would mind giving me your economic research on the next department to follow me; would she give me all that information?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, she could.

Hon. Mr. Randall: She would, eh? Everything you are going to ask the Minister of Transport, the Provincial Treasurer? I would be glad to get it. I just wondered if you had any information if you would keep it in your own department.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I had the floor. If this government is doing a study of regional economic development, what do you do it for, if you then refuse to give it to the local people with whom,

presumably, you are going to establish communication?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They get it when we are ready to give it to them.

Mr. MacDonald: When you are ready to give it to them! The fact of the matter is—and I reiterate and I am not going to pound the point any longer—the people in the Niagara peninsula spent weeks, and months, to get the report out of this government. And then the irony of it, Mr. Chairman, which I was just going to draw to the attention of the Minister, is that after they got it then The Minister of Economics and Development went out and did a duplicate study. Can you conceive of anything more utterly ludicrous? One department—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The study is on the way now—

Mr. MacDonald: The study is on the way now, sure.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think I know what you are talking about. You are speaking of the preliminary survey that was conducted by the community planning branch—

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: —for a very definite purpose, and that was to see whether or not the municipalities in Welland and Lincoln counties were interested in a complete study. When that preliminary study was ready and was acceptable to me, the Minister responsible for this department, I went to Niagara Falls, met with representatives of all the municipalities in Welland and Lincoln counties and put up a proposition to them.

As a result of that meeting and their consideration at their own municipal councils, they agreed to the appointment of a consultant to undertake a complete study. This study, my dear sir, is underway at the present time. It is under the direction of Dr. Mayo, whom you probably know.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just draw to your attention a quotation from the Krueger report, and Dr. Krueger had access to the departments in doing all of his research. He said:

> —as a further illogical complication, not long after the community planning branch Niagara survey, The Department of Economics and Development also began an independent economic survey of the Niagara peninsula.

I leave it there for the moment, but let me proceed.

Under The Planning Act which comes under the community planning branch, you have now moved toward establishing county planning areas.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MacDonald: Nothing is wrong with it, except that I will come to a conclusion I want to rather emphasize because I think it is rather pertinent. You have made grants available to the Waterloo county planning area and they are starting to do good work, but as Dr. Krueger concludes:

> Thus it appear that The Department of Municipal Affairs is encouraging regional planning boards to take on the function of regional promotion, which is also a major concern of the regional development associations.

He also goes on to point out in the next paragraph, that as a fulfillment of this kind of regional planning on the part of the regional planning branch, the government has set up regional offices, to date two regional offices—and this is now 15 or 18 months old. How many more have been established, it would be interesting to know.

To date two regional offices, each with a district planning adviser, had been set up in Sudbury and Port Arthur. The Krueger report added: "The branch plans to introduce similar regional offices in other parts of the province."

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I gave that information right here in this House. Krueger does not have to be paid to write that.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not saying that this is a secret. You have set up public offices so that people must be aware of it. But I come to the conclusion. This is from Dr. Krueger:

> Thus it appears that co-ordination is as much a function of the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs as it is of the regional development division of The Department of Economics and Development.

Both departments are involved. Not only do the two divisions share the need for co-ordinating government policies and programmes, but they are engaged in two aspects of regional development that cannot be separated in theory or practice—economic development and physical planning. There-

fore, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Krueger came to a logical conclusion.

Hon. Mr. Randall: So did we; that is what we have said all along.

Mr. MacDonald: He comes to a logical conclusion; that the government should form "a community planning regional development municipal services branch"—bring all of these units together and put them in one department. Is it the government's intention to do this?

When this question, in an embryonic form, so to speak, was put to the hon. Minister by the hon. leader of the Opposition, he said, "I will talk it over with my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs." This is where I began to wonder whether the Cabinet committee really means much at all. When you start talking it over with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, this is two empire builders, and Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no.

Mr. MacDonald: Let not the Minister try to kid anybody in this House. There has been a power conflict between his department and the community planning branch, which has been raging behind the scene for months and years, and everybody knows it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not since I joined the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, nonsense, not since you joined the department! This is the real area of conflict, and you are not going to sit down with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and resolve this. Until you resolve it you cannot have regional economic development, because you have got two cooks at the moment, spoiling the broth, or certainly not co-ordinating their efforts, and the real answer has got to rest at the Cabinet level.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will tell you, you do not get so mad at the cooks that you stop eating in the meantime. That is what we are trying to do, work out the programme.

Mr. MacDonald: I submit, as I leave this point, Mr. Chairman that the hon. Prime Minister has got to make up his mind as to what is going to be done on this, and he has got to lay down the orders as to what will be done.

Hon. Mr. Randall: He is quite capable of doing that.

Mr. MacDonald: I hope so, but you bet he may have to knock heads together.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, maybe he will.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, because on the basis of past experience and the efforts to maintain these empires, it is going to mean some heads will have to be knocked together, and let us not have any illusions on that score.

Let me take a second example, picked from the Krueger report. This is with regard to tourism. If there ever was a chaotic situation it is in tourism in the province of Ontario. It is partly the responsibilty of The Department of Tourism and Information, it is partly the responsibility of The Department of Economics and Development through its regional tourist councils, and it is also part of the regional development associations. As Dr. Krueger points out, if I may just refer to it briefly, on page 76, in his report:

> It was not until the late 1950s that The Department of Travel and Publicity defined tourist regions and encouraged and assisted the formation of active organizations to be known as regional development councils. These were to be comprised not only of operators of tourist establishments but also of businessmen who directly or indirectly benefitted from the industry, as well as representatives of municipalities and local groups. In 1961 the government passed legislation and they made $5,000 available to each of the regional tourist councils, and to date there are some 30 of these in the province of Ontario.

However, he points out on page 77 that when they set up these regional tourist councils, there was no consideration at all of the boundaries of the regional development associations. He points out, for example, that in eastern Ontario there seemed to be too many tourist councils, to promote tourism adequately for the whole region. He says:

> Recently, in eastern Ontario they have formed an association of tourist councils in an attempt to overcome this problem.

In other words, the government went in and established so many regional tourist councils that the local people have to get together and form a federation of tourist councils to do a job for that area.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what is the function of the regional development association? It is there, it is involved, it is presumably doing something in this area. Is

it not the logical federation for it? Dr. Krueger says:

> Not only do the boundaries of the regional tourist councils lack coincidence with those of the regional development associations but they also lack coincidence with the boundaries of the administrative regions of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Then he points out the need for research. He points out the lack of co-ordination in promotion, with two or three people involved in the whole picture.

Without dwelling at any greater length on it, here surely is an area with three departments, all involved in the same thing, with a waste of public expenditure. In some instances they are competing with each other, and certainly they are not co-ordinating their efforts, in order to be able to get the most effective results for each dollar that is spent.

However, I want to raise one final point, Mr. Chairman. It is bad enough to have chaos administratively because of a lack of co-ordination between two government departments, but it becomes very relevant in consideration of the estimates of this department, when we find that there is even lack of co-ordination between two branches in The Department of Economics and Development on an important issue, namely, that of industrial promotion.

You have the municipal services branch, and you have the regional development associations. The municipal services branch is referred to in the Krueger report, on pages 20 and beyond:

> The municipal services division gives advice and guidance to individual municipalities regarding the promotion of industrial development.

As part of their whole function in doing this, Mr. Chairman, they are now encouraging the establishment of industrial commissions in each of the municipalities. So here is one form of activity within the department.

However, you have the regional development councils or regional development associations all across the province, which are involved in the same job of promoting the development of industry. But there is no co-ordination. They do not talk to each other, in many instances. They avoid each other. They both deal directly with Queen's Park.

Indeed, if I may just read this one section, which puts it so clearly, on the line, from the Krueger report; my own words could not put it any better, so I go directly to Dr. Krueger. He said:

> On the surface it would appear reasonable that individual municipal industrial commissions work closely with regional development associations, and where feasible, have area industrial commissions and under the aegis of the regional development associations. Then the trade and industry branch could work through the regional development associations. However, in many instances industrial commissioners refuse to co-operate with the regional development associations since they see them as a threat to their position.

In other words—let me pause there, Mr. Chairman—here is one little empire which one branch of this department is setting up and financing, refusing to co-operate with another branch of the same department, which the department is financing, and—

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is just one point we do not agree with Dr. Krueger on. That is his opinion, we have another opinion. I do not agree with Dr. Krueger on that, because I know different.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me put his evidence on the record.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: He says:

> In still other cases, the management of industry stipulates that it wishes to negotiate directly with municipal industrial commissioners. Thus the trade and industry branch usually lines up the prospects and takes them directly to the industrial commissioner of an individual municipality.
>
> It is true that the regional development managers are generally not experienced at industrial commissioner work and that intermunicipal competition for industry makes the role of the manager very difficult. However, in rebuttal it can be said that industrial commissioners themselves are often inadequately trained for the job and competition also exists among those municipalities which the trade and industry branch is attempting to combine into industrial commission areas.
>
> If these expanded area industrial commissions are going to broaden their scope to include all aspects of economic development, then these in effect become little regional development associations within the larger regional development associa-

tions, but associated with a different division of the same government department.

If these divisions co-operated closely with one another, such a setup might be defendable. The fact is that there is very little co-operation and co-ordination between them.

This kind of situation appears to us to be intolerable. And I invite the Minister right now to try to defend that kind of thing as being preferable to the proposals that Dr. Krueger has made.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the industrial commissioner, as the hon. member well knows, can be hired by a town or city, he does not necessarily have to spread his talents beyond the industrial part of, say, Burlington or Hamilton or the city of Toronto. He performs a different function entirely.

He is in constant contact with the industrial men and the various banks, he reads the reports of companies coming into areas, he comes to our department and says: "Can I get this for my town, town 'X' or town 'B'?" —and I think instead of being criticized for working with both groups, we should be complimented by Dr. Krueger because if there is a bird dog out there trying to get industry into his particular area, we want to know about it.

We have had occasions where our industrial development people have taken a group of manufacturers across the country; I can think of one located up north of the designated area of land the other day. We had that company into 32 different towns in the province of Ontario. And they talked in most cases to the industrial commissioner, if there was one. If there was not one they talked to the mayor or the reeve. We laid before them the opportunities in these 32 towns and they chose to go where the designated area programme was established.

After we got through showing them around, Mr. Drury brought out his designated area programme and the capital cost allowance but they ignored the 32 towns we had shown them and they went to where they got the capital cost allowance, and as a businessman perhaps I cannot blame them.

I do not think that Dr. Krueger is right when he said they do not talk to each other, because I attend regional development meetings and invariably the industrial commissioners of those areas are at the meetings. I think there could be closer co-operation with these people. Certainly I agree with the hon. member, I think all the way through we need closer co-operation, but let us not take it for granted, because Dr. Krueger says it is so, that this is right off the good Lord's knee, it is not.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the hon. Minister permit a question here? The industry and trade branch is now creating industrial commission areas, broader areas, because of the inevitable competition between neighbouring communities, neighbouring municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is good competition.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, there will be competition. As the hon. Minister said, he took them to 32 areas and they took their choice. This is the kind of thing that goes on. But to avoid an uneconomic kind of competition, a dog-eat-dog competition, presumably if there are two or three municipalities in a neighbouring area, the trade and industry branch is establishing larger industrial commission areas. So, as Dr. Krueger said, these become little regional development areas within the broader regional development area of that particular part of the province. Surely this is building wheels within wheels? If you want your regional development association to be the co-ordinating body, let it be designated as a co-ordinating body and not another branch of the department setting up a competing co-ordinating body. How does the Minister reconcile that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I reconcile it very easily. I go to the United States on these opportunity missions and I talk to 100 or 150 businessmen and tell them why they should come and locate in the province of Ontario. So, when they come, they come to our office.

Now, we are not going to discriminate against any town, village, hamlet or area in the province of Ontario. We have before us from these various areas a list of the development areas they have, their industrial programmes, where best they think an industry can locate. We offer these to the prospects we bring in and naturally we take them out with our industrial officer. We do a favour to these areas by taking them into the industrial office in that area, if they have one, giving them a chance to sell their particular area to the group we are taking around. That is our job. Not to say: "You are going to go here, this is the only place we are going to show you" and let him wander around on his own.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would the hon. member wait until I get through? So we take these prospects to the areas of Ontario—they tell us what they want and what they want to manufacture, the conditions that they want. We have a list, we have an inventory of those and we take them to the areas.

Now, there may be an industrial commissioner there, I hope one of these days we have an industrial commissioner in every town of any size that wants industry in it. And I think this is a complement to the regional development councils and I think the councils would welcome and are going to welcome the co-operation of these industrial officers. Certainly I do not see any conflict, I think we are covering all the bases.

I think we would be redundant if we did not do this. We would not be doing the job that we are setting out to do to help industry if we did not make use of the industrial development officers, if we did not try to co-ordinate their activities with the municipal councils.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have one final comment and then I leave the case rest. The hon. Minister in effect dismisses the contention of Dr. Krueger that there is not close co-operation between the industrial commissioners and the regional development associations.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, let us be honest with Dr. Krueger. There may be some areas where perhaps they do not see eye to eye but I say in the main there is co-operation.

Mr. MacDonald: I hope the hon. Minister is correct, that there is co-operation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know it.

Mr. MacDonald: Because if there is not co-operation, we are defeating our purpose and this department is spending money in two different directions, which finally get into competition with each other and that, I suggest to you, is futile. We know what our objective is. We know what is desirable. I just emphasize to the Minister the necessity of eliminating the competition or the lack of co-ordination and co-operation, wherever it still continues to exist.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South is so perfectly right in this complete confusion, I think, in this matter of regional development. Because we have possibly 370 municipalities in Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Nine-hundred-and-some-odd, is there not?

Mr. Sargent: —engaged in the hunt for industry. Basically, people who are concerned with what we are talking about—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Where did the member get the figure of 370? He said there were 370 municipalities in Ontario hunting for industry. Where does he get the figure? I would just like to know for my own information.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I would be very happy to have the Minister tell me what it should be then.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Now, that is the silliest answer I ever had out of the hon. member. He has a lot more sense than to say that. I have known him for 25 years as an honourable gentleman and one who had some common sense. That is not an answer and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Why didn't the Minister answer it?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, because I am not asking the questions, he is.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister should know the answer, he is getting paid for it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can answer the question, they are all looking for industry.

Mr. Sargent: Well, somewhere along the line I got that figure and I may be wrong—I am usually wrong—but the hon. Minister mentioned there were possibly 200 new industries came into Ontario last year—is that figure right?

Hon. Mr. Randall: One hundred and seventy-eight!

Mr. Sargent: One hundred and seventy-eight! So possibly we have then 370 municipalities—I will try it again—hunting for 170, fighting to get 170 industries. And bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that each of these 370 municipalities whose job it is to get new industries, have their own setup, their own boards and the whole rigmarole that every municipality has to get industry. If we can parcel that out, they are getting about a half an industry a year, if they ever get any.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I suggest the member add to that the 478 companies who expanded and had branch plants around the province too?

Mr. Whicher: Half of them in Toronto!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: We are doing very well, Mr. Chairman, because we have a designated area by the federal government and I would like to suggest that we have in all these hundreds of boards and industrial commissions set up, they employ their own industrial commissioners, all their own staff, meetings with committees of council, right down the line, involved in getting industrial development for that particular area. And the frustration, the waste of time, the waste of money, the waste of effort, the complete confusion, as pointed out by the hon. member for York South, is so rampant.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have the highest regard for our Minister here, I think that if anyone can bring any sense of intelligence out of this mess, it might be him. And he has the happy faculty of getting able staff. I have the greatest regard for his staff, but he has a bad one here and how he is going to solve this mess, I do not know.

But you certainly will not solve it, Mr. Chairman, by spending $150,000 in this department. There is a figure here: "To aid regional development associations, $150,000." This is an insult. To do a job, you should spend ten times that amount of money if you are going to get any decentralization and any way of developing the outlying parts of the province.

This was covered very well by the previous speaker, but the fact is that in my part of the province, tourism is a big industry and I think that what we will have to do is to ask the government to help these outlying parts of the province, whether it is feasible or not. But we must think in terms of tax concessions, if possible, so that industry will locate outside of this area here. Such things as hydro concessions, and things along this line, should be part and parcel of this department to do a job.

If they are really sincere in doing a job they must spend some money—not $150,000 because that is peanuts. The government is spending $1 million on publicity in this department, in putting your picture around the country and taking trips abroad with your film crews to follow you, and here you are spending a measly $150,000 under the guise of aiding industry.

I do not want to flog this point, but the fact is that up in the resort areas of this province—the Bruce peninsula and all through the great north country—we have millions of Americans coming in to spend their dollars and we cannot give them the things they want because of the stupid liquor policy of this government. I think if the hon. Minister feels that he wants to help the tourism industry he should get back to basics, the way he would have done in business himself.

But one does not run this department the way one would run a business. You are playing politics all the way down the line, and I say this, very respectfully. You have a pot full of dough there—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You cannot say that respectfully!

Mr. Sargent: I say it to you; I do. I think if you had the power and if you were not such a hypocrite as the hon. Prime Minister appears to be—insofar as your liquor policy is concerned—and if you were a businessman you would say, "Away with this hypocrisy; we will change the liquor policy and give these people across the province their licences on a merit basis."

But here you have one area that is dry and another that is wet and Americans come in here and think that we are—

Hon. Mr. Randall: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, this not in the vote.

Mr. Sargent: It certainly is, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about the tourism industry, and this is part and parcel of it.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I think that I would have to agree with the Minister, that really the member is stretching it a bit on the liquor problem.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I submit that I was talking on tourism development and I will leave that point where it is. The hon. Minister, I think, knows what I am thinking about. We should have a consistency across the province as far as having a liquor policy is concerned, if you are going to do anything for tourism.

I will get back to my main point, that you are not kidding anybody when you say you are doing a job for industrial development in the outlying parts of the province through regional development. We have these hundreds of municipalities doing a full job with very little chance of getting any industry because of the lack of direction on the part of your department.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I come back again? I would like to get the hon. Minister's thinking on designated areas.

The hon. Prime Minister went up to Ottawa and said that he did not agree with the designated areas set out by the federal government. He said that this was a provincial responsibility. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, considering the effect that designated areas have on the economy of these areas, what does he not agree with about this, and what is his alternative proposal?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, let me ask the hon. leader of the Opposition before I give my version: Does he think that the designated area programme as it exists now is not discriminatory against other municipalities such as the hon. member for Grey North was talking about, if they do not have it at the same time?

Mr. Thompson: I think this, as suggested so ably by my colleague, that you have to show causes in certain areas—employment factors. You have to look at the whole environment of certain areas to see how it could be stimulated, and how the economy of this area could be stimulated.

If I could follow up a little further on this, I am very concerned that the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister have this philosophy of saying that growth areas should encourage industries, that there is a natural kind of approach that takes place and this is good, that our province is moving ahead and do not worry about it, and that you cannot tamper with free enterprise in any way.

What they are really saying is that anyone in a slowth growth area might as well get a bus ticket for Toronto and start working here, because the Minister is not going to do much to encourage an area with a bit of stimulation by government. I was concerned about his remark about the north. I asked him what they could do in New Liskeard and he said that they could not have heavy industry. I am thinking about the Wabush mines for example, and the iron works that are up there.

The very fact that the people themselves with their know-how and their energy and their confidence are refuting the kind of arid approach by a number of economic academics who say that because of transportation distance, it is not economic to be up there.

Canada itself has been a challenge to economic laws, but the people are making them work. I am concerned, that the hon. Minister has some dusty academics in the way who are suggesting to him that industry should not be encouraged in the north because it is too far distant from the main markets. And yet, as I have been in the north and have looked at some of the secondary industry and some heavy industry, the people decided that they would prove this stuff about transportation distances and so on, wrong.

I would hope that the hon. Minister who tells us that he could sell refrigerators to the Eskimos—he likes that kind of spunk on the part of regions—would have an approach of recognizing that things can be done if the people get after them and if the government would give them some encouragement, instead of having one of their representatives going up there and spreading doom and gloom about the area as far as industrial development is concerned.

Coming back again to this, instead of asking me, the Prime Minister went down to Ottawa with a great clarion call before he went, saying, "I do not agree with the designated areas; we will provide the alternative." What is the alternative that he has provided?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to say a few words at this time, during the last hour and a half I have heard nothing but doom and gloom as to the efforts of this department in the new development council.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have asked the hon. Mininster a question. Is the hon. Minister without Portfolio going to answer it, or are we just going to have him jump in when he feels like it?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister—

Mr. Thompson: I waited patiently when the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party—Is it a question on this subject?

Mr. Chairman: No, he is just following on the debate.

Mr. Thompson: Well, do we all just follow in the debate when we feel like it?

Mr. Chairman: That seems to be the order, yes. We are on vote 401, item 5.

Mr. Thompson: But surely when you have a question for the hon. Minister, out of common courtesy to him you should let him answer the question, instead of some strange

fellow getting up like the hon. Minister without Portfolio to throw in a few words.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Just a minute, sir. We have been following along on item 5. I think that everybody has had good participation both with questions and debate.

Now the Minister without Portfolio has something to say on the matter and the Minister can answer both at the same time. I think that is in order. Let us wait and hear what he has to say.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you are going to provide a lot of disorder in the ruling you are giving.

Mr. MacDonald: There was a resolution on the order paper—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Maybe he is going to ask another question.

Mr. Thompson: I asked him that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe he is going to ask another one.

Mr. Thompson: I asked him if he was going to ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have not taken up a lot of time in this House and I have been very patient in trying to say a few words on the development associations. Our hon. Minister went down to Ottawa on April 28, when he explained the whole programme to the eastern Ontario development association and at that time, Mr. Bushnell, who is the vice-president, thanked him for his visit down there. I want to read into the record, the words which he said:

> Mr. Minister, after listening to your address, it is indeed a very great privilege for me, on behalf of the management and members of the EODA to have the opportunity and responsibility of thanking you not only for the very special effort you have made to attend this meeting but particularly for your detailed explanation and confirmation of the policy statement, Design for Development—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: There was no detail in it, I assure you, I read the Minister's speech.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Still quoting:

> —announced and issued by the Prime Minister of Ontario, Tuesday, April 5 of this year. Speaking personally, when I read this statement, I was not only impressed and delighted with its overall contents but also with the clarity in which the decisions reached have been set forth in black and white, no mumbo jumbo, no equivocation, no ifs, ands and buts, but on the other hand, a lucid, well-defined document of principle and purpose.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Still quoting:

> A book for businessmen if ever I saw one. If, in the minds of anyone who has studied this statement, there should or could have remained any question or serious doubts that you, Mr. Minister, and your department intends to tackle and to satisfactorily resolve this complex problem of regional development and growth, I feel sure your address today has thrust them away.
>
> Of the many relevant phrases contained in this policy statement several struck my eye with particular pertinence. May I take a moment to quote one or two of them?
>
> "Local initiative. Responsibility and advice must continue to be encouraged and sought, and development structures created by this government will be such that they will not disturb the existing power and authority of the municipal and county councils within the region."
>
> Those are heartwarming words, encouraging and reassuring. What they represent and mean, if I have interpreted them properly, is this: You, Mr. EODA, still have the ball. The provincial government intends to give you its active support financially and otherwise in carrying the ball, but what you do with it for the time being is mainly up to you.
>
> I believe—in fact, I know, Mr. Minister—that you can rely and depend on EODA to welcome and grasp the challenge. That is the message we would like you, as the Minister responsible for this new policy, to carry back to the Prime Minister, your colleagues and associates.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the eastern Ontario development association see the advantages that this government is trying to do at this time. I point out to the hon. member for Grey North that when he says we are only spending $150,000, he has completely forgotten about the Ontario development corporation. By this means, we feel that in eastern Ontario we are going to have a

vehicle whereby the cost of capital construction can be borne by moneys out of this fund.

This has been one of our greatest drawbacks, that all the lending institutions would give money to areas such as Toronto, and the Dominion government looked after areas such as Owen Sound with its programme. Now this government is looking after the people, by offering funds from this corporation's account, to build these factories in the areas where they are needed, and I am sure that we are going to get on with the job down there.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, after that sort of violin interlude, could I come back and ask if the hon. Minister would answer my question, please?

Hon. Mr. Randall: At least I have one friend up in eastern Ontario.

Mr. Whicher: He is paid for it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, he is not paid.

Mr. Chairman, endeavouring to answer the hon. leader of the Opposition's question, I think it was in the House last year that a lengthy discussion took place on the tax assessments that various municipalities up to 1961 were giving to industry to come in. And what a rat race it was, with each municipality vying with the other and giving greater tax concessions in order to get industry. That was apparently removed, and we got some order out of the chaos after 1961 with reference to the municipalities fighting for industrial development.

In some respects this has been brought back with the designated area programme. It is obvious there are many areas in Ontario that, when that programme went into effect, would not qualify on the basis of their above-average unemployment, or their average below the national income which, I think, were the two factors that the Ottawa authorities used. I am aware that there are other factors in there. I would think that the cost of living in those areas would also have to be taken into consideration.

These are some of the things, as I think you are well aware, that we did not have the chance to discuss with the Minister of Industry before this was put into effect. I have had some discussions with Mr. Drury on designated area programmes. I am sure the need is brought home to him very forcibly. Almost every day there is a delegation going to see him from some part of Ontario, or some part of Canada that has been left out, and the pressure upon Mr. Drury is fantastic. I know, because I get a copy of the letters, I get a copy of the resolutions, and a copy of the wires, asking me to also write Mr. Drury and say that a certain group from Ontario is coming up. I took it upon myself to go and see Mr. Drury about six weeks ago. We had a full day in discussing the province's designated areas. He recognizes that the criteria used are not entirely correct at the present time, and perhaps are being changed almost on a month-to-month basis.

I hope, as a result of that discussion with Mr. Drury, that we can work out a shared programme of some kind to get a better designated area programme for the province of Ontario, if we have to have one in co-operation with the federal government. I have had discussions with Mr. Drury along these lines. What will come out of it remains to be seen after our estimates are over. He is another Minister in Ottawa that I hope to sit down with and talk about designated areas.

Certainly we agree, and we grant, that they have proven very successful in the part of Ontario that has been designated. I think something like 19 industries that we know of have gone into that designated area. Mr. Drury's department says 27, but the other eight have not announced themselves yet and therefore that information is not given to us; it is confidential.

Mr. Sargent: What is holding you back?

Hon. Mr. Randall: My discussions with Mr. Drury lead me to believe that there are some things we can contribute to the designated area programme and we are going to have further discussions on it. There are many areas in Ontario that we believe we are going to help with our own programme under the new Ontario development corporation. I think I have pointed out to the hon. members here, when we put the legislation through, that one of the greatest drawbacks to getting industry in smaller centres was a lack of mortgage money for commercial buildings. I think one only has to drive around Metropolitan Toronto to find empty buildings every day in the week, with a sign on, "for let," or that are going to be available tomorrow.

On this basis, a lot of manufacturers today are coming in and are not putting money into bricks and mortar; they are putting it into inventory, they are putting it into equipment, they are putting it into merchandise, and therefore the people who lease back buildings are having a heyday. The man

who leases back buildings, as a rule, will put them where he is going to find his customers as soon as they are completed, and those customers do not exist, as far as he is concerned, in the areas we are talking about here, the development areas, where we would like to see the buildings built.

In view of the fact that they are not buildings those buildings there, and in view of the fact that private entrepreneurs will not go in and put up a building on spec, the Ontario development corporation, as hon. members well know in the legislation, is now prepared to grant mortgage money to any developer who will put up a building. And if he will not put it up, we will contract to put it up and carry the lease ourselves.

In my estimation, this is one of the major steps that we can take in Ontario, with or without the federal designated area programme, to get industry decentralized in the areas where it is economically viable, and where it can exist. I talked to Mr. Drury about this, before I brought my legislation into the House, to ask him if he felt we were on the right track, if we were doing the things that he would agree with, and he said, "By all manner of means, we think you are moving in the right direction. I would like to talk to you more about it when you get through with your estimates."

So I think we are in accord on what we want to do for industry in these developing areas. I believe Mr. Drury's programme—the federal government's programme — has done a job in one area of the province; I think the programme we have here will do a job in many areas of the province. It is even possible in a designated area that a manufacturer will go in and get the capital cost allowance, and then he will say: "I do not have any money for bricks and mortar." He can still come to us and we will put up the building in Owen Sound, Collingwood, Midland or any of those towns that are designated.

I think the programme that we have envisioned here to decentralize industry to help manufacturers go into these areas, perhaps has a lot more merit without being discriminatory against other areas of the province that are not getting the capital cost allowance.

As hon. members know, the designated area programme was based on a company getting a credit against its earnings, and if a company did not have any earnings the designated area programme did not mean very much. On the new basis under the federal government setup, if a man does not make a dime in the first three or four years of operations he still gets the capital cost allowance, which has been one of the better drawing cards in this second designated area programme.

But again, I want to say that I think the programme we have right here to provide bricks and mortar and manufacturing facilities in areas where private money will not put up bricks and mortar, is perhaps one of the best things that has been done in this province to serve all areas of the province.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister certainly takes a much more cooperative stand than the hon. Prime Minister's release. The Prime Minister went up there saying that regional development was primarily a provincial responsibility and that the designated areas did want to have a very strong say. From the remarks the Minister makes he goes up to see the Minister of Industry, the hon. Mr. Drury in Ottawa, and they both sit down and consult and try to dovetail programmes in together. You have no argument with the fact that the federal government is designating areas, while you are supplementing other programmes to develop this.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I just add to that? As you recall, the first designated area for the Georgian Bay area did not encompass the territory it now does, and when the hon. Prime Minister and I had discussion with Mr. Drury they enlarged that designated area programme. Again I say to the hon. member that if industry comes to you, which they have been doing, and you have been bringing them to us and they say: "What can you do for us on capital cost allowance?" I do not have that programme, it is a federal programme and the feds say: "This is where we are going to operate the capital cost allowance and no other area."

So Mr. Drury is under the same pressure we are. The only thing I say is Mr. Drury has the authority, if he wishes, to widen the designated areas; I have no authority to widen the designated area and I do not have the 25 per cent capital cost allowance. So I am posed with the problem of the people who cannot get the capital cost allowance, but I do not have the answer. And I think that not having that answer we have come up with what we think is a better answer through the Ontario development corporation.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I still have not got the answer. Do you agree with those designated areas?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do I agree with them?

Mr. Thompson: Do you agree with the areas designated by the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I say I think we need areas; I was up there the other day and I say there are 19 gone in and perhaps another ten going in. It is a wonderful thing for that area. I also think there are many other areas in Ontario that should be given the same treatment. Again I say Mr. Drury is faced with the same problem—if he enlarges the area in Ontario, then Manitoba comes in and says: "You must enlarge this." B.C. comes in and says: "The Okanagan valley is no good to us, we want the city of Vancouver incorporated." And the first thing you know, if Mr. Drury was to give that same programme to everybody that wants it, all Canada would be a designated area at a very heavy cost to the taxpayer to subsidize industry in some areas where perhaps it would not be economically possible to operate.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just bring to the Minister's attention we had the Minister without Portfolio telling him how the eastern Ontario regional development association thought he was doing a magnificent job and they are pulsating with life and so on. I think you can appreciate that this is not quite the case. I was interested that the eastern Ontario regional development association had only four counties out of the 11 counties in the region as members. I was interested in looking at others.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: In the northeastern regional development association there are 41 out of 130 municipalities that are members. In Lake Erie regional development association there are 34 out of 71 municipalities, and I could go on down the line with this. I want to be fair about it, in the midwestern regional development association there are 68 of 80 municipalities, which is the highest proportion.

The question is really, these municipalities, I am sure there is not a municipality or county which is not wanting to get the greatest opportunity for its area. Why do they not belong to the regional development association? I would come back to the points the leader of the New Democratic Party made, I think they think it is just utter chaos and confusion about regions. You have never stated clearly what the regions are.

Just in answer to my last question you are saying you agree with the designated areas; the Minister of Health has got his 11 units; you have, I understand, 10 economic units. I do not want to labour that point again but let me say administratively this is just a whole patchwork quilt of overlapping and duplication and, of course, makes an impossible situation for you to do your job but also for the regional development associations. It must be one of desperation for them.

I was interested in the municipalities in some of their regional associations. The hon. member for Brant has pointed out that there is the saying in a fooball game to "hold the line." Well, in terms of regional development associations they mean "hold the line" in trying to keep their membership together. There is always this aspect of municipalities getting fed up and disillusioned and yet yearning to get some kind of vehicle by which they can build up the economy of their region. But they get fed up and disillusioned with the lack of help which they get from the government. And their greatest emphasis that I can see in these associations is trying to keep the membership virile, trying to get them to stay each year just so they can justify their existence by keeping the membership.

I notice that a number of the projects again do this on their own almost. I talked about the next project and I appreciate that Western University is going to be in touch with Toronto University and there is some co-ordination there. But I have phoned the major regions and have asked them about projects. Then I asked what they felt would have been a significant project during the past year's operation.

Frankly, if the Minister is going to believe the Minister without Portfolio, I can assure you from the phone calls that I made that it was a very sad account that I got from a number of the regional associations about what they felt they had achieved.

In answer to the questions there was a sense of frustration on their part. They were saying they wanted to have more co-operation. One of the regions told me that even your economics and development department had gone up and put on a project

in a certain municipality—I do not want to mention it in case there is some kind of reprisal towards them—but they said in this city that your people had gone up and put on an economic project and never even told the regional association.

The regional association said that they had had some calls from people in different municipalities saying: "I guess you are closely in touch and will be attending this affair." They said: "We do not know anything about it," and they said they felt that egg had been spattered all over their face.

So I am much more inclined to agree with Professor Krueger than I am with the hon. Minister about this point but, of course, the hon. Minister has to put up a point of view that everything is going with harmony and smoothness. But I think he realizes himself that there are lacks. There is a lack of co-ordination; there is duplication, and also certain little empire builders, and disunity within this whole approach towards regional development.

I was concerned as well—and that is why we will go along with this vote—at the lack of finances which the executive director—I do not know what they are called in each place—gets in a regional development association. In a number of them they have one man with a secretary.

There was one regional association that was encouraged to do a project, to have a survey which was going to be done by a university. So it went ahead on this survey and found there was some duplication with its own department about the survey. But the other interesting thing was that it found the survey would cost four times the amount that the association gets from the department, and from the fees. Therefore, it had to drop the survey.

I have a great number of complaints on their part. Most of them went ahead in making a data sheet booklet or a trade encyclopedia or whatever term you want to use for this. But they are not sure in some cases what surveys the department is doing; they are not sure what surveys the federal government might be doing; they are not sure in some cases about tourism.

My colleague brought up the need for tourism in his own area, and certainly in many areas of this province the tourist association is removed from the regional development association and perhaps in some areas there are personality problems. There is generally confusion of purpose, a lack of sense of direction and certainly lack of co-ordination.

I would be glad, without disclosing the names of these regions, to show the desperation and frustration on the part of these regional development associations, because the government, the department, has not taken a hard look at this situation. The hon. Minister says that he is going to look at it this year. If I am correct, he says he is going to concentrate on this. Last year I may say the Minister told us he had no regional development programme so he has not developed one yet.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are developing.

Mr. Thompson: I went up to North Bay, and I used that. But I felt, just as was done with housing, that this year the Minister could tell us what his regional development programme is. Next year, will the Minister be able to tell us of a regional development programme and go further than that, rather than sidestepping it, because the Minister is not a man who sidesteps an issue?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will give the hon. leader of the Opposition all the success stories.

Mr. Thompson: But what I want to get from the Minister is that he will be frank in this. He will tell us that these are the regions where we think we should not put industry—industry in the sense of secondary industry or heavy industry—but that there are other plans for these regions. These are the regions where we are trying to induce secondary industry, maybe regions where we will have heavy industry, and I wonder if the hon. Minister will have some cataloguing of regions and the objectives for regions next year.

So I ask the Minister if I can count on that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sure we will.

Let me try to answer a couple of the questions here and take the doubt out of the mind of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I think it depends who you are talking to, to see what kind of answers you get. And I think the leader of the Opposition will go along with that.

I can assure him that I am not at all complacent about the situation of the regional development councils. I think there is room for a lot of improvement, as I said earlier this afternoon, in co-operation with them,

and some of the meetings we have had. I have had meetings with the regional development council directors in the last two months and I do not share the opinion that you offered this afternoon, that they are discouraged in all areas. Perhaps the odd one is, and perhaps there is the odd manager who may have to be replaced, but let me tell you what has happened since early April.

Here is just one report from the Georgian Bay development association: It says:

> Early this month Bruce and Grey counties accepted full responsibility for 31 and 27 municipalities respectively. This leaves only Dufferin county to hear from within the Georgian Bay region, which comprises four counties as well as the districts of Muskoka and Parry Sound. The blanket inclusion of three counties amounts to a membership of 90 communities, to which should be added, if they renew membership for 1966, three from Dufferin county, one from Muskoka, 13 from Parry Sound district, for a total of 107, plus the cities of Barrie and Owen Sound, who make their own decisions.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, not once has this Georgian Bay development association ever gotten an industry for our area. We have been part of this deal and it is costing us about $2,000 a year, for the last 10, 12, or 15 years, and to my knowledge it never resulted in getting industry into Owen Sound.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not in a position to tell the hon. member whether they did or did not; I am not going to defend their past performances. All I am going to say is that—

Mr. Sargent: How do you measure anything?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute and perhaps I will tell the member. Just give me a minute. The member should take his time and not get excited; keep his blood pressure down.

I have just outlined here what is happening up there now and I say this enthusiasm has been generated, I think, in the last year. This is true in almost every area that I have visited and all areas I have talked to. Let me also point out that approximately 2.5 million people or 60 per cent of the population of Ontario, excluding the central Ontario economic metropolitan region, which is now being organized—this one right here—are now represented by regional development associations. The municipal participants range in size from the township of Cockburn Island in the district of Manitoulin, with a total population of 21, to cities such as Hamilton, Ottawa and London. Twenty-two county councils contribute fees and support regional development associations.

Someone asked the other day who the members were, and I have a list of the members here. They are ex-wardens, ex-reeves, ex-mayors; they are the élite of the municipalities who are serving in these areas. I believe we can get them all in now that we have a programme. The hon. leader of the Opposition touched on the amount of money required; let me suggest to him that the amount of money that is now going to these associations amounts to $25,000, which is a big improvement over what they had previously, so there is money to operate their office—

Mr. Sargent: That is matching.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no, $15,000 outright grant and $10,000 matching. This means if they match it they have $35,000 to operate their offices with. And if we are paying for the research they certainly do not need any more money than that unless they are going to pay for their own research. We have offered to pay for their research if they bring the programmes to us.

Let me just show hon. members what they did have in there, even with the old programme. Eastern Ontario development association—

Mr. Sargent: It is not working.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, sure it is.

Just a minute. The hon. member asked a question about money. Of the nine associations that are listed here, one had an income of $42,764 last year; another one, $33,751; a third one, $42,104; and the others, $35,000; $33,000; $28,000; $31,000; $23,000; and $23,000. I do not think they have been short of money in their office; I think their major problem has been a lack of co-ordination and co-operation with our department or other government departments and the fact that they want a project, they want to have some direction. When they have a project, they want to come and talk to somebody about getting it under way and they want research in their areas, and that is what we are providing under this new programme.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about this. Personally, I would like to compliment the hon. Minister for his enthusiasm. Obviously he has done the best

he can with the very tough job in the time he has been Minister of this department.

It is rather amusing for me, coming from a rural area, Mr. Chairman, to hear the Minister say that now everything is going to be all right because now we have a plan. You know, Mr. Chairman, long before the Minister came into this legislative assembly we heard that there was a plan. And we are getting sick and tired of having Ministers of this department, not particularly this Minister, but Ministers of the department and various Cabinet Ministers saying that everying is going to be all right.

We have been promised this for the last ten years but now in the last five minutes the Minister has told us that now things are going to be all right, starting as of him. He ignores the fact that there have been Cabinet Ministers sitting in this government before who have had the same portfolio as this Minister, Cabinet Ministers who started the Georgian Bay development association and all the other various development associations in this province. By what the hon. Minister has said himself, they have done a very poor job because he said just a minute ago that now things are going to go ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you they certainly have not gone ahead in the past. I have read this *Ontario Industrial Review* for 1965.

It is so full of nonsense that it is like "Alice in Wonderland." That is what it is, it is a fairy story. Here you have the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. He is a fine fellow, as a matter of fact. He looks like Winston Churchill with a firefighter's hat on; the only thing is Winston Churchill had a war to fight and he won it, and Mr. Chairman, this hon. Minister has not won his war by any means.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not claim we had.

Mr. Whicher: He has not won his war, he has not even started it. But this government has been claiming for years that they have won it, when the brutal fact is this, that rural Ontario is starving to death and the communities that are governed by the various industrial development associations under this department are starving along with it. The only area that has progressed—the only one, bar none—is the city of Toronto, places like Ottawa, Hamilton, and so on. But a huge area, 95 per cent of this province as far as area is concerned, is not going forward it is going backward. Let us listen to the first two sentences.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not think so, from the result of the last election!

Mr. Whicher: "All systems go," the hon. Minister says in the title, and continues: "As our front cover depicts, Ontario's 1965 economy continued to amass new records in prosperity."

Hon. Mr. Randall: Right!

Mr. Whicher: Nonsense! Not Ontario—Toronto!

Hon. Mr. Randall: All over Ontario!

Mr. Whicher: Toronto continued to amass new records in prosperity. Ontario, as far as area is concerned, is starving to death. The hon. Minister is captain of the ship and it is all very well for him to stand up here with his peaked cap and look as if he is pulling the ship through the storm, but he is in a storm and had better call on the first mate of the ship because I have a feeling that he is going to need a lot of help.

Let us take the second sentence: "A national marketing magazine recently headlined: 'Ontario's economy is vigorously healthy' and 'all systems go!' "

Ask them in Bruce county, Mr. Chairman, they are going broke. But the hon. Minister is captain of the ship—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would the hon. member now turn to page 62?

Mr. Whicher: Do not interrupt me, please!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Turn to page 62.

Mr. Whicher: I can show the hon. Minister books here that he has not even read. Somebody said here just a few minutes ago, it was the hon. Minister himself who said, "We are doing the groundwork."

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister has a lot of ground, but he has not done much work!

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister has a lot of ground, there is a lot of ground from Moosonee to Fort William down to the city of Toronto, and he has not covered even five per cent of it. This city is going ahead, not because of the hon. Minister but because there are 2,000,000 living here and people generate prosperity; but in rural Ontario under these devlopment associations—and the

hon. Minister can stand up here and deny what he wishes, but it is wrong—these areas are starving to death and it is up to the hon. Minister to do something about it.

He gives us the idea that all is well in the province of Ontario. If the government did not have the taxes that this city generates it would not even have enough money to have hospital insurance in this province. There would not be enough money to develop the highways of the province or anything else. But because this city is developing, the huge corporation taxes from this city are helping out a great deal. But in Bruce county and in Grey county they are starving to death, as well as in many other counties.

Has the hon. Minister read his own "People and Land in Transition" put out by—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member read it the other night.

Mr. Whicher: I want the hon. Minister to read it; I read it. I know what is going on and the reason I am talking here today is to make sure that he knows what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member did not tell all the facts!

Mr. Whicher: The gross income is $1,580—

Mr. Randall: Just on land only, what about—

Mr. Whicher: Do not raise your hand at me!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not ignore it!

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister spoke for three or four hours here with a lot of glossy nonsense. I am telling him some of the facts; I am representing some of the people that I am talking about and they are starving to death. The Minister is the captain of the ship; let him tell me the industries he brought to Bruce county, tell me that he has them here in his book. Show me the industries that came to Grey county. Show me the industries that came to Bruce county or went to Muskoka. The only industry we have is there because of the tourists from Cleveland and New York and Toronto go up there—the tourist industry. What is the Minister doing for that? Nothing!

As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Grey North and other hon. members here have talked about designated areas. If we did not have designated areas in some of the rural areas in the province of Ontario, we would not have anything. The industries that have gone into the poorer areas of Ontario have gone there—rightly or wrongly—because of the policy designated by the federal government. The hon. Minister has not done a thing.

I remember when the man who nominated the hon. Minister—as a matter of fact he was not the man who was picked in his riding at all—I remember reading it in the newspapers, Mr. Macaulay had to step in and get him as a member so that he could take Mr. Macaulay's place when he left.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And they picked out the party nominee who is not very happy about it.

Mr. Whicher: That is right!

But in any event, I remember the hon. Minister's predecessor, long before the present Minister thought of coming into politics. He came in here and said that $100 million would be put into the Ontario development fund. Where is the $100 million? Only $4 million has been spent and this has taken several years.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this Minister is enthusiastic, but enthusiasm does not buy shoes for little children and it does not buy bread and butter for people who take just as much bread and butter for sustenance as does the hon. Minister himself. We are sick and tired of the hon. Minister and other Cabinet Ministers standing up and telling us how well Ontario is going ahead.

Why, it is not going ahead at all. It is utter nonsense. There is no "Forward, Ontario!" Ontario is going ahead by the grace of God—that is the only thing that is keeping it going and the fact that we have a wealthy country to the south of us and the fact that we sold wheat to China and the fact that there is a great uranium industry in this province. That is how we are going ahead.

I say this to the hon. Minister, and he will remember it, that I complimented him for his enthusiasm and I am sure that he hoped all would be well in the future, but let me tell him this: All is not well in this province at the present.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the hon. member stopped at the first page. I am delighted that the picture was a show stopper and prevented him from getting beyond the first page, but I would suggest that he go onto page 62 and the following pages, which take in the 178

manufacturing establishments and the 478 expansions, and read the areas where they are located. He does not have to take my word for it; the plant and the bricks and mortar are there.

If there is not one located right in the hon. member's town I must apologize; I will try to get one there next year. Do not get mad at me because I did not get one in there. I do not have the designated area programme, as I have just finished outlining to your hon. leader. I can assure the hon. member that I am going to do my best to get a plant in his area as soon as I can but—

Mr. Whicher: I am not talking just about my area; I am talking about all rural areas.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am talking about the hon. member's area particularly, but I suggest that he look all through the book and get the facts on it and he cannot possibly stand up, in his right mind, and say that Ontario is not going ahead when he sees what has happened in this province in the last year.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister referred to page 62. There is a matter that I want clarified, with regard to that. I intended to raise it under the trade and industry branch, but since the matter has come up now perhaps I could raise it.

In his introductory remarks on page 34 of his prepared script, the hon. Minister was relying, I think, on the table for new establishments shown on page 62 of the *Ontario Industrial Review, 1965*. He stated, and I quote: "Ontario gained 178 new manufacturing establishments last year compared with 163 new branch plants in 1964."

Now this refers, I take it, to page 62 showing new establishments.

The point I want to inquire about is this, Mr. Chairman. It is stated in the note with regard to that table of new establishments that: "This list—" that is the list shown in the 1965 industrial review—"This list consolidates the listings previously reported under 'new branch plant' and 'expansions at new locations'."

So the table in the 1965 annual review consolidates two tables that appeared in the 1964 annual review. The hon. Minister in his statement to the House sort of glossed over that fact. He said: ". . . 178 new manufacturing establishments—" in 1965— ". . . compared with 163 new branch plants in 1964."

You will notice that there is a change in terminology there.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is exactly the same thing, my hon. friend.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute; that is what I want to get at. There is a change in terminology. In the one case it is "new establishments" and in the other it is "new branch plants," which makes the statement technically correct but I think a little misleading unless I have misunderstood the clear words in the *Ontario Industrial Review* itself—in the 1965 *review*—

Mr. Chairman: Order. May I ask the member if this should not properly come under vote 406?

Mr. Bryden: When I started, Mr. Chairman, I said that I had planned to raise it then, but since the hon. Minister has brought it up, perhaps we can get it out of the way. I am half way through it and I might as well finish it off.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I think we can keep better order if we carry on that way.

Mr. Bryden: It was the hon. Minister himself who introduced it.

Mr. Chairman: Unless you are going to be brief.

Mr. Bryden: I have just about finished my point, Mr. Chairman, so I think I might as well finish it off.

If you are going to make a comparison of a table in 1965, which is a consolidation of two tables in 1964 you do not compare it with only one of the 1964 tables but with a total of the two. If you do that, what you find is that the total of new branches and expansions at new locations in 1964 was 163 new branches and 51 expansions at new locations, making a total, all told, of 214. This is 214 plants or expansions, as compared with 178 in 1965, so that the figure did not, in fact, go up from 163 to 178, it went down from 214 to 178.

This did not come out in the hon. Minister's statement, because as I said, he took only one of the two tables that were consolidated into the new table. But surely if you are going to compare a consolidated table with the previous year, you have got to take the two tables of the previous year and add them together.

On that basis, the number is down. I am not making any great point out of this,

but the hon. Minister invited us to look at page 62 of the 1965 review. I looked at page 62 and the information it communicates to me is that there were 178 new branch plants and expansions at new locations in 1965, as compared with 214 in 1964, a decline of 36. I think at least we should get the record straight on this.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can show the hon. member that the record is straight, as far as I am concerned. I will check, between now and the time we get to trade and industry, the question that you have asked, but I can assure you that we had exactly what we have in the book—178 new plants, as against 163 under the same base as last year. About the mathematics, I will have them checked out.

Mr. Bryden: It is not on the same basis. When you get to the mathematics—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The mathematics. I will check out when we get to the trade and industry branch.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister does not need a computer. It is a matter of simple arithmetic, following what is stated right in his own report.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, referring to the matter of regional development itself, we have already discussed the importance of returning to the jurisdiction of this Minister the community planning branch that has drifted away from the department over the years, and is at present being administered by The Department of Municipal Affairs.

The difficulty, as I see it, is that even though there is a co-ordinating committee that is to be set up in the Cabinet, and even though the Minister's own chief economist may be secretary of that committee, it appears that the decisions, or at least the background material that will lead to the decisions, will be made by The Department of Economics and Development and put before the Cabinet committee for ratification, and I suppose if change is obviously needed, it could be done at that level.

But our experience with this in the past, where a Cabinet committee sounds to be a useful tool in co-ordinating the efforts of a number of the Ministers, is that it is far preferable to put the operative branches under one energetic and able Minister, such as the one whose estimates we are discussing at the present time.

We have been discussing the possibility that one arm of regional development, the community planning branch, might be brought back to The Department of Economics and Development. There is another one that should be considered in the same light. I am referring to the branch of The Department of Agriculture, that deals with ARDA. We are familiar with the large sums of federal money that are available for developmental projects, mostly in rural areas across Ontario. The hon. Minister himself has said that he does not see any sense in planning for a dairy farm on the corner of Queen and Yonge. I suppose I would have to agree with him on this. Nevertheless, his responsibilities extend into all parts of the province as far as the development of the regions is concerned.

I believe that the ARDA programme is one of the most effective tools for regional development we have. I believe that under the administration of The Department of Agriculture, we have missed the boat in using this as an effective tool for regional development. He regards it, as the Minister of Agriculture should, I suppose, as something to assist only the farmers in the area, so because of this, we have had the development of community pastures, and projects of this type.

But I believe that the original insight that brought about the ARDA programme—and the Minister knows that this was introduced by some of his party colleagues at the federal level—was far more than this, and that it was to be a tool for regional development. The Minister whose estimates we are discussing right now is responsible for this.

I wonder if he and his advisers, including the chief economist, who is going to have some responsibility in this connection, have ever recommended to him that he go to the hon. Prime Minister and suggest that they might consider taking this responsibility away from the hon. Minister of Food and putting it with the hon. Minister of Development.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot answer for the hon. Minister of Agriculture, but I am sure he can answer that himself. I might say this to you, that during my visit to Ottawa to discuss the designated area programme with Mr. Drury, he brought up the matter of ARDA. In fact, I believe if you checked federal *Hansards,* you would find he made a statement about ARDA money being available even for use for industry in rural areas. We tried to check this out with

his department. Somebody apparently had done it down in Quebec, but the only thing we can find they have done in Quebec with ARDA money, which would come near to what we could call industry, was building a ski lodge in one of the resort areas. Certainly that same money could be used here for the same purpose.

But at the moment, we are looking at the amount of money available from ARDA for the development of rural areas. I have questioned my friends in Agriculture and the hon. Minister and I have discussed whether it is possible under the ARDA programme that money could be made available to help industry go into rural areas. We have one project now that we are looking at, both the Minister of Agriculture and myself, and perhaps within a few days we will get the nod on this. Everything looks like it is going through the Ontario development corporation, the new development corporation, through ARDA and through the Minister's department here. I think perhaps it would be a co-operative effort on the part of both his department and our department to use some ARDA money for helping industry into rural areas.

But just how far we can go remains to be seen, until we have a chance to talk to Ottawa about it. In the meantime, the ARDA programme is directed through my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, and I think until we have had further opportunity to talk to Ottawa about what the money could be used for in other areas, we have to leave it at that.

Mr. Nixon: I know the hon. Minister would agree with me that his responsibilities in regional development far exceed the placement of industry, important though this itself may be. His responsibilities in housing are just another arm, another branch of government that he does in fact operate, that is a part of regional development. I submit that the community planning branch goes along with this very well and that ARDA itself might be exerted as a tool for regional development more effectively through the staff that is responsible to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

In closing my comments on this, it is possible and I guess the policy decision has been made, that a Cabinet committee will coordinate all of these things. But our experience on this side is that the announcement of the committee is one thing, but for it to be a working committee, chaired even by the hon. Prime Minister himself, with all of the hon. Ministers having this dispersed responsibility to come together and act with unity of purpose, is practically impossible. My submission is that if these arms for community development and regional development were placed under one Minister, they would much more effectively serve their purpose.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, to get back to the discussion of regional development, under which the hon. member for Bruce was talking, the hon. Minister pointed out that if you go to page 62 this answers the member for Bruce's indication that regional development is only occurring in one part of Ontario. I have gone through from page 62 to the end and covered the new establishment in Ontario and it says there are 178. In northern Ontario, which represents 12 per cent of the population, only seven new establishments were set up last year, which represents less than four per cent and of the additions of plants and expansions, only eight out of 494 were in northern Ontario, which represents less than two per cent. I think this, therefore, points out that the hon. member for Bruce is correct as far as other parts of Ontario are concerned in comparison to Toronto, and the Minister was wrong in pointing out that the section from page 62 on would answer the member for Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting into another vote. I would suggest I have some figures here I would be glad to release to you when we get to trade and industry, and I think the question the hon. member asked would be better answered in the trade and industry vote, if he does not mind.

Mr. Sargent: In rising to support the hon. member for Brant—I had to step out when he was speaking about ARDA—I would like to ask the hon. Minister about this: I think it is factual that the province of Quebec has spent four times as much on ARDA as the province of Ontario; in other words, they have four times as dynamic a programme in ARDA as we have here. They have spent $1.5 million on research in one area as compared with a research programme here of $187,000. They have 80 specialists and are trying to make this thing work. There must be some reason why there is no dynamic programme here.

Could the hon. Minister tell us why it is not working here?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would suggest that the hon. member discuss that with the hon. Minister of Agriculture; it is under his jurisdiction at the present time. He is quite capable of telling what they have done with the ARDA money and what they intend to do. I would suggest the members discuss it under his vote, it is not my vote.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is up to the hon. Minister; it is part of regional development, especially where it concerns the outlying parts of the province. It is his baby, I would suggest. Regardless of where he wants to lay the blame, somebody has got to accept the blame for it. And nothing is happening.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, I would speak on this if I may. The ARDA directorate is administered under The Department of Agriculture and we would be perfectly happy to discuss the vote at any length when it comes under our department's estimates. I would say this, that with regard to the matter of industrial development there is a fund of $360,000, which is allocated by the federal government at Ottawa to the province of Ontario for industrial development and that amount has been used up already in the province of Ontario for this year. So if the hon. member wants more money to be spent by this Minister, who has done such a fantastic job for industry in the province of Ontario, then he should go to his counterparts at Ottawa and get them to step that $360,000 up to a feasible amount.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: You must understand that you are the ones who are talking about industrial development, and you are asking us to spend this amount of money on a programme that is not working. Do not start laying the blame on Ottawa; they have a plan that is working. The Minister says that now he has been talking to Mr. Drury, he says he is going to see what he can do about designated areas for Ontario. Why did the government not do it five years ago? Why are you always following? Why do you not lead something yourself once in a while? We tell you that the Quebec programme for ARDA is four times as dynamic as Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about ARDA, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I am not going to allow any further discussion on the ARDA programme. It is in order to discuss it when ARDA comes up and it comes up under Agriculture.

Is there any further discussion on item 6 of this 401 vote?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are one or two questions—I had a number of questions but most of them have been answered—with regard to the hon. Prime Minister's statement about the design for development. There are still one or two I would like to ask and since the subject has been dealt with so thoroughly we might as well finish it off now.

I would like to ask, first of all, who are the members of the Cabinet committee which is supposed to be co-ordinating the design for development programme?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The members have not been appointed yet. They have not been named by the hon. Prime Minister yet. They are in the process of doing that now.

Mr. Bryden: It was six weeks ago that this announcement of a design for development was made, Mr. Chairman. I must say I have been wondering all along when we were going to be told about the names of the members of the co-ordinating committee. I had assumed that the committtee was in such high gear that they did not even have time to tell us. But is the hon. Minister seriously suggesting that, after the optimistic, glowing announcement in the old Macaulay tradition was made back on April 5, they have not even gotten into first gear? In fact, they have not even started the engine yet.

As he said himself, at least I think it is a fair inference from his statement, the whole thing really is meaningless without central co-ordination. I did not want to get into the argument a little earlier, but at the present time all the departments are going every which way. Unless we get them all going in the same direction, just nothing is going to happen. As far as I can see from my knowledge of how departments operate, there has to be pretty clear and authoritative direction or they are never going to get into the act. And yet we have not even got the committee.

I suppose then my second question is hardly worth asking. I suppose they also have not got the senior departmental advisory committee that was referred to as their point number two, or as the Prime Minister referred to as his point number two?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I answered that a few minutes ago when I said that the groundwork for setting up the development

programme is well under way. The appointment of the Cabinet committee is the prerogative of the hon. Prime Minister. I am sure he knows who is going to go on the committee and the senior group under him will probably be a senior man out of each Minister's department, but not necessarily so. We may not need a Minister in that Cabinet committee but may need his deputy or one of his senior staff officers.

The programme is working without the Cabinet committee meeting and sitting down and having its picture put in the newspapers. The work is proceeding. The Prime Minister will announce the Cabinet committee in his time, but the work, as far as the regional development association is concerned, is proceeding. It does not mean because we have not announced who is in the Cabinet committee that we are not laying out the programme, that it is not under way. I tell you it is under way.

Mr. Bryden: Either the Cabinet committee has a function or it does not have. Points one and two of the nine points in the Prime Minister's statement were the Cabinet committee and the subordinate departmental committee. We are back now—Mr. Macaulay used to love programmes with varying numbers of points—to one example of that type of programme, a nine-point programme.

One of the points, of course, is merely an expectation and another one is an intention, but the other points really all relate to governmental organization and reorganization, and we have not even started with point one. The Minister says his department is going ahead whether or not all the machinery that the Prime Minister announced in glowing terms has been set up. None of it apparently has been set up. We have not, in fact, even started on the thing, apart from some preliminary surveys that apparently have been made within his own department. Perhaps when we get to the vote relating to the office of the chief economist we might get a little further information as to what sort of surveys are being undertaken.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a most amazing revelation especially in view of the fanfare. Admittedly this did not catch in the press nearly as well as I am sure the government expected, but they certainly expected it to be the big announcement for this year. It is just words like so many announcements—

Mr. MacDonald: They recognized it for what it is worth.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are not interested in words, we are interested in action. That is what we are getting.

Mr. Bryden: Out of nine points you have not done one, yet. That is action?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me tell you something. I have here for your information the project your government ran for 17 years in Saskatchewan. I tell you I have studied it very carefully. Let me just tell you that if we went ahead and did some of the things they did in such a hurry, we would never get off the ground and we would never get re-elected into office.

We are going to put this programme across and we are going to put it across on the right basis. We are not going to rush in for the sake of making headlines. And any contribution I make to a programme is made on the basis it will work and I will not recommend anything to the Prime Minister or the Cabinet until I have a chance to set it up and set it up properly.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why those fellows over there, whenever they get into a corner, always start trying to escape out to Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are not escaping.

Mr. Bryden: I will not discuss Saskatchewan because I believe in staying in order. I could debate it at some length with the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Randall: So could I.

Mr. Bryden: —and ram most of what he said down his throat.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no.

Mr. Bryden: But I am interested in what he is doing, not what has been or may be done in Saskatchewan or any other province. The plain fact is that nothing has been done. He says he is not going to rush ahead just to get a headline. The trouble is those fellows over there sit and shout to get headlines without ever doing anything.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Twenty years—

Mr. Bryden: They make announcements that have no substance to them and they have been doing it year after year. Politically, of course, there is a certain useful purpose in that; it means they can make the same announcement every year for 100 years, because they never do anything anyway.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have been elected every time; we get elected year after year.

Mr. Bryden: This is their other retreat—they keep harping back, they clutch to their bosom the last election. The point is, Mr. Chairman, the election that will count is the next one and that is the one they do not want to have to face.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Want to bet on it?

Mr. Bryden: They have no answers to arguments, they drag in a lot of misinformation about Saskatchewan and then they start shouting about the fact they won the last election. This we know, this the people of Ontario know to their cost, too, but it really has no relation to the matter we are now discussing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If this is misinformation, the member should sue for defamation of character, as what happened in Saskatchewan with the socialist party for 17 years.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I do not know what the Minister is talking about but what he says is misinformation. He has some book there, I do not know what it is, it may be Eaton's catalogue for all I know.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member is always belittling this government but he cannot take criticism himself on his own party's activities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Let us get back to item 5.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 26, by Mr. M. Gaunt:

Resolved:

That, in the opinion of this House, The Farm Products Marketing Act should be amended to provide that, before a local board is dissolved, public hearings be held by a judge in order to determine the facts in issue, and, where the hearings justify dissolution of the local board, that an election be held within 60 days of the dissolution to elect the producer-members of a new local board.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 26, standing in my name, which has just been read.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, divides itself into three parts. The first part is where the farm products marketing board, the government board, and a local marketing board, are in dispute over a number of issues presumably concerning the operation of the local marketing board. If the situation remains unresolved in the mind of the government board, then the government has the recourse of appointing a judge to determine the facts in issue.

Let me stress at this point that the judge, in my view, should not have the power to recommend dissolution or otherwise. If this were so, I could envisage all sorts of problems arising, problems perhaps as great or even greater than the original.

For example, a judge may be appointed in a dispute who does not understand or have very little sympathy for the collective marketing philosophy. Under these conditions, there could be a very real possibility that the decision of the judge, if it were final and binding on both parties, would be unfavourable to the local marketing board. After a series of these, it would undermine the whole marketing structure that has taken years to build.

In my view, we cannot afford to let this happen. It is not likely to happen, but the possibility always exists if the judge's decision is final.

It was therefore my intention, Mr. Speaker, that the judge's role in the affair should be one of fact-finding and putting the facts in their proper perspective, as well as acting as a negotiator in the dispute between the parties. After that his duties are ended. The ultimate decision rests with the government as to whether the dissolution takes place or not. However, the judge's hearings would be subject to the whole controversy of public scrutiny and debate and would serve as a check on rash government action in moving in swiftly to dissolve a local marketing board where disagreements had arisen.

If, in the view of the government, the facts point out very vividly that the local board should be dissolved, then elections must be held within 60 days to elect producer-members of the new local board. This, of course,

gives assurance to the growers affected by the dissolution that the management and operation of their board will be restored to their control within a 60-day period.

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that the system of marketing boards has been used by the farming community to increase its bargaining power in the marketplace, and in some cases with a great deal of success. At the present time, the acceptance of the marketing board concept has been, generally speaking, well accepted by agriculture. Indeed, in Ontario we are utilizing this system to a much greater degree than any other province in Canada. Thirty-six farm products are being marketed through 18 marketing plans, operating under The Farm Products Marketing Act. Approximately 75 per cent of producers are organized under the various marketing plans through which more than 60 per cent of the total value of agricultural production is sold within the province.

The Ontario farmer has accumulated considerable experience and attained a relatively high degree of sophistication in the field of orderly marketing. To say that marketing boards in this province are important to farming, both in terms of adding bargaining power in the marketplace and in terms of the implementation of planned production within the industry itself, is certainly the understatement of the year. However, it seems to me that a continuous experience in reviewing and updating our marketing legislation should take place in the light of experience and present conditions.

In this connection, it seems to me that the entire Farm Products Marketing Act should be revised, because it has become a piece of legislation which is a result of deletions and amendments to the point of being a hodgepodge piece of machinery designed to facilitate farmers to market millions of dollars worth of their produce.

What I am saying is that we are attempting in this province to shove marketing of agricultural products through on a piece of legislation that is long overdue for updating.

I will not get into the whole broad area of what should be embraced in a revised Farm Products Marketing Board Act, but of course, one of the important things is, in my view, the principle embodied in my resolution, where the local board, threatened with dissolution, at least has recourse to a judge being appointed to determine the facts in issue. Dissolution could not take place unless a judge had been appointed in the case.

Let us use as an example, the bean board dispute. And I make no apologies because this is the one dispute where my resolution and the implementation of it would have prevented some rather embarrassing problems cropping up as far as the government is concerned. Without reviewing the entire controversy in detail over the several years it took place, I want to touch on several of the vital points – the controversy which remains unanswered in the eyes of the farmer, the bean growers board and, indeed in the eyes of many of the bean growers. The government condoned the use of the check-off to subsidize losses of the bean company for several years, and it appears that when the company started to make money—albeit small amounts—the Ontario farm products marketing board started pressuring them to separate the company from the board, declaring it was illegal for the check-off money to go for the subsidization of the company. This was, I repeat again, after the company started making money. This was the crux of the entire controversy which has waged over the past several years.

The bean board has consistently refused to separate the board and the company, and this action was apparently sanctioned by the growers although they later voted not to extend facilities.

The government hired Price Waterhouse to study operations of the board and the company, and this report justified the government's stand in the matter. The bean board then set up their own study on the Price Waterhouse report which refuted about everything that was said by Price Waterhouse. The Ontario farm products marketing board had worked out—and this is later on—the Ontario farm products marketing board had worked out an 11 point programme with the bean board and nine of the 11 points had been undertaken by the growers board. The last two points were tabled, according to members of the bean board, to allow newly elected board members to deal with them. The motion was tabled at the meeting of the board, I believe, on November 25. The minutes of this meeting were sent in to the government, and would be in the hands of the Ontario farm products marketing board no later than December 20. But the board did not take action until February 22 or, at least, the government did not take action until February 22.

In the interim the Minister had allowed a vote of the growers to allow the board to

build additional facilities with the check-off. After the vote failed to get the required 66⅔ majority support, the Minister moved in and placed the board in trusteeship on February 22, as I said. This raises some very important considerations.

One of the reasons for dissolution was the fact the Minister felt the board had rejected the final two points of the agreement; one of which was to separate the company and the board. And the bean board, in his view, showed its rejection by tabling the motion. But that was on November 25.

Now, where was my hon. friend from that date until the date he decided to allow the bean growers to vote on more facilities? My friend claims he knew nothing of the tabling motion. If this is so, then all I can say is that communication in the department, between the farm products marketing board and his office, have broken down almost to the point of being impossible. Perhaps the farm products marketing board didn't read the minutes or, if they did, they didn't understand them.

All I am trying to do is rationalize the Minister's action. However that is, at this point, impossible. All one can hope to do is to guess at the reasoning behind the action. But it certainly does not seem to be based on any kind of logic. I hope my friend did not feel that before the vote he could not have gotten away with this kind of action, but after the vote he decided the growers were divided and this was the time to move in.

Another reason for the Minister's action, according to his statement, was that the floor price for beans should be higher. In effect the board had cost the bean growers millions of dollars because the floor price was too low. As an aside to this, the Minister has repeatedly stated that there is a market over in Britain for the asking and the main reason why our exports to Britain of white beans have gone up only 7 per cent in the past ten years, as compared in the same period to 66 per cent for the United States lies at the doorstep of the bean board.

One point I would like to interject at this stage is to ask if indeed the farm products marketing board have the responsibility to see that growers get the highest prices possible for their produce. Or, is this the responsibility of the local board who have to submit themselves to re-election periodically? Perhaps the farm products marketing board does have the responsibility to the growers, and if it does, then I suggest that the job cannot be done adequately with one full-time chairman, and four part-time members.

The Minister has claimed that the basic reasons for placing the board in trusteeship were: 1—the bean board had failed to get the best possible prices for beans; 2—it had no intention of ever separating the board and the company; and, 3—it had been losing out on a very lucrative market in Great Britain.

All of these reasons have been refuted by the board. How then would the resolution apply in this situation? First of all, before the government could have placed the bean board in trusteeship, it would have to place the whole matter before a judge to determine the facts in issue. That is step one. Step two could be for the government and the bean board to discuss the facts in issue that separate the two points of view. Perhaps the judge could act as a negotiator in such circumstances. Perhaps this could be compared to labour negotiations and conciliation. It is not quite the same but there are similarities. Step three, if it is obvious that dissolution is the only solution after the steps have been taken, then the government can then, and only then, take over the operations of the board. If it does so, elections must be held within 60 days from dissolution.

The obvious purpose of this resolution is to provide a check on the government power in dealing with the growers marketing board where disagreements have arisen.

When this power to dissolve was placed in marketing legislation, it was promised it would never be used. The fact of the matter is that the government could use this power to—what I might call—rape the bean board in a less-than-dignified manner. I want to make sure that this does not happen again to any marketing board. Surely these differences that are bound to come up from time to time can be settled in a fashion which would not require this type of action. However, it has happened once, and it could happen again.

It has been suggested that a standing committee of all the chairmen of the various marketing boards, with the chairman of that standing committee being the director of marketing in the Ontario federation of agriculture, be established to hear and resolve disputes arising between the Ontario farm products marketing board and the local board. Frankly, I am interested in coming up with the best system possible which will give some protection to the local board, and be in the long run in the best interests of

agriculture in the province. That being so, I would be in agreement with anything that would accomplish this purpose in relation to appeal procedures as they relate to local boards.

The intent, then, of this resolution, is to build, if you like, appeal procedures into The Farm Products Marketing Board Act where the Ontario farm products marketing board and a local board are in dispute, and the local board is in danger of being placed in trusteeship. Let me stress, and I want to underscore this emphatically, Mr. Speaker, that this method of appeal would apply only in a dispute between the farm products marketing board and the local board, and this method of appeal should not be extended beyond this.

For instance, a grower who feels he has had an injustice done to him by a local board, has already clearly defined methods of appeal. It is not intended to interfere with this. So, I underscore again, that this resolution would only deal in respect to appeals to a situation involving the Ontario farm products marketing board and the local board.

In the light of what I have said, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude and I want to urge all hon. members to support this resolution.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, in the course of his remarks the hon. member for Huron-Bruce accused the government of raping the bean board in a less-than-dignified manner. You will forgive me if I find myself preoccupied for a moment or so in trying to figure out how you would rape the bean board in a dignified manner.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): It can be done —the hon. Minister did it.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not sure which was done but perhaps we can agree there was a rape.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): With consent.

Mr. MacDonald: With consent—that is the suggestion of the hon. member for Halton. However, let me get down to the substance of this resolution. The hon. member for Huron-Bruce started out by discussing the mechanism that he is advocating in the course of his resolution and from that he moved to some general comments on farm marketing, and then back to the details of the bean board situation.

I want to reverse the process. I want to discuss first, briefly, what I think are some relevant considerations with regard to farm marketing generally in the province of Ontario and out of that I can make the comments that I would like with regard to this resolution.

I want to suggest that the setup of farm products marketing boards in the province of Ontario is wrong, basically wrong in principle, and a lot of our difficulties are flowing from that situation.

The whole purpose of farm products marketing boards is to give to farmers the collective bargaining strength that in general terms is given to trade unions through The Labour Relations Act.

That simply means then, Mr. Speaker, that you are going to give delegated powers from this Legislature, through a piece of legislation, to a group of farmers so that they can exercise those delegated powers in strengthening their bargaining when they go into the marketplace against the greater market strength of corporate enterprises.

However, that is not what has happened in the province of Ontario. What has happened in the province of Ontario is that the government has gradually taken away the control of marketing from the producers so that we have not in any real sense got producer-controlled marketing in this province at all. We have state-controlled marketing. And that control is exercised through the Ontario farm products marketing board. The correct setup, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you, is that if this government wanted to give delegated powers to the farmer, it is our responsibility in the Legislature to pass whatever Act we want, The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act. And in it we spell out the limits of that power that we are willing to give to the farmers.

If in the course of their exercising that power, in our belief, we feel that they have exceeded it, it is our privilege at any time when this House is in session, to add to or to subtract from that power through amendments to The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act.

Now, the difference between these two approaches, Mr. Speaker, is simply that in the one you treat individuals as grown-up, free men and you give them power and the right to exercise it. If they abuse that power, then we correct it in terms of the legislative designation of the power.

In the other instance, you give the power but the exercise of it is restricted and

shackled by a governing agency, the Ontario farm products marketing board, so that every individual exercise of power has to be rubber-stamped by the Ontario farm products marketing board at Queen's Park.

They are not treated as free men, grown-up, who are supposed to act like adults. They are treated like little children who cannot be trusted on any particular occasion. Mr. Speaker, this is a fundamental violation of the basic principles of a democratic society. Yet, this is the kind of a situation we have gotten ourselves in in the province of Ontario.

However, having stated the case or, at least, given my analysis of it, Mr. Speaker, within the existing setup how are we going to cope with difficulties when they arise between the local marketing board and the government agency which is really in control of the situation and acting as an agent of this government?

Its quasi-judicial functions are really secondary to its functions of fulfilling the policy as laid down by this government. It is not in any real sense a genuinely independent agency.

If difficulties arise between this agency of the government and the local marketing board, how are you going to resolve them? I have been interested to learn that there is growing in farm circles, particularly in those sections of farm circles that have direct relation to the 18-20-odd marketing boards at the present time, the feeling that one way in which you might avoid a situation going from bad to worse, is to establish a committee. It would be made up of the chairman of the marketing board or his deputy, so that if difficulties arose between the Ontario farm products marketing board and the local board, this group of all the other marketing board chairmen could be brought in to examine the situation, to make their recommendations, in the hope that they could perform a conciliating role.

Conceivably they might then be able to avoid the situation degenerating to the kind of place where it is explosive and leads to the kind of action that took place in the instance of the bean board. Although such a committee may have some merit, Mr. Speaker, it is not likely going to cope with every situation. We have had two situations in the last six or eight years in the province of Ontario where such an atmosphere of distrust grew up between the local marketing board and this government and indeed, the rest of the farming community, that I do not think you could have persuaded the local marketing board to accept mediation that represented any serious encroachment on the position that they had taken.

I am referring to the hog marketing battle a few years ago and to the bean board situation in recent times. Therefore, it may well be that if even though you had a committee to provide a conciliating role, you might ultimately have to have the kind of machinery the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has incorporated in his resolution to deal with that situation.

I was rather interested in the reaction of those 250 or more farm leaders who were drawn together in a meeting by this government in the Royal York hotel following the bean board dissolution. After they had learned the details on one hand of the government's assessment of what had taken place, then only belatedly in the meeting did somebody ask: "Well, is it not possible to hear the other side of the story?" The chairman of the meeting, the Deputy Minister, said that he had no objection.

Mr. Allen, the former chairman of the bean marketing board, stood up and gave his version of the story. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced I am not misrepresenting the situation when I say that the overwhelming majority of people in that meeting were not at that point persuaded that the government's action was a valid action when they had heard both sides of the story.

I am not suggesting that there were differences. And I am not suggesting that in some way you would have to mediate those differences, but certainly when you heard the other side of the story, for which there has not been any adequate publicity, it was difficult to justify the kinds of ruthless, arbitrary action which this government had engaged in.

Indeed, I was very interested in one contradictory set of statements that was made by the chairman of the meeting that day. On one occasion, he went out of his way to extoll the members of the bean board as being honourable men. He did not question their sincerity; he painted them as good fellows. But subsequently in the meeting somebody got up and said: Look, you had differences with the bean boards, but instead of acting this way, why didn't you in effect say to them that, as of such-and-such a date, you either do what we have said must be done or else you are going to be put under—your board is going to be dissolved? And what was the answer of the chairman? The answer of

the chairman was: Well, if we had done that, when we got to their office we may have found that many of the books were gone and we would not have got the whole story.

So these honourable men were in fact being regarded by the government in such a manner that they had to pull off this Latin-American coup approach — of inviting the members of the bean board into a hotel room down in London and when they had gotten them down there, then the police and others moved in, or whoever it was that moved in, to in effect take over the establishment of the bean board.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Good schemers, the government!

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, it was good scheming. As a matter of fact, there is considerable—

Mr. Nixon: In a dignified way.

Mr. Singer: That is what makes it dignified.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, perhaps—I had not thought of that. This is the difference between a dignified and an undignified rape.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the government does move in the fashion that it has moved, another thing that I draw to the attention of the House and ask them to contemplate for just a moment, is the offensive nature of the actions that a trustee appointed by this government has to take.

Surely the function of a local board is for a group of producers to come together and to set up the kind of structure that they want. When the government, or its agency, the Ontario farm products marketing board does not like that structure, what has happened in the bean board instance is that they move in, they put it under trusteeship, and then proceed to reshape the whole structure, and hand it back to the farmers.

This is supposed to be democracy. This is supposed to be the manifestation of an exercise of democracy by a group of responsible citizens, and I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, how incredible, how preposterous it has been in one respect, in the instance of the current trusteeship over the bean board.

There has been a great argument in co-op circles of recent years as to the question of whether or not there is a serious contradiction in terms of establishing a compulsory co-operative. The argument has arisen because in the very nature of a co-operative, from the days of the Rochdale beginnings, it had to be a voluntary organization. So how could you introduce in any sense, compulsion into a voluntary organization?

Well, this is a complex problem, which in modern economic conditions we have had to face. The trade union movement is basically a voluntary organization, but when you get into the union shop, or the closed shop, and various degrees of that, at some stage the majority rules and the minority has to go along, so you have some qualification on the voluntary nature of it. We are now facing that problem in seeking to merge co-operative principles to marketing. I can think of many speeches that have been given by Ralph Staples from Ottawa as to the dilemma involved in compulsory co-operatives.

But, Mr. Speaker, can you think of anything more preposterous than a compulsory co-operative being set up, not by a majority of the producers, not by a majority of the farmers involved, but by this government? A trusteeship was set up, and that trusteeship goes in, reshapes the whole organization and it imposes a compulsory co-operative. Surely that is about as complete a violation of basic principles involved as you could have. Yet this is the kind of thing that happens, when the government takes over as it did in the instance of the bean board.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the general objective that has been spelled out in this resolution by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce. In those instances when differences between the local board, and the Ontario farm products marketing board cannot be mediated, by the kind of body that I envisaged a few moments ago, when the situation degenerates to the point where you have conflict and argument over basic facts of the kind that emerged in the bean board; where you had the Price Waterhouse report on one hand, and you had a reply—in my view a devastating reply that tore the Price Waterhouse report in shreds—obviously you have got to have an independent outsider come in and assess what is right and what is wrong.

The proposal of my hon. friend is that it should be a judge. I have only this one qualification that I would like to add, and that is that if a judge is appointed, his role is to be not that of a passive commissioner who accepts the evidence, but rather of an active investigator who goes in and gets more information if it is necessary, to reconcile the conflict between the evidence. Because it

would be rather difficult, for example, for a judge to be handed the Price Waterhouse report, and the counter-report that was prepared by the bean board, and to be able to reconcile it just from the evidence he had there. He would have to go in and do further investigation, and I think that kind of a role has to be laid down.

Second, of course, if you are going to have a judge move in in this fashion and if dissolution of the board is going to be contemplated, surely there should be time limits put on so that you do not take the democratic process away from the farmers for an indefinite period.

I was interested, as a final comment, in the wrinkle that my hon. friend introduced, namely, that the judge should not have the power to make a report that would be final and binding.

Indeed, I think, in a rather confusing way, he had the judge acting as the conciliator; and quite frankly, I lost him at that point. I do not think the judge can perform that kind of a role. But on one thing I did agree, that his report would not necessarily be final and binding. It would be a report that would clarify the issue for the farmers and the public, and leave the final responsibility with the government to take the action, because they are then going to have to suffer the consequences.

Too much has happened in this province to let this government come up with a technique, in effect, that they would fix the responsibility for dissolving marketing boards —particularly if it is going to be a judge who might be basically not in sympathy with farm marketing—and then they could just fold their hands and say: "We did not do it, the judge did it."

No, let us keep the responsibility where it stands, because I think the farmers are finally wakening up to this government and its treatment of them, and let us not now pass it off to anybody else.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we would support the resolution that the hon. member has introduced, with the minor qualifications that I have suggested in my concluding remarks.

Mr. Singer: We are not going to get the hon. Minister of Agriculture into this debate.

Mr. R. Welch (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the hon. member for Downsview, perhaps coming from the area that I do, I would like to take part in this debate of the resolution of the member for Huron-Bruce, and perhaps the member for York South has provided the—

Mr. Singer: Are we not going to hear from the hon. Minister of Agriculture?

An hon. member: This is private members' hour.

Mr. Singer: Are Ministers not members, too?

Mr. Speaker. Order!

Mr. Welch: —introduction into this particular discussion for me, when he insists that we leave the power for dissolving boards where they are. I might say that on that particular point, and only that point, I would like to agree with him, because that is where it is, and that is where I think it should be left. I would like to document in the time which is allowed to me, the case why I feel that we should do this.

Reference, of course, is made to section 6 of the present Act, The Farm Products Marketing Act of the province, and, in particular, subsection 1 (g) which now leaves with the Lieutenant-Governor the power to make resolutions for the dissolving of these local boards.

When one listens to the reasons given by the proposer of this particular resolution, I cannot help but think that he too agrees that that is where we should leave it, because he makes quite a point out of insisting that the ultimate decision must be with the government, so perhaps we all three have agreed at least in this resolution, that all three say that the ultimate decision is with the government. Because the hon. member for Huron-Bruce is very careful to say that really all this official is going to do is act as a fact-finder, and perhaps a negotiator, he really will not be able to make any recommendation, or take the position of making the order for dissolution. This must, of course, be left with the government.

For fear I missed this point during the course of my discussion on this very important resolution insofar as it affects the livelihood and the future of the agricultural people from the riding of Lincoln and, indeed, from the whole province, may I say that we already have a suggestion with respect to the type of body the members of which would be better qualified and very competent to act in this negotiable role, or this role of advice or communication between the Ontario farm products marketing board and the member commodity board in making

reference to that particular committee to which the hon. member for York South has already referred.

I want to come back to that, in a moment. For it seems to me that in discussing this we should in fact confine ourselves to the principle of the resolution. I do not pretend to know all the facts in connection with the action taken by the government insofar as the bean board is concerned. I have studied reports of the solicitors to the chairman of the board, and the account.

I think, perhaps, the record should be clear that I know my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce did not intend to mislead the House during the course of his remarks, but I know that the government, and I think we should make this point clear, never did condone the use of check-off funds to offset losses of the bean company. This was the very basis, indeed, of the long-standing dispute. The bean board, as I read these facts, refused to separate and desist from using these licence fees to offset the losses. And I think that point should be kept quite clear and perhaps the record could be clarified from that particular point.

The member for York South makes quite a case out of insisting that the government has run roughshod over these local boards, that the local boards are the victim of this terrible government, and in particular, this Minister. It is about time, and I welcome this opportunity, that some of us stood up in this House and put an end to this attempt to deface and defame and to hold up this Minister of Agriculture in the way that the Opposition has done throughout this province. I, for one, representing the county of Lincoln and its rural people, want to say that they stand behind him 100 per cent in the action which he takes to preserve their very way of life, and in preserving the methods which they have through this board.

I think it is a disgrace the way we have treated this Minister throughout the province in this matter. Mr. Speaker, the member for York South, as I have already stated, takes quite a bit of the time of the House today to show some reasons for the ruthless action—and they are his words, not mine—of the government with respect to the attitude toward these boards.

I come from an area where the boards are quite happy with what the government is doing on their behalf, and perhaps it is about time we read into the record and document the case on behalf of these poor boards, of which the member for York South, himself, would like to pretend he is the saviour in this House. May I say, without any question, and without any fear of contradiction, the member for York South does not speak for the growers of the riding of Lincoln and I doubt that he speaks for any of the producers in the province of Ontario. No doubt, this where the rub is.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Welch: The member for York South says I do not know what I am talking about. Perhaps he will sit back and listen to the evidence with respect to the attitude of the people who are in some of these commodity boards. May I refer for this information to an editorial which appeared in *The Grower* of March, 1966.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the poorest one to which to make reference.

Mr. Welch: The member for York South says this is the poorest one to which to make reference because he is not treated too kindly in this particular editorial. I did not mean to underline this, because I do not wish to introduce personalities into a debate on second reading of a principle of a very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, under the heading of "Unwarranted interference" there is some reference to the fact that there is a suspicion on the part of the growers of my area, and particularly the editorial writers, that there may be those who are attempting to make some political advantage out of the situation. I would not think that would be at all attributable to the member for York South; not at all. The editorial writer here says:

> It is not our desire to get involved in the problem of the Ontario bean growers marketing board, other than to say that there is reason to believe that some of those who have intruded are now playing the game of politics.

Mr. MacDonald: What does he think his hon. Minister was doing?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Welch: Continuing to quote:

> To anyone really concerned with the welfare of agriculture or of any segment within agriculture, the last thing that is desired in disputes, such as occur from time to time within the marketing board, is the introduction of party politics.

They are making some reference, I think, to the member for York South.

The conclusion is that this individual—

and they have been referring to the member for York South up to this time:

—is not concerned with the welfare of agriculture.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Welch: Still quoting:

His one and only concern is votes, even if those votes are born out of false images. There is a serious difference of opinion within the ranks of the bean growers. That it can be resolved is obvious if the people concerned are given the time and opportunity of ironing out their differences.

Those who are seeking to make political hay out of the bean board dispute are guilty of interference of the worst kind. They do nothing to advance the cause of compulsory marketing.

The Ontario farm products marketing board was set up to supervise the operations of the various boards operating under The Farm Products Marketing Act, for it was realized at the start, and has been basic ever since, that the boards cannot be a law unto themselves. They must operate within the terms of the Act and the regulations under the Act. This is recognized by all those who waged the good fight, and secured the much-valued legislation.

They also realize that when one board goes off the deep end, the whole structure of organized marketing is jeopardized. The legislation prevails because most of those who had been involved were content to use it for what it was intended—a protective device by which the farming community could help itself. No one group can be permitted to injure or destroy, especially if they are sided in their disputes by people who never operated under one of the boards, or by people who never grew a cabbage or a peach.

When disputes arise within the board, or within the confines of any one board, they should be resolved by the farmers involved under the terms of the legislation which makes their operations possible. There should be a picket line against interference by politicians, especially those who hope there may be a few votes at the other end of the line.

The following month, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the following month, in the same paper, *The Grower*—and one might get the impression that this is a very important publication in my area because there are a great many marketing schemes in the riding of Lincoln—there are expressions of opinion and we will document them from some of these particular boards that the hon. member for York South is so concerned about. I think perhaps if he was really concerned about these boards, he might well have consulted with them to see whether or not they felt the way he feels about the board.

Mr. MacDonald: I have, and that is why I said what I did.

Mr. Welch: We have here a statement by Mr. Sandham of the Ontario fresh growers marketing board which is editorialized in this same paper. He points out to the critics of the action taken by the government that they failed to realize that the operators of all marketing boards in Ontario are bound to observe the terms of The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act which defines the jurisdictions and modes of operation, which is a better way of saying no individual and no board is above the law—they must obey the law. I think this is a very important consideration which is being—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is certainly picking and choosing among the editorials.

Mr. Welch: The responsibility of policing —and we go on to repeat this, Mr. Speaker —the responsibility of policing the operations under the Act falls on the Ontario farm products marketing board. It is not an enviable job, especially when individual marketing boards undertake to exceed the powers given them by the Act.

They make some reference to Mr. J. M. Sandham, who is secretary-treasurer of the Ontario fresh fruit growers marketing board, a very valued leader in the marketing board in my area.

Mr. Sandham's interest is that of an official of one of the boards. He along with many others realizes the dangers when the Act is placed in jeopardy by those who try to proceed beyond the powers given. Mr. Sandham knows full well that any threat to the Act is a threat to those boards who are doing a commendable job within the framework of the Act. And

> he says *The Grower* is to be commended for its action in taking issue with at least one of the critics, especially when that critic fails to realize all the implications and the threat to the legislation which has accomplished so much for so many over the years.

Credit from *The Grower* giving full credit to what has been accomplished by the present Act to which references have already been made.

> It is this threat that has created the interest in the whole matter. If there is any criticism of the Ontario farm products marketing board and The Department of Agriculture, it is that summary action was not taken sooner. No local marketing board is a law unto itself; this is basic to an understanding of the powers contained in the Act, for when a local board steps beyond the powers granted it, the only alternative is the imposition of the required disciplinary measure.

And so one could quote from this same editorial where you see the department is not being criticized nor is the Ontario farm products marketing board being criticized for taking action. They say if there is any criticism at all it is unfortunate that action was not taken even sooner.

In view of these particular editorials the reaction to this from some responsible people—

Mr. Singer: Just table the editorials and we will read them later.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not give the reaction of others?

Mr. Speaker. Order.

Mr. Welch: The Ontario fruit and vegetable growers association, a very important organization within the area which I am privileged to represent, over the signature of the secretary-treasurer Mr. Wilson has indicated to the Minister in a letter—a copy of which I have—that that association wants to reiterate the two editorials in *The Grower* to which I have made reference, supporting the government authority to take over a marketing board if and when deviations from the Act occur.

The most recent one, and that is the one on half-truths and biased reporting which I have just quoted from, was sent to local newspapers because it expresses the viewpoint of us in this matter and our support—the support of the Ontario fruit and vegetable growers association—of The Farm Products Marketing Act in its present form.

The suggestion of a judicial board, and this has bearing on the principle of the resolution of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, the suggestion of a judicial board is not supported by the commodity groups involved by the marketing of fruits and vegetables as it would interfere with the present authority of the board and the Act.

The board deals with principles and how specifics would affect a principle; a judicial board says this would be the reverse and deal with specifics and not principles, thus weakening the overall concept of marketing legislation.

For these basic reasons the fruit and vegetable commodity marketing boards do not support any changes to the present Act in the form of a judicial board, and at the same time support the action of our Minister and the farm products marketing board in its dealings with the bean board.

Then the Ontario fresh fruit growers marketing board just completed a vote not too long ago, enthusiastically and overwhelmingly supported by the growers in the area, and passed a resolution last Monday which is worded:

> Resolved that this board supports the action of the Minister of Agriculture and the farm products marketing board in the recent bean dispute and that this board express its satisfaction with the appeal procedures presently embodied in The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when one presumes to speak on behalf of these poor downtrodden commodity groups I would think there would be some need to consult with them to find out what they think about the legislation which governs and disciplines them under the law of this particular province.

What are we talking about here with respect to this resolution that could not now be accomplished through some procedures which are already here? I ask you as a rhetorical question, Mr. Speaker, how could any judge not trained in or really conversant with the intricacies of this matter be in any better position to adjudicate or to fulfil the role which the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has already said is merely one of fact-finding, merely one of negotiating? How could any judge do it any better than (a) either the Ontario farm products marketing board itself, (b) the Minister of Agriculture and indeed the government? Actually, we all agree that the government must take this responsibility.

Reference has been made to this meeting of the commodity groups which was held on May 9. The commodity groups are all listed here—and it is interesting to note as I now quote these references: ". . . that the bean growers were there and the hog producers were there . . . " All the commodity groups were in Toronto at this meeting on May 9. As far as this particular committee is concerned, the committee to which the hon. member for York South makes reference, I think in fairness it should be pointed out that the whole suggestion that the chairmen of these particular commodity boards form such a committee came from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture of this province.

It was his suggestion that was placed before this meeting for the discussion of the representatives. The minutes, if you wanted to consult them, are available.

It was Mr. Biggs who reported that there might be a committee set up consisting of the presidents of commodity groups. This was the subject matter and this was how this particular matter was in fact introduced. It was not just to settle disputes though. It was also to be available as a medium of communication so that there could be some discussion, and there could be this type of relationship between the committee and the Ontario farm products marketing board.

So impressed were the representatives at this meeting on May 9—and I repeat, all the commodity sections of the Ontario federation of agriculture, all were there discussing this —that a resolution was passed by these people. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the House would like to have this on the record:

> Resolved that a standing committee consisting of the chairman, or his appointee, of each board established under The Farm Products Marketing Act and The Milk Act 1965, be constituted. The director of marketing shall be the chairman. The farm products marketing board and the milk commission of Ontario may refer problems arising between the farm products marketing board and the local boards and between the milk commission and the marketing boards to this committee for consideration, consultation and recommendation.

Mr. Singer: They all want—

Mr. Welch: There are some comments here with respect to the attitude of the chairman of the Ontario farm products marketing board, Mr. Arbuckle, and also the chairman of the Ontario milk commission, Mr. McKay.

Following this discussion there was a further resolution, once again passed by all the representatives of all the commodity boards of OFA—the bean people, all these people here. This is what they say, and I think this makes much more of an impression, surely, I hope on government than these other comments, which have been made completely unrelated to the feeling and attitude of those who are working with this legislation and who are working with these schemes. Here once again:

> Resolved that this meeting recommends—

listen, and I think this is very relevant to the principle of our bill:

> —that this meeting recommends the continuance of the present system of hearing appeals by the Ontario farm products marketing board and the milk commission of Ontario and that there be no change in the existing provisions of The Farm Products Marketing Act and The Milk Act 1965 with respect to appeals.

Here, once again, the people themselves, these boards, who are being so disregarded by government, are themselves speaking here at a meeting as recently as May 9 and passing resolutions for their own benefit along these particular lines as to how they see this whole matter could, in fact, be operated in the best interests of us all.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that one could go on. I agree with the hon. member for Huron-Bruce and join with him in this common concern that we protect the marketing legislation which has been provided for our agricultural people in this province.

We have heard from many quarters the great stress and strain which is placed on those who look to agriculture for their livelihood and I tell you their salvation is in orderly marketing. I do not want to be a party to any resolution which would do anything to undermine good farm marketing legislation insofar as this province is concerned. I am satisfied, as I presume to represent many people from the county of Lincoln, I am satisfied that they are happy with the present and I find from them no screams to throw out the present Act as the hon. member for Huron-Bruce wants to do, and write a brand new one, because they are quite happy that they have always had an ear at Queen's Park.

When they brought their amendments or

suggested changes they have been incorporated in the legislation. I think it goes without saying that as one documents all the evidence which is now before us, it is about time we had the expression of confidence that I hope I have been able to voice to the hon. Minister of Agriculture of this province and his department who have been working with these commodity people. So on May 9, they stood, as do many of our people, to support him in the actions which he has taken in his attempt to preserve what they consider to be very basic to their livelihood and to their way of life.

I would urge this House not to support the resolution in its present form. There are other ways and another manner in which we can provide for the consultation which obviously the hon. member for Huron-Bruce wants, in keeping with the desires of the commodity people themselves.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): I will be brief, Mr. Speaker. I rise to say that I will support the resolution of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce. This all originated under the late bean growers takeover last February and I might say that I am disappointed in what the hon. member for Lincoln has just said. I think that in a democracy, when a board is taken over, there should be a place to go to appeal.

I would ask every member of the Legislature to support this resolution. We do not want any more bean board takeovers in the province of Ontario.

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

No. 115



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 19, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 19, 1966

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 3705

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3737

Appendix "A" 3738

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and tonight we have a number of groups—some in the Speaker's gallery whose name I do not have; under the Speaker's gallery on the east side, members of the Don Mills Progressive-Conservative riding association, and under the Speaker's gallery on the west side, the executive members of the YPCs from that great city of Oshawa.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I would like to advise you and the House, that the distinguished looking group in the Speaker's gallery is the Scarborough North NDP association.

Mr. Speaker: We are very pleased to have the NDP group from Scarborough present.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order: House in committee of supply; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*continued*)

On vote 401:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak on item 5 here, does the hon. Minister know which regional associations are going to be concentrating their efforts in the tourist industry only?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Would the hon. member repeat that? I did not hear him.

Mr. Newman: Which regional development associations will be concentrating all of their efforts in the tourist development phase?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They will be working with the tourist associations but they are not concentrating all of their efforts on tourism.

Mr. Newman: Some of them will be concentrating their efforts primarily on tourism because they see that their development will be essentially in the tourist industry. I am thinking that The Department of Tourism and Information has regional tourist associations. If the associations are going to concentrate their efforts in tourism, then would not this grant given to this development association be better off given to the tourist development association so that funds could be funnelled into the proper type of endeavour, and so that they could concentrate their efforts on tourism rather than on industry?

We know well that certain areas of the province are not going to attract industry to any extent, whereas there is some hope for them in the tourist trade.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the hon. member is right. In some areas the development of the tourist business will be the main objective, but any fund here that will lend itself to the development of tourism through the regional development association, will be used in that direction.

Also the tourist councils themselves have a direct grant from the tourist and industry branch and they are performing a specialized function. I would think that if they have sufficient money to operate their branch in conjunction with ours—and the two will be working together, as we said this afternoon —so if the grants that we are making toward the regional development association is in an area where tourism is more prominent than in the next area, it is obvious that the regional development association there will be giving its services in that direction and trying to develop the potential of the area for tourism.

Mr. Newman: But there is a duplication of services, though, because this is being taken care of by the Department of Tourism and Information and here it is again in the hon. Minister's department, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not say that it is a duplication of services. It is one of the projects we have already discussed with the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information as to how best we can utilize the people now in the field on tourism as well as regional development to make sure that we do not have an overlapping jurisdiction.

I think you will find when we get through, that the tourist councils are going to be very closely related to these regional development councils. They have been already working with them.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister has two sets of people doing the job, why is it not a duplication? How are they broken down?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not going to answer for the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information; he has already answered that. I am only suggesting that tourism has been a specialized development by the tourist industry branch to work on tourism and tourism only. This development council here is going to be looking at the entire potential of the area and will work with the tourist council. There are sufficient funds in it. If tourism is going to be developed, naturally this is where the energy is going to be, and I do not think that there is any duplication. They will be working together as a team; that is part of the object.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may follow on a different topic. The St. Clair regional development association has not, to date, been able to make itself appealing enough to have the city of Windsor become directly involved. Now the doxiadis studies that were conducted by Wayne University concerning the megalopolis that would extend from Minneapolis and St. Paul through to Toronto indicates that the city of Windsor will be playing a very important part in this development. Would grants be available if the city was interested in joining with their counterparts across the river with the city of Detroit in furthering their economic future by being a member of an association in the United States, rather than being directly connected with the St. Clair?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not think so. What I would like to do is to take the question under advisement. I will check it out and see if there would be any merit in it. Right now, I would say that there is no provision for us to provide money for the city of Windsor to join forces with the city of Detroit.

Mr. Chairman: On section 6:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, on section 6, are any funds included there for Sheridan Park development?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. Nixon: Where is the hon. Minister asking for the funds for the research foundation building in Sheridan Park? Has that been previously voted?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was voted last year. There are no funds this year; it went through in last year's estimates.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister mentioned that the entrances were going to be improved and landscaped. Was this all paid for in last year's vote?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That money was made available when the government purchased the land. The money was incorporated in there to do the landscaping. The money that was advanced for developing Sheridan Park was available; it is in that amount of money and it is already taken care of in last year's vote.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Minister have any plans for industrial parts of centres other than Sheridan Park?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The answer is yes and no. Let me try to qualify it. We have had some inquiries from research organizations who would like to have a pilot manufacturing plant close to their research. There is no provision for that, of course, in Sheridan Park. It is one of the developments that we are now looking at to see if, when Sheridan Park is completed, we could give consideration to setting up combination research and manufacturing. I say sophisticated manufacturing. You wouldn't want smoke belching out of chimneys—it would be highly sophisticated manufacturing in a research area. I would think that when we have completed Sheridan Park we will be looking at other areas to see if we can continue with the same kind of a project. I think there are enough prospects around for us to do so.

Mr. Nixon: It seems to me that in the Sarnia area, particularly, where there must be so much research going on, if the hon. Minister were to provide serviced land of a similar nature, he might very well be able to draw the growing research associated with the chemical industry there. I was wondering if, in connection with the acquisition of land for the St. Clair parkway, it might not be possible that something be established in that end of the province.

On the other hand, in the Cornwall area, where there is some additional development going on, I would think there would be ample reason to consider very seriously the

establishment of a similar research park there. I think it is an excellent idea. It seems to be growing reasonably well west of Toronto, but surely if we are going to make the facilities distributed fairly evenly across the extremes of the province, we might consider this.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment further on the suggestion that grants for technical training might be provided at these research facilities in co-operation with the research foundation? I know their main function is to do specific research. They may feel that training responsibilities would be an encumbrance, but my limited experience with scientists is that they may normally consider if part of their responsibilities, as repositories of this advance knowledge, to pass it on and help those who are qualified to take this training to come along with them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I think that what you say is quite correct. I think a training programme out in Sheridan Park one of these days could be possible. As I said the other day, we have talked about it. Some of the staff of the Ontario research foundation are now teaching in some of the technical schools around Toronto, and the matter has been discussed with them. As I said before, when I was talking about our estimates the other day, we first of all want to complete the park and get the buildings there and get the diversification of research. Then I think that something along the line of what Waterloo University has been doing with students going out into industry for a few months and coming back to areas like Sheridan Park would perhaps work.

Also, I might at the moment suggest that the idea of starting research parks in other areas of Ontario is certainly of interest to us. You know this one was sparked because the Ontario research foundation had outgrown its facilities in Queen's Park and had to move; that is the reason why the first location was chosen close to Toronto. But I would think there are other areas, and there are some areas in eastern Ontario, up near the national research foundation in Ottawa, in the Ottawa valley. We have talked also about the possibility of getting into research in those areas, when we have completed this project here.

Mr. Nixon: Does the research foundation provide a service for industry on a fee-for-service basis?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, the basis of 40 per cent of the income for the Ontario research foundation is work done for independent industry, both here and abroad; 60 per cent of its income is from jobs given to it by the various departments of government. This is the reason for the sums of money voted to in-house research that we have in the estimates here tonight.

They are constantly trying to widen the number of customers they have for research, who cannot provide research in their own facilities, smaller manufacturers. One of the services we have in the trade and industry branch is to try to get Canadian manufacturers, or small manufacturers, even subsidiary companies, that do not have research facilities, to get some of the research done at the Ontario research foundation.

Mr. Nixon: Well, the vote calls for the spending of $760,000 in chunks to be authorized by the Minister. Does this refer to various government projects then, that would be approved by the Minister during the year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: When we go to Treasury board for the amount of money to be allotted to the Ontario research foundation for research, we give them a programme of continuing research—what we call in-house research—that the Ontario research foundation is doing. This amount of money is $600,000 and is made up of three amounts: Research and development on natural resources of Ontario, which has been carried on—and, as you know, research has to be carried on; it is not something you can do today and quit tomorrow. There is $127,000 for exploratory work on new applied research areas; $112,000 and supporting research $361,000. I would be glad to read off the breakdown of those three areas if you want.

Mr. Nixon: No. I would be interested to know, however, if there have been discoveries that were useful enough to be covered by Canadian patents during the past year; that is, in the name of the research foundation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. I am informed there have been. I do not have a list of them here, but if the hon. member would like them I can get them for him.

Mr. Nixon: I was more interested in how the government deals with these patents which, if they are useful enough to be patented, would be useful enough to be sold. What is the policy of the government in making these patented methods available to industry for development?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Any patents that we own, any developments that we produce that are licensable, we license to any manufacturer in Ontario. Licence agreements are available. This is similar to the pattern followed by the national research council up in Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: Well, you get money for the award of these patents, do you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We get a licence fee the same as you would if I was a manufacturer and somebody else used my patent.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell the House how much of the $760,000 is spent on anti-pollution-of-water-and-air research?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I can cover the items. In supporting research, destruction of bacterial spores, pesticide research, building materials research, wood fibre modifications, metal physics research, solid state research, glass and ceramics research, research in electronic beams, chemical synthesis, ultrasonic applications, cellulose fabric treatments; these are just—

Mr. Nixon: They are all very interesting projects, I am sure—

Hon. Mr. Randall: And solution research for The Department of Health.

Mr. Nixon: Yes. Well, I was wondering; the OWRC has very elaborate research facilities in both their buildings on the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. Is there an overlap of responsibility there?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, no. Thereis no overlap as far as we are concerned.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The Department of Health pays the Ontario research foundation out of its own budget for the research they do for us in air pollution.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, one of the most interesting meetings of the standing committee on government commissions this year, in my view was the meeting with the Ontario research foundation. It was interesting because, for the first time, I began to get some idea, or some yardstick, to assess how adequately we are tackling the question of industrial research in this country. For example, in the committee we were informed that the work of the Ontario research foundation falls into three categories.

There is the lower 50 per cent of small businesses, for which the research foundation provides know-how. Their chief interest is not research in the normal sense, but to be able to get the know-how which they are seeking to establish in a certain manufacturing process. And in view of the fact that two-thirds of the scientific knowledge, so we were told, has developed since the year 1940, one can imagine that there is a lot of know-how around that a small manufacturer could avail himself of, and the research foundation provides this, and provides it free. This is the lower 50 per cent. At the other end of the scale, you have the upper five per cent, which are the big corporations, who do their own research work; except that on special projects they will come—if they do not happen to have the technical personnel for that special project—and they will in effect get the research foundation to do the job and pay them for it. This, we were told, represents some 25 per cent of the work of the Ontario research foundation.

However, the main job, the main field for work of the Ontario research foundation, is in what I describe as the middle 45 per cent: the medium-sized industries which need research but are not large enough to be able to finance a research unit which, we were told must be a minimum of six or eight for a viable, effective unit. Most of their work is with this middle 45 per cent. Finally, we were informed that a legitimate expenditure in industrial research was two per cent of gross sales.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may say to the Minister, this immediately got me working on as to how one might calculate a fair amount for research in the province of Ontario, on the basis of the two per cent gross sales. My problem was to discover what the gross sales were in the province of Ontario. I want to say to the hon. Minister that it was one of the most interesting and effective solicitations of information from the civil service. I thought the proper place to go was to the Minister's statistical centre, which I did, and I was provided with some information which, if the rules of the House permitted, I would be tempted to suggest that the table should be put in. I do not know how one reads a table of six or eight columns intelligently and I do not think the rules permit just saying this will be put in. Therefore, I am afraid the rest—

Mr. Singer: We will give the member unanimous consent.

Mr. MacDonald: Will you? Is this possible? Well, the point I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, is this: the director of the statistical centre provided me with a table indicating the number of establishments and the selling value from each of these establishments. This is from DBS statistics back in the year 1961, and I want to come back to that in a moment. It is a breakdown that shows those whose sales were under $10,000.

The number of establishments involved was 1,096; this represented 9.08 per cent of the total number of factories. Their total sales were over $6 million, which was .05 per cent of the total sales. And so it goes on down the table—which, with the unanimous consent, I will give the *Hansard* in the hope it appears. (See appendix A, page 3738).

Until you get to the other end of the scale where you have those which are $5 million or over. There are only 381 companies representing over $7 billion in sales, for 60 per cent of the total.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the interesting thing is that the bottom 50 per cent in the first four categories—almost 50 per cent, 48.53 to be exact—represented 5,863 establishments in the province of Ontario, but they produce 1.74 per cent of the total sales. The top 381 factories representing 3.15 per cent of the total, had over 60 per cent of the sales.

Now, in itself, I think this is interesting in terms of the kind of breakdown of our corporate setup at the present time. Then I proceeded from these basic statistics which were given to me, Mr. Chairman, to some calculations which Dr. Chong provided to me. In the 1961 figures, the upper five per cent—I should say the total number of sales was just under $12 million—the upper five per cent had $8.1 million; the middle 45 per cent had 3.5 million; the bottom 50 per cent had $300 million, less than half $1 billion. Did I say million before when I should have been saying billions? I am afraid I will have to go back and correct that. The upper five per cent, $8.1 billion; the middle 45 per cent was $3.5 billion; the lower 50 per cent was only $300 million; in other words, .3 of $1 billion. The statistical centre was able to project these in terms of the same kind of a breakdown for the latest figure, that we have, the total figure, which is now $17 million, and it gives these figures, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: 17 million or billion?

Mr. MacDonald: $17 billion. The upper five per cent had $12.1 billion in sales, representing 68 per cent of the total. The middle 45 per cent had $5.2 billion, representing 29 per cent of the total sales. And the lower 50 per cent had $500 million, half a billion, and that represented three per cent of the sales.

Accepting that, and going back to the fair and legitimate amount of money that should be devoted to industrial research, let us take a look at what we should be devoting to industrial research, in the middle group, which is serviced by the Ontario research foundation and in the top group, which does its own research, except that it leases out some, so to speak, to the Ontario research foundation.

In the instance of the upper group, which has total gross sales of $12.1 billion, two per cent of that would mean that these companies should be putting in industrial research in the province of Ontario to $242 million. I would be curious to know how much money is being spent on industrial research by the top five per cent in the province of Ontario. I do not imagine the hon. Minister knows; I do not know whether his advisers are in a position to suggest how much is being spent.

To be fair, one has to acknowledge that they are now concentrating some of it in Sheridan Park. Indeed if I am correct, their capital expenditure in Sheridan Park, over a period of years, is going to be $100 million. I suppose, to be fair also, they in effect inherit, through their connections with parent companies in many instances, in the United States, access to research, though they may not be doing it themselves. But I raise this rather interesting question: How much money is being put by the top five per cent, which represent 68 per cent of the sales, and should be spending $242 million in research? How much is really being devoted to industrial research in Ontario?

However, let us come back to the middle 45 per cent, because this is the group which is serviced in its research needs by the Ontario research foundation. Now, their total sales were $5.2 billion, and two per cent of that would be $104 million. In other words, since all of their research work is being done by the Ontario research foundation, so we were told, using that two per cent as a fair figure, the Ontario research foundation should be spending $104 million a year, and their budget last year was $2.5 million.

I invite a comment from the hon. Minister. There are not very many questions I can ask, other than it seemed to me that this was

the first time that I was able to get any sort of a yardstick to judge the adequacy, or more accurately, the inadequacy of industrial research in Canada. Even if one forgets the top group and concentrates on the middle group, which is being serviced by the research foundation, it shows that we are spending about $2.5 million, when the fair figure would be something in excess of $100 million in order to keep ourselves in the kind of competition that we face in the world today, of which the hon. Minister knows full well, since he does so much travelling of the world today.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know you pose some questions, I wish I had all the answers.

I agree with you. Having been in the manufacturing business, I recognize that a lot of money should be spent in research. I think that in my own case, we probably spent as much as anybody in the industry, perhaps more, because we were a Canadian company, without any American parent. If we did not do our own research, we did not have any product to compete with the American companies.

Research money is being spent around the world in various countries. Of course, the United States is the highest. As has been figured here they spent 2.8; United Kingdom 2.4; Sweden 1.7; France 1.7; Netherlands 1.4; Switzerland 1.4; West Germany 1.3; Japan 1.3; and Canada .85, and these are percentages of the gross national product. Now, as far as the Ontario research foundation is concerned, it does not do all of the research. We may have Ontario companies who get their research done at the national research council and who pay them for the privilege, or they may get their research done in other areas, by some of the universities, for instance. But our feeling is that Sheridan Park, as it is being built up today, will encourage more people to do their research here.

That is one of the things that we have been discussing with American corporations. For instance, when I was in Chicago about two months ago, talking to 20 or 30 of the top industrialists in the Chicago area, I pointed out to them that research in many instances, if it gets too big, becomes just another large operation and research should not get too large. In this operation you are far better off to have smaller units. They agreed with that. In fact, out of that meeting we have three prospects that I hope we will sell this year.

One of the major reasons why I think they will look this way, is because they are having difficulty getting research staff in many of the research centres in the United States.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Where are you putting it, Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, Owen Sound.

In discussing the reasons why they should put the research over here, we pointed out that we have coming out of our universities, the postwar babies, who will be available in 1970. We think they are as well trained and as well educated as any you will find anywhere in the world. If companies are going to break down their research facilities, and get the best of the brain power, it seems to us—and I think they agree with us—that they are far better off to have smaller research units across not only the United States, but perhaps some in areas like Canada.

I used as an example the Zenith Television Company, that took in a number of Jewish scientists when Hitler moved into Germany. They were working in the television and radio plant of Zenith and Commander MacDonald was told if he wanted any defence work, he had to get these people out because they were security risks. Commander MacDonald went down the street and rented an old building.

Mr. Singer: Will the hon. Minister tell us what year this was?

Hon. Mr. Randall: 1940, 1941, 1944, 1943.

Mr. Singer: They were getting men out of Germany in those years?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They got out of Germany. They were in the United States, they were in the Zenith plant. He put them down the street in an old building and told them they could not work on defence work, but they could work on postwar products and today, if you check the records of the Zenith Television Company, you will find that Zenith is perhaps one of the largest companies selling electronic know-how anywhere in the world. I do not know how much of its net profits come from research, but a vast amount of its earnings—and it is one of the top earners in the business—has come from research.

This is something that the people to whom we talked, understand. I think it is something we in Canada should understand. We definitely have come of age, in this province at least, in industrial manufacturing, sophisticated manufacturing, but it is obvious to us that the next move is to get more research done in Canada, and I certainly agree with

the member that we are not spending sufficient, we should spend more. I also think the same thing applies to advertising. I do not think we spend enough to advertise our products.

I cannot answer any further questions for I cannot find the answers to those other questions you pose, but simply say that by building Sheridan Park, by creating the research centre out here, I believe we could encourage more companies to spend more money on research. I am sure that anybody who has an industrial operation today—we are talking about this lower 50 per cent—if they are ever going to get up in the five per cent, they just have to have research, there is no way out of it. If they do not do it here, they have to buy it from somebody and this is another reason why I believe Sheridan Park is going to encourage more money spent in research. So that the .85 we see here I think in a few years is going to be—

Mr. MacDonald: Is that the Canadian figure?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, on the gross national product.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask one or two small questions, just to fill that out? What is the American figure in industrial research?

Hon. Mr. Randall: 2.8.

Mr. MacDonald: 2.8?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, on the gross national product.

Mr. MacDonald: On gross national product. Is that a measurement of growth sales?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not a measure of gross sales, because in that are services and everything else. It is pretty hard to break it down. You are talking about gross sales, and I think that would be a more accurate way to look at it. If I were in the manufacturing business, I think I would have to make my expenditures on a basis of what my gross sales were.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me say this, if one can set aside for a moment argument over the location in Sheridan Park—so that I will not get into a battle with my hon. friend from Owen Sound. Indeed, I recall a blistering editorial from as far away as the Pembroke paper, with regard to another concentration down near Toronto and the inevitable consequences of drawing the existing industry to it. They wanted to know why it was not in Pembroke. If I can set that aside, I think the one project that I would certainly give unqualified approval to, in the government's move in recent years, is Sheridan Park, because I think if there is not some encouragement for the kind of industrial research that is necessary to keep ourselves in the competitive field, we simply are going to fall behind. As the figures indicate, we are .85, which is a third of the American, and half of most of the western European countries. So conceivably when we get it into operation, it will assist; I would hope that the Ontario research foundation might be able to get a more generous budget because I think it pays dividends. I think it is going to come back in terms of taxes and increased production and economic growth. So, if there ever was an amount of money that is a genuine investment it is, I think, what goes into industrial research.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may on this same topic mention the fact that American universities seem to tend to spend more and more funds in research. In fact, I can say that the University of Windsor is setting up a research institute specifically geared toward the local economy and they are going after helping the small manufacturer, the individual, who could not possibly afford to have the Ontario research foundation do the research for him on new products and so many other items.

The main groups that the University of Windsor is going to research: 1. evaluation of present products and methods with a view to their improvement; 2. the establishment of new products; 3. co-operation and parts of research products in which large companies are involved; 4. local problems of interest to all industries, but not at present gaining the attention of any; 5. troubleshooting.

More than likely the university would have difficulty in the beginning getting itself well established in this. Would the department consider giving financial assistance to them for a project such as this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The Department of University Affairs makes substantial grants to the universities for many purposes and I would say that if they have a cause down there that appears to be one to be encouraged, I think that they should talk to the hon. Minister of University Affairs.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would this not come under the hon. Minister's vote at all?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The grants to universities were taken care of by the hon. Minister of University Affairs.

Mr. Newman: But the grants to universities are not necessarily given for research projects.

Hon. Mr. Randall: A great deal of the money goes to research. We used to give it through this department, but it did not seem the proper thing to do, so last year it was transferred out of here into The Department of Education. So the hon. Minister of that department would have control of all grants to universities. It may be that the University of Windsor needs a grant to do the things the hon. member just outlined, but it may be that another university is not setting up the same kind of research programme.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I must congratulate the hon. Minister on the way he is standing up under the barrage here.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is what I get $1 a year for.

Mr. Sargent: The money voted for Sheridan Park—$3.5 million, roughly. What was the actual cost?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The total cost of Sheridan Park is $7,267,324 and the contracts were $5,470,000. As I recall the figures, the government gave approximately $3.5 million which went through the estimates last year, and the contribution from the province was $5,135,000. That included the amount of money that they got for the property over here, which was $1.5 million, and $125,000 for a special piece of research equipment they bought. The board of governors of the Ontario research foundation will solicit and collect from industry the other $2,132,324 to bring it to that $7,635,000 figure. There is no money in our votes this year for buildings or equipment; that was taken care of in last year's grants.

Mr. Sargent: The contribution from industry was 33⅓ per cent—or how much?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Industry is going to put up $2,132,324. The total cost of the new operation out there is $7,635,000. What they got for their building plus the grant they got from the province of Ontario gave them $5,135,000, leaving a balance of $2,132,324 which the Ontario research foundation will raise from their members and from the manufacturers at large.

Mr. Sargent: Who underwrote the project?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There was no underwriting because they were granted that by the government. It was a gift of the government to the new Sheridan Park Corporation.

Mr. Sargent: Is the recovery of the $2 million a sure thing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: Is the recovery of the balance from industry a sure thing? Is the government sure of getting the money?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is up to the Ontario research foundation; we have no recovery at all.

Mr. Sargent: What is the Ontario research foundation? Is that the government?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The Ontario research foundation operates as a separate organization, but the government granted it some $3 million last year; they got $1.5 million for the property they owned across the road, and they have income of their own as we talked about earlier. They will have to raise this to pay for this when they move into that building. In other words, they are going to have a mortgage of $2,132,324, and they will have to finance that mortgage over the years and find the money through their operations after soliciting from industry as they have done in the past, or earn it through research work to pay off the mortgage. Does that explain it?

Mr. Sargent: Not entirely. The main beneficiary from research is industry, and the hon. Minister is suggesting that industry shall put up two-sevenths of the deal. The recovery is not in total, so if the money is not raised, who pays it out?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us go back to the original story. As I understand it, when the Ontario research foundation was formed it got a $1.5 million grant from the government and industry raised $1.5 million to give it $3 million to start with. They have an investment portfolio of something around $4 million, which brings in an income of $250,000 a year, plus what they earn for doing research for the government.

Mr. Sargent: That answers my question; there is security. Thank you. I have one more question. The $750,000 we are asked to grant progressively—the hon. member for Brant asked to have this spelled out. Is that all to be spent in the Sheridan Park area?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That has nothing to do with the work that is going on in the park. We have a Sheridan Park Corporation which has funds of its own, and which was set up by the government when we bought that property out there with funds from the hon. Provincial Treasurer. We sell it off to the new tenants coming in and recover the cost of the acreage as new tenants come in. Right at the moment we have 85 acres left; I assume when we sell that 85 acres this year, we will have got back all the money we had to buy the property and will have paid our expenses as we have gone along. That $250,000 I talked about to build the frame around the Sheridan Park picture this year is already in that $2 million fund, which is an operating fund and which will be paid back as we sell off the land.

In other words, we are in the position of being a land developer until Sheridan Park is all sold out.

Mr. Sargent: What percentage of the research programme is spent on water pollution?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that question was answered a minute ago. The water pollution research is being done by The Department of Energy and Resources Management. I am not too sure that we have any pollution research in here or not; the general manager tells me that we have nothing directly in here for that. Nobody has given us a contract to do it and we do not have it in the schedule of things we are doing for the province of Ontario in continuing research. We believe that is adequately taken care of in The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): What about bacteriology, the first study the hon. Minister mentioned? What is it if it is not pollution?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would the hon. leader of the Opposition like me to read the technical explanation? I would be delighted to read it.

Mr. Singer: Would a Dow go good now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It sure would.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the Minister, because I appreciate the technical explanation.

Is it something to do with the fermenting of food, or—

Hon. Mr. Randall: It has to do with reducing bacteria content in foods. There is a lengthy explanation here; I would be glad to give it to the hon. leader of the Opposition if he would like to have it.

Mr. Thompson: I would not understand it, frankly.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am a little disturbed, as my colleagues the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for Grey North, about giving the hon. Minister a blank cheque for $760,000. I think this was the objective of their questioning. As I have sat and listened, I really have not been able to extract from him or hear him put on the record the exact way in which this $760,000 which he is asking for is going to be spent. The estimates say this is a grant to the research foundation to be paid in amounts as may be authorized by the Minister—which is so delightfully vague it may mean anything or nothing. I have heard repeated rumours, Mr. Chairman, that the government of Ontario contemplates erecting in the near future a permanent Ontario trade fair. I have looked through the Minister's estimates very carefully to see where, if this rumour is true, the money could be hidden. Naturally, my attention is drawn to these vague and unidentified estimates. My first direct question to the Minister, and I hope he is not going to dodge it, as he dodged the member for Brant and the member for Grey North—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have not dodged anything.

Mr. Singer: I would like him to specifically say what he is going to do with his $760,000, where is it going to go?

In other words, he is asking us for a blank cheque. Now being somewhat suspicious of government actions, I would like to know, when the Minister comes in and asks for a blank cheque for $760,000, what he is going to do with it.

The second specific question—and the Minister may want to say I am under the wrong sub-paragraph of his estimates—is there any present or future intention of this government to build an Ontario trade fair on a permanent basis? Let me make it even more specific than that: Located in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto—and let me make it even more specific than that—in co-operation with the Molson interests. Where, when and how much is it going to cost the government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just let me see if I can answer the question of the hon. member for Downsview so that even he will understand it.

Mr. Singer: I am trying desperately.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would hate to think the member is confused like the kid who dropped his bubble gum in the chicken coop.

Mr. Singer: I am only confused by the Minister's footwork, but I am not going to let him off tonight.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am delighted to share my knowledge with the hon. member.

In the first place, let me just suggest this: I think every developer downtown has been in to see me with reference to building an international trade fair. I say that the government has no money to put up bricks and mortar, that is the job of a private entrepreneur.

If you go across the United States you will find the private entrepreneur putting up international trade fairs. The latest was down in the southern United States; it was in *Business Week* last week. As far as I am concerned I think it is a splendid idea on somebody else's money. I think perhaps one of these days we would be asked to participate, perhaps as a tenant, just as we are renting space now at 950 Yonge street. It may be of interest to the province of Ontario and the city of Toronto that our department rent space, just as we are renting right now in an international trade building. I would not see anything underhanded or hidden about that. There is nothing in the votes for it, I can assure the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Have you made any commitments?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have made no commitments, none whatsoever. We have made a survey of international trade fair buildings across the United States through our department of trade and industry to find out how they are built, what kind of trade shows go into them and what results they get out of it. I think we have a pretty good factual report on the worth of international trade fairs. I might say it has been brought about by the one that is built, for $75 million, down in Montreal. Maybe that keeps you awake at night, but I can assure you we have nothing like that in mind in this province.

Now, the fact that they are building one in Montreal has sparked an interest on the part of developers downtown who have large plans, as you have already seen in the newspapers, on the waterfront, the Toronto-Dominion square, and the T. Eaton Company square. I think the Bank of Commerce as well has a big plan downtown.

All of these people are interested in getting a tenant in advance, so they have all been in to see the government to see if we are interested in international trade fairs. The answer is "yes," I am intensely interested in international trade fairs.

I think it would bring millions of dollars of convention business to the city of Toronto and the province of Ontario. I think it would be good for our manufacturers to have more foreign visitors coming here, but we have no money in the estimates for trade fairs. When we do, my hon. friend, I will bring it in and tell you what the facts of life are.

Mr. Singer: Will the Legislature be told before the developers, or vice versa?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It depends when it happens. If the Legislature is in session we will be glad to inform the hon. member.

Let me go back to the first estimate. The hon. member talked about the $760,000. I thought I covered the $600,000 very well, but perhaps I did not.

This list, as it is here, is presented to me by the general manager and the board of governors of the Ontario research foundation, and they say: "This is the work we are now carrying on, this is the work we want to continue with." We go over the programme and to the best of my knowledge and ability I say yes or I say no or I give them an argument. When we are all through deciding how much money is going to be required, we both appear before the Treasury board with the estimates and say the Ontario research foundation this year, in order to maintain itself, must have a certain amount of work from the Ontario government and its various departments.

Mr. Singer: The Minister has skipped something. He has already appeared before the Treasury board. He can appear before us with $760,000 in this book, he has already cleared with them. What we are concerned about is what are the criteria? The Minister asks for a blank cheque for $760,000. We want to know, and we are entitled to know, how he is going to spend it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the hon. member will just sit back a minute I will be glad to read off the list.

Mr. Sargent: Before the Minister answers that, will he tell us his contract with the Ontario research foundation? What is the contract yearly? Is he going to give them a million dollars a year to operate, the same as this vote here? What is the contract with these people?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps I can answer the question of the hon. member for Grey North at the same time. Under the first four items on which we have had approval from the Treasury board are:

Research and development on natural resources of Ontario. We discussed the possibilities of tree studies related to paper making. The cost of this study for the next year is $11,000 and we approved it. The Treasury board and I approved it.

The second was metallurgy research, $40,000; agricultural research, $38,000; parasitology on wildlife, $38,000.

That is $127,000 approved by the Treasury board and approved by our department. This is now being submitted to the House as the basis on which we are going to spend it and the departments in which it is going to be spent in.

In exploratory work on new applied research: Ultrasonic application, $35,000; the investigations of five tri-five n.i. alloys, $12,000; cellulose fabric treatment, $22,000; low-density refractory materials, $21,000; catalytic oxidization of sulphur dioxide, $22,000. That is $112,000. And then the third group is supporting research on destruction—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is mechanical—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, just wait a minute, the member is asking questions—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just sit down and keep your blood pressure down.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on this very important point—

Hon. Mr. Randall: When I am through, Mr. Chairman, I will let him—

Mr. Sargent: Why is industry paying for this? Why are we paying for it?

Hon. Mr. Randall If the hon. member will sit down, I will tell him.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for Grey North please take his seat?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. leader of the Opposition asked about this one, destruction of bacterial spores. That was $39,000. Pesticide research, $36,000; building material research, $40,000; wood fibre modifications, $17,000; metal physics research, $60,000; solid state research, $42,000; glass and ceramic research, $36,000; research with electronic beams, $30,000; and chemical synthesis, $61,000.

This is a total of $361,000 and it makes a grand total of $600,000 approved by the Treasury board and being presented in the estimates as a contract or an agreement with the Ontario research foundation to carry on in the coming year. Now, if hon. members would like me to explain what each one of these lines are I have four or five pages here; I could go through and read all the rest of the information. I would be glad to get it on the record, you can take my word for it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I really do not think the Minister has answered the question yet.

For example, without going into the detail, the scientific background on it, I notice he took interdensity refractory; that means nothing to me. But why did he choose one particular area of research over another?

You have bacteriology research and you have something else on glass and ceramics. Is it because you have decided that there is a particular need to encourage this industry to develop? How did you come to the decision? You have got so much money, how do you decide that you will concentrate on this particular industry? Is it because the industries come to you and apply some pressure and say we want you to help us with this area of research?

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, before we go any further, as chairman of the standing committee on government commissions, I want to make the statement that the Ontario research foundation was before this committee and all members of the committee had every opportunity to ask questions, and they did, so now this is simply a repetition. If the members of the Opposition were not given information, I am sure it is their own fault, because they had every opportunity to ask all of these questions. Now why should there be the repetition in the Legislature of all of these things when their members had this opportunity? They asked all these questions. They had answers that were good answers and I would say that this is simply a repetition and an effort to delay the business of this Legislature.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I just answer this question? I think you asked a question and I will try to answer it for you.

We have a board of directors of 19 very prominent Ontario citizens and I would like to read them off to you. These are the people that make a decision as to what kind of research should be done in the interests of the province, that is why they are there.

Mr. Thompson: And do they then advise you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They advise the president of the Ontario research foundation, he in turn brings his estimates and his recommendations to the department, we in turn get a clearance from Treasury board, and come back here for approval.

I will be glad to give you, if you have not got it, the list of these very prominent people. They are very knowledgeable in their field, and I do not think we could get a better board of governors anywhere.

Mr. Sargent: Very briefly, I do not want to flog this point, but I think that we should understand—in my opinion I think industry should be paying the freight for research that is going to benefit them directly. To lay a charge on the taxpayer for this year, in the amount of three-quarters of a million dollars for research, that is going to reflect itself in the corporate profits of these companies, is not to my way of thinking being democratic, or good business, or free enterprise and I think—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You just lost the NDP's.

Mr. Singer: Who wants to find them?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, some day along the line, when my friends on my immediate left here see the light and join with us, you will not be so cocky all of you, you will be very much in the minority, so do not forget it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister tell the House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is important before this House is asked to vote three-quarters of a million dollars for additional research, on top of a capital investment of $3,500,000 of the taxpayers' money for big business, for industry, that the hon. Minister tell the House that there must be some agreement with industry that they will pay the freight yearly for additional research, that this should not be a recurring charge on the taxpayer. This is pretty basic, Mr. Chairman, that you are asking us to pay the dominant capital costs of this research programme; you are charging it to the home owners across Ontario, to reflect itself in profits for industry. Now you are charging us for the cost of research, which will accrue to the profits of industry.

I think you must show the House before you can expect to get this money, as far as I am concerned, that you have a contract that we will not have to pay research charges of a million dollars a year from here to infinity. This is very important.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, just to wind this up, I want to assure the hon. member for Grey North—so that he will not lay awake all night and worry about it—that basic research is subsidized by almost every country in the world, because there is no return on research, until it develops a product either for the province, or for the industry which pays for that development.

I quoted a figure a few minutes ago—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now just a minute.

Mr. Sargent: No, but he wants to give two statements here.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I quoted a few minutes ago a figure on the amount of money earned by the research corporation and I will just read this one paragraph, and I think it will give you some idea who is paying the shot:

> Over the years the foundation's income has steadily grown. At this time, 1965, the total annual income is around $2.5 million. Of this, about 60 per cent, or some $1.5 million is derived from work done under contract, mainly for industrial firms. About 30 per cent is for work carried out for the Ontario departments relative to the natural resources or the specific industrial processes of interest in this province.

If this province was not getting the work done here, we would probably be paying a bill to the national research council up in

Ottawa, or paying a university, or buying it in the United States; so we are just the same as an outside industrial company. We pay for the work that the Ontario research foundation is doing, and the remaining ten per cent of their income is derived from the above-mentioned endowment fund, which I mentioned a few minutes ago—a total of $4 million.

I think that if many corporations could have operated their businesses as efficiently and as profitably—and a growing business—such as is the Ontario research foundation, they would be very happy to have it under their wing.

Mr. Sargent: But do you not agree, Mr. Minister, that research should be a fair business expense charged against the industry?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is.

Mr. Sargent: Well then, why should we be paying the freight for it then?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are not.

Mr. Sargent: You are not with me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to the fact that the hard-pressed taxpayer should be asked to subsidize industry for research. And that is just exactly what we are doing here. Any big business corporation can afford to pay their share of the cost of research in Ontario, as a tax write-off on their federal taxes and I do not see any point in passing a vote costing three-quarters of a million dollars for research for big business. I think we should be dead against that.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to support what the hon. member for Grey North has to say. The fact of the matter is that industry, in order to get—

Mr. Chairman: Pardon me, the member for Port Arthur.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have listened to criticism today, some constructive and some not so knowledgeable, of The Department of Economics and Development and its Minister.

I would like to say a word for the department—my own thinking, Mr. Chairman. I have always found them co-operative and helpful, all the men that I have appealed to in that department, and my part of the north has been helped a great deal by this department, and by the hon. Minister who, as you and I know, has a great knowledge of industry and was president of a tremendous complex when he took over the position.

Mr. Sargent: Make this speech at the end.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now, you said your piece. Sit down. I do not want to hear any more from you.

Earlier today, the hon. member for Bruce charged that not only was this province making no progress, but that many parts of Ontario were worse off than at any time in their history. At least, that is the impression I gained from his remarks. You all heard them.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to make but two points: There are, praise be, not too many members of this Legislature who rise to point with pride at their own constituences because of their poverty or lack of progress. Unfortunately, not all elected representatives of the Bruce have as little faith and confidence as the hon. member who spoke today.

Last night, while the hon. member for Grey North was speaking in this House, at a public meeting in Owen Sound, the home city of another economic crepe hanger, the warden of the county of Bruce said that the four northerly townships in his county had never before been so prosperous, largely because of the expansion of the region's tourist industry—

Mr. Sargent: They have a good member up there.

Hon. Mr. Wardope: Certainly, the hon. member is not letting us think that tonight, the way he is talking.

—an industry in whose promotion I am proud to say this government played a major role. If there has not been major growth in agricultural income, the warden of the county pointed out that new and broader income sources have been found. In other words, he was giving credit to this department and others of this government.

Mr. Chairman, this is happening all over Ontario. I know it is happening in my own constituency. Certainly there are shifts in population and shifts in patterns of employment and there always will be. Many of our cities would stagnate if it were not for immigration from rural areas and from abroad, but in the northwestern part of this province, we have had unprecedented economic growth and in co-operation with the hon. Minister

of Economics and Development, we are planning far, far more.

In my own area, employment is good, as you all know, and we are growing in every way. True, we want more growth and prosperity, but we certainly are going ahead as every other part of Ontario is. Ontario, as a province, is growing. It is an excellent place in which to find opportunities for economic advancement; and it is attested to by the fact that, for many years, well over half the immigrants to Canada freely chose to settle in Ontario.

What better testimonial, Mr. Chairman, can there be than that? We are certainly happy, too, that they have been making this choice. Without their new skills we would not have grown as fast as we have. Indeed, those of us who are perhaps a little older than some of our hon. friends across the floor, do not find it too hard to remember the days when we were concerned about finding enough jobs for the people we had—

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. With due respect—and I like to hear the flow of rhetoric from the hon. Minister—has this really anything to do with the Ontario research foundation?

Mr. Chairman: This has to do with development. Continue.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, in no sense do I suggest that this government, or any one Minister of this government, is responsible for the prosperity we now enjoy. It is the product of the collective energies of all our people. I would like at this time, however, on behalf of the people of my own constituency, to commend the dedicated enthusiasm which is so widely evidenced by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development who has given you his speech.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You know, and I know, Mr. Chairman, that he is a real economic missionary.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister is speaking to the gallery, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North will have to take his seat.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Nobody plays more to the gallery than the hon. member for Grey North! The hon. Minister of Economics and Development is a real economic missionary on behalf of Ontario and we are all the beneficiaries of his efforts.

Mr. Chairman, to the Minister and his staff tonight, I say this: Keep up the good work!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we have only reached the first vote on the Minister's estimates.

An hon. member: George was miscued.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to comment briefly on what the hon. member for Grey North had to say. It is true that there are substantial tax incentives provided to industry to invest more funds in research and development activities. There are very substantial concessions to industry at the present time for this purpose, and yet it is only a mere—if my memory serves me correctly—.85 per cent of the gross provincial product that is used for that purpose in the province of Ontario.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister two or three questions in connection with research and development. One is: What amount of money flows out of Ontario to the United States, for example, for royalties and technical know-how, under agreements with that country? To what extent is that a damper on the development of adequate research facilities in Ontario and to the direction and use of funds in Ontario for research purposes?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have any figures in what goes out in engineering fees and licence fees. I have been involved in it myself, and I have sold licence agreements around the world and earned money for Canada, and I have also bought licence agreements from the United States. I could not tell the hon. member what money flows out; I do not have the figures. Perhaps I could get them for him. But I would say that the reason for Sheridan Park is to prevent the very thing that he has outlined, to stop the drain on our dollar by doing the research here.

I think, first of all, we have to go back in history. When the British Commonwealth preferences were put on in Canada, this forced a lot of United States companies to come into this country to jump the tariff hurdle in order to participate in those Commonwealth markets. The first thing they did, as the member well knows, is that they came in as suppliers of parts and we had assemblers here. Now we are highly sophisticated in manufacturing and they are coming in with their research organizations.

Of the companies listed in Sheridan Park to date, more than half are subsidiaries of American companies; so the drift now—as I

said earlier—is to get American research in here instead of having to buy it in the United States. I do not know what the dollar figure going and coming would be, offhand.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister is serious about a reasonable target of two per cent of the gross provincial product being devoted to research purposes, one of the ways in which he can ensure that this will take place, rather than just to hope that it will take place, is to require companies in Ontario which are affiliated with United States companies to provide his department with information about the technical know-how and the patent licensing agreements which they have, and the costs to those affiliates in Canada for those know-how agreements and for licenses—so that the hon. Minister, in his department, can analyze them and find out whether or not he or his department thinks that the cost to the Ontario economy, for the know-how and for the information, is a reasonable cost; whether it is being wisely expended; and whether a substantial part of that expenditure could not be devoted or redirected in the next little while to research in the province of Ontario. I would hope that the hon. Minister would comment on that.

My last remark is that the information which was published recently by the organization for economic co-operation and development shows that there is a very substantial loss to Canada of qualified scientists and qualified engineers. I believe that, in the case of engineers, 50 per cent of all engineering graduates go to the United States. I wonder whether the hon. Minister could comment as to what his views are as to the kind of incentives which might possibly keep them here, because a large number of them go to the United States for the purpose of engaging in research and development in the tremendous facilities which are available in the United States. If more facilities were available here, I am sure that there must be some way in which we would be able to keep qualified people in Canada to continue research work here.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, answering your first question, I agree with you. More money will have to be spent on research. I think that the incentives that the federal government has established on research write-offs—and more that I understand are to come; Mr. Drury has been talking about greater relief for research expenditures therefore I think there is legislation going through Ottawa now which will allow corporations to make greater deductions if they spend more money on research and research equipment.

As far as the brain drain is concerned, there were figures in the paper the other night, where I think we had lost something like 9,000 engineers or scientific people to the United States, or professional people. A great majority of those were people who were in transition. They came in here; got established; then moved down to the States, after they got a proving ground in Canada—which is very much like the United States insofar as working conditions are concerned. But again I say, I think the way to stop the brain drain is more Sheridan Parks; and this is the objective behind the Sheridan Park research centre.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the moving remarks of the hon. Minister of Mines, in questioning the very intelligent approach taken by my colleague from Bruce, moves me to reply. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Mines is not in his seat, but I know he is still in the House. I would draw his attention to a document produced by the Ontario economic council in 1966, particularly to page 24 and to the statistics quoted by my colleague from Bruce. I ask the hon. Minister of Mines if, in sincerity, having read these statistics, he can honestly put forward the remarks that he did in praise of his colleague, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

I am reading from chart number eight, on page 24 of this report of the Ontario economic council. This chart indicates that, in McCrosson and Tovell townships in the Rainy River district, represented by my hon. friend from Rainy River, that the gross income from the soil for full-time farming was $3,300. Does this indicate the propsperity in Ontario that the hon. Minister of Mines was talking about?

The chart goes on to say that in the township of Brethour and the township of Harley, in the district of Timiskaming represented by my colleague from Timiskaming, the gross income from soil per full-time farm was $3,000, and in the township of Harley the gross income from the soil for a full-time farm was $1,870. Does this indicate the prosperity that the hon. Minister of Mines was talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, I will answer that.

Mr. Singer: This report goes on to say on page 24, table eight—I wish my friend the Minister of Mines would get this report of the Ontario economic council out and have

it before him, so that he will have an answer—that in the township of Monteagle in north Hastings, represented by the hon. member for Hastings who is not with us this evening, the gross income from soil for a full-time farm was $1,530. Does this indicate the prosperity throughout the province of Ontario that the Minister of Mines was talking about?

The gross income from the soil in the township of Lindsay, in the county of Bruce, represented by my friend and colleague from Bruce, for full-time farming was $1,530. I ask the hon. Minister of Mines again: Does this indicate the prosperity that he was talking about a few minutes ago? The income in the township of Carlow, again in the county of Hastings, represented by the hon. member for Hastings, was $1,380 for a full-time farm effort. Does this indicate the type of prosperity?

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I say that when we get a high-sounding meaningless speech as we got a few moments ago, brushing aside the statistics that are put forward by the Ontario economic council, the government talks through its Ministers with voices that are loud and noisy, full of fury, but signify absolutely nothing. These are the things, as my colleague from Bruce said earlier this week, that should concern the Minister of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Singer: I wanted to get on to another point. You will have your chance in a few minutes; you spoke a little while ago—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You are scared of an answer.

Mr. Singer: It is my turn now.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You are frightened of an answer.

Mr. Singer: I am certainly concerned about you. You scare me no end.

Mr. Chairman, I want to continue. A few moments ago I was asking my friend, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, about rumours I had heard about a possible location in the Toronto area, or in the province of Ontario, of a permanent trade fair. I compliment the Minister of Economics and Development for his very careful and efficient sidestepping of the issue. He said that he had been approached by numerous developers who had interested themselves in the developments in Montreal and the province of Quebec, where they are building a $75 million trade centre. He said that we are always willing to listen to people who come in to us. There is nothing in the estimates that indicates a similar expenditure. I would like him to get much more specific, and I think the Legislature is entitled to know, and know tonight, if the government of Ontario is interested or contemplating between the time of these estimates and the time we next see the estimates of this department, in first of all making a capital expenditure either in the nature of $75 million, or whatever the figure might be, to purchase, buy or build its own centre. That is number one. I would like specific answers to this, because I am going to try and pin the hon. Minister down, and it is a trick to be able to pin him down.

The second thing is: If the answer to the first question is no, is the government interested in renting a trade centre, built and developed by someone else? And if so, when are they going to proceed and are we going to have an opportunity to review that in the House before the deed is done?

Thirdly, if they are interested in either buying or renting, what are the criteria that are going to be used in choosing between the various proposals that are put before the government?

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest your questions come under vote 406?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this was my difficulty. I said in my remarks earlier that I searched very carefully through the estimates to try and determine where they came, and I threw it out to the hon. Minister in order to find out where they might come. There is no place I can locate.

Mr. Chairman: I think 406.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think, Mr. Chairman, I can just settle this for the hon. member in a hurry. The answer to the first question is no. The answer to the second question is that, any recommendations for a trade centre that come forward to me will not be built until sometime in 1968 or 1969, so we are certainly not making any arrangements between now and the next session of the Legislature. I almost forget what the third question was.

Mr. Singer: I said whatever consideration you are giving to either the purchase of the renting, what are the criteria that you would use in choosing between representations from A B C D?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the criteria would be location. If it is the best location

for an international trade mart, that would have a lot to do with the recommendations and the cost per square foot that we would have to rent, if we were going to rent square footage; transportation in; the handling of people in and out; and the number of other tenants who would be interested in going into that area, such as consular generals and trade officers from other countries. This is what the entrepreneur himself would have to know before he put his money into that kind of a building. All that they have ever said to the government is, if we had a building like that, how much square footage do you think the government would rent? I said we would take a look at it. I do not know. The building they have presented to me is not built yet; it will take at least two or three years to build, if they are going to. Three or four people are interested. So we look over the three or four propositions. If they decide to go ahead with the building, it could be called an international trade fair. Then all we would do is become a landlord, to the best of my knowledge. If there is any change in that, I would be glad to inform the House.

Mr. Singer: Do you mean a tenant, or a landlord?

Hon. Mr. Randall: A tenant.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity. I wanted to mention to my friend, when he talked about the Bruce, that I mentioned that last night at a public meeting in Owen Sound.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Yes, we heard that, but what about what the economic council said?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What you said in your remarks?

Mr. Bryden: About the economic council.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Is that the economic council you are getting at?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All right. Listen to what a reeve says right up in the area you are speaking of.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now just a minute. You laugh all you like. I can stand here and listen to your ridicule and the nonsensical things you try to becloud the issue with. That is what you are doing.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Now listen to this.

Mr. Singer: Who is right, the reeve or the economic council?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would say the reeve, today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: When was that written?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Singer: In 1966.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All right. How much of a change has there been since that time?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do not laugh in that ridiculous way. You do not want to hear this, I know, but you are going to get it. Last night, a public meeting in Owen Sound—now that is last night not 1962—

Mr. Singer: May, 1966.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All right, the home city of another crepe hanger, I said. The warden of the county of Bruce said that the four northerly townships in his county had never before been so prosperous—that is the warden speaking. Of course, you fellows over there know far more than the warden does.

Mr. Singer: Would the Minister agree that we do away with the economic council?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, I would not. I would say that the warden would be more up to date.

Mr. Singer: Well, let us do away with the economic council.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Largely because of the expansion of the region's tourist industry; he is not talking about farming, as the member is. That is the big point. This is the tourist industry which is taking over in these areas, an industry in whose promotion I am proud to say this government has played a major role. That is what I said. I did not get the book out and say somebody earned $1,500 a year in farming, and so and so, this is the head of this county, last night.

Mr. Singer: Your own economic council—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All right, they are talking about other things than I am talking about. The tourist industry is the big thing that has taken over in these regions. They are not talking about turnips or carrots. But you must find something to refute anything that is good, of course, to be critical. It would not do for the member to praise the Minister for a moment that they were doing anything. That is what I was trying to say.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Mines has had a great career but I would not judge his career by that last speech.

Mr. Bryden: It is typical of most of his speeches.

Mr. Sargent: This is typical for the record of the intelligence of the Cabinet Ministers in this government. I would say that a man who cannot assess poverty in farming, as given in a report given by the hon. Minister in question, against a press report—there is a need for review on the Cabinet strength.

Mr. Chairman, the point before the House at this point on this vote is this: that the government is known by its legislation and the hon. Minister will have to stand by the legislation and go on the record as being in favour of it or make a public statement at this point. We have here again the fact that we are asking the taxpayers of this province who have already met a two per cent increase in sales tax, an increase in gasoline tax—I am sorry, a total of 66 per cent increase in sales tax, gasoline tax, all the things that hurt the little man are taxed; and now you have an area whereby you want to levy another three-quarters of a million dollars on the little guy—am I wrong?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, the member is.

Mr. Sargent: All right, stand up and say I am wrong. You must accept the fact that we are overtaxed. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs knows the mess he is in at local level.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I pay my bills as they arrive at my office, I try to support my family and I am in no mess at all.

Mr. Sargent: He is a nice guy but he cannot handle the municipal setup. And here we are now at this point, the Minister of this big PR department, asking us to help his friends in big business, saying, "Boys, we are going to give you another three-quarters of a million dollars; on top of the $3.5 million we gave you to create this research development, we are going to give you another three-quarters of a million this year to do some research.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Sargent: In a minute, I am sorry, I am busy.

So I am asking the Minister if he would like to go on record as saying that he thinks this is justified, to tax the ordinary taxpayers of this province three-quarters of a million dollars for research for big business, where it is of no cost to business at all, it is a complete writeoff on their business expenses. And he thinks this is justified to go on the record, Mr. Chairman, as saying this is a policy of this government to load another three-quarters of a million dollars on top of a capital expenditure of $3.5 million that we did not need to put out in the first place. Big business gets it and the Tory Party gets it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The people who work for the government get paid.

Mr. Sargent: That hon. Minister's intelligence has been given a minute ago, let him pass for a second. I would like the Minister to answer the question—if he thinks this is a just charge on the ordinary taxpayer of Ontario, to go on record as saying that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North has asked this question three times and it has been answered three times. Let us go onto the next item.

Mr. Sargent: I have not been answered, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote—item 7.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I still have the floor, I want my question answered.

Mr. Chairman: The question has been answered three times and asked three times, let us go on to the next item.

Mr. Sargent: What was the answer?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has given the answer.

Mr. Sargent: I am not satisfied. Mr. Chairman, I want an answer to that question.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Please take your seat.

Mr. Sargent: I will not take my seat. I want an answer to that question.

Mr. Chairman: The question has been answered.

Mr. Sargent: It has not been answered.

An hon. member: Name him.

Mr. Sargent: You try and name me on that one; just try and name me on that one.

Mr. Chairman: The question has been answered and we are going on.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, every seat in this House has equal value, whether he is a Minister or whether he is Chairman of the House.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member is a great little hero.

Mr. Sargent: I am not a hero, I do not respect the lack of courage on the part of the Chairman or the hon. Minister, if he cannot answer a simple question. I respect all of you individually but I say that the Minister has a duty to answer that question. And I am going to insist he answer that question or I will not sit down.

Mr. Chairman: Because the member is not satisfied with the answer does not mean he has not been answered.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, what the member is asking, is whether the Minister feels that public funds should be put into the Ontario research foundation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I certainly do, and I think the hon. member for York South answered that question a few minutes ago when he pointed out very clearly, probably better than I could, that big business is not the beneficiary of the money being spent at the Ontario research foundation. I think it was very clear to everybody in the House that it is in the interest of small business and in the interest of the province.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I would like to ask the hon. Minister—and I am taking some of the leniency which was offered to the Minister of Mines — I would like to bring up this point: It was mentioned earlier but we can see what ARDA can do in economic development and the research that has been done. I am looking again at the economic report here, the opportunities for resource development in rural Ontario, marginal and abandoned acreage. I am sure if the hon. Minister of Mines had a chance to look at this, he might change his thinking a little bit, because certainly there is a very competent group of people who have been working on this and I think with all respect to the reeve that the Minister quoted, that there is substantial evidence that you should have concern.

What I really want to get at is that I frankly am concerned about the great opportunities that ARDA provides and yet I do not think there is enough impulse given, enough stimulation to get this programme developed throughout Ontario. I agree with the hon. member for Brant who said that it is more than just working in agriculture. I look at the way it has been used in Quebec and the way it has been used in many other provinces and it seems to me that where the ARDA programme should be working now is with the hon. Minister's department. I say that as a compliment to him in some ways, because in economic development you can do so much for areas, for regions around the province. I do not think enough incentive is being given, frankly, through the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

I think, because you have a broader point of view, a greater grasp of economic development, that the logical place for ARDA to be handled is in this Minister's department. I leave that with the Minister and if he can arrange that it could be handled by him, I know—and I want to re-emphasize it. The member for Brant brought this up, and I think there are people in many areas who feel that it is far beyond agriculture. There are some of these mossbacks over here who cannot see that in agriculture today, with the transition taking place, we need secondary industries to be developed in areas where the small farmer is, and a whole variety of programmes. I say, sir, that from our point of view we would like to see you handling this programme.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on item 7, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what proportion of this $840,000 is spent on films?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sorry, I did not hear that question?

Mr. Thompson: I would like to know what amount is spent on films.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have $20,000 in the estimates for 1966-67.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to ask where these films are shown.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are shown in many places. They are shown at symposiums we hold across the country with reference to getting more people export-conscious; they are shown at the women's "Shop Canadian" shows; they are used by our offices in New York and Chicago to show to businessmen in the United States to show what Ontario is like; they are shown in Europe—

Mr. Bryden: And they are also shown on political broadcasts.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, not on political broadcasts.

Mr. Bryden: What about that trip by the hon. Prime Minister and yourself to Europe?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was a hodge-podge put together and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: In 1965 they reached an audience of almost 2,000,000 television viewers and there were 700,000 people who saw these films during the two weeks of the Canadian national exhibition. At the women's conferences there were 3,000 women who attended and 7,000 in 1965, and there are 1,000 in 1966 to date, and so a total of almost 2,703,000 people who saw these films in this last year.

Mr. Thompson: When the hon. Minister says that in 1965 two million television viewers saw these films, does he mean that they were in Canada, or the United States, or where?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They were shown in Canada.

Mr. Thompson: May I suggest, for the hon. Minister's consideration, two things? There are films that are made on tourism, and on a whole variety of departments; and Travel and Publicity films. I wonder—and I am thinking particularly of the United States—that perhaps a film on industry for two million television viewers is pretty heavy. There could be a combination with travel and publicity, getting that message across, as well as one about opportunities in Ontario for industrial development. It seems to me that travel and publicity is just focusing on its own particular message—there could be a combination; perhaps some sugar coating on this thing, and not just a dead serious, economic film.

The other thing I would like to suggest is that, particularly in the United States, a spot on television, rather than a film, might be more worthwhile. I should say that I am a little bit concerned with this enthusiasm to use films. The hon. Minister has a background in promotion far beyond mine, but I wonder if, in his business, in order to promote it, whether he put out films which were shown to ladies' groups, and so on. I would think that he would go after a far wider audience than these.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As a rule, when we produce the films, we do not pay to have them shown. People ask for them and they show them themselves. For instance, the films on regional development, that were shown on television last year, were shown pretty well all over Ontario and in many parts of Canada. It did not cost us a nickel to put these on.

As the hon. member knows, the television stations have to have so much live time and have only so much film time; so that in Canada here, if a good film is produced that has a message about the province, or about conditions in the province, you can get wide coverage without spending a nickel.

Mr. Thompson: I am thinking of the United States mainly—to get coverage there.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might say this: In the United States, in Chicago and New York where we have offices, many groups and associations call up, as they do the Canadian federal office, and ask if there is a film on Canada or a film on Ontario. Some of the questions we run into—I can recall in some of my travels that people have said, "Well, films on Canada are pretty outdated; they do not show what your industry is doing there. They show the Rocky Mountains and the northern parts of Ontario but do not show sophisticated manufacturing." This is why we have gone into producing some films, so that we can not only sell the people at home on the fact that we are highly industrialized, but we can sell it to people in other parts of the world particularly in the United States where we are trying to sell more goods.

Mr. Thompson: How much is it a minute?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The cost of films runs at all prices. We have one here that was produced in 1963 entitled, "Are People Necessary?" I think that was to do with labour and automation, and was used at the

conference held in 1963. The cost of that film was $5,855.50, and I do not know how many times that has been used.

Mr. Thompson: How long is that film—15 minutes?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it was a half hour show—or 25 minutes—which leaves time for the introduction and the sign-off. Another one is "Women's World" made in 1965, which is a 15-minute film. That was made in conjunction with the Eedee awards, which we will be having again next Tuesday evening. This is to help the fashion industry sell millions of dollars worth of fashion goods, not only here but abroad. That film cost $4,500 and has been used time and time again by women's organizations and television stations all across the country. These are some of the films that we are working on.

There is another one entitled, "Our Man from Ontario"; it cost $5,500. Now, "Our Man from Ontario" is a selling programme to get a lot of our manufacturers interested in continental markets, and show that there is an opportunity there for them. This is the type of film we are producing.

Mr. Thompson: Who is the feature star in "Our Man—"? Is it the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. It is any number of the 500 salesmen we have taken abroad on various sales missions. I introduce the film, and the rest is calling on customers in various countries and showing them how easy it is to sell—and so forth and so on.

Mr. Sargent: This vote calls for an increase of $160,000 and it would appear that the department is going to step up the public relations job they started to do. The most embarrassing thing that could be for the government under this vote is the expenditure of some $24,000 for the conference of women. Bearing in mind that 51 per cent of the people of this province do not want you people in power—and the hon. Minister made a statement a few moments ago that he did not mind spending someone else's money—I would suggest that, in this particular department, he is spending my money across this province in about 24 different areas to tell the women of this province what good guys the Tories are.

If you will bear with me in this department, some of the material says:

> Born recently, the women's advisory committee is already "mother's helper" and a girl's best friend.

This relates to the advisory council of women, and I would suggest that the advisory council of women is the Tory party's best friend. They are using the money belonging to the taxpayer to go about this province selling a bill of goods for the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, this is under trade and industry; it has nothing to do with this vote. We are wandering here.

Mr. Sargent: Well, in the big book I have conference of women under this vote.

Mr. Chairman: It is under 406, I would advise the member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Under vote 6—under vote 7? Vote 7 we are on.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 406—406.

Mr. Sargent: I thought we had passed 406.

Mr. Chairman: No. We have not finished 401 yet.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry; I thought we had passed—

An hon. member: I wish we had!

Mr. Thompson: I think he means item 7.

Mr. Sargent: Item 7?

Mr. Chairman: We are on item 7.

Mr. Sargent: Item 7 on 401?

Mr. Chairman: But the member's particular remarks come under 406.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about item 7:

> Advertising, films, conferences, special services and publications arising therefrom —$840,000.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): The hon. member's item is specifically referred to under 407.

Mr. Sargent: 407?

Mr. Chairman: 406.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: 406, rather.

Mr. Thompson: I think, sir, he is talking about vote 401, item 7, under conferences.

Mr. Sargent: Vote 401, item 7, is what I am talking on.

Mr. Thompson: Under conferences.

An hon. member: He is confused.

Mr. Thompson: No, he is very clear about it. It states right here, conferences.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It comes specifically under vote 406.

Mr. Chairman: The women's advisory committee comes under 406. I suggest you leave it for vote 406.

Mr. Sargent: All right.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7 agreed to. On item 8:

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister? From the public accounts he has an item of $371,000. It is the only large item under miscellaneous and it is to the McConnell Eastman Company. What is that for, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is advertising, two years ago. McConnell Eastman was the advertising agency, I believe, in 1963-64.

Mr. Nixon: That is the hippopotamus?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. That is the hippopotamus.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, earlier in this session we had a publication distributed to us called *Ontario Style,* which is meant to be distributed, I presume, in the European countries—to lure immigrants to Canada.

There were some great discrepancies in this publication, in that no mention was made, or very little mention was made, of lumbering or mining in northern Ontario, where we presumably require 5,000 miners.

There were also some other statements in the publication that I do not think the people in the north would be too happy with, and I think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the hon. Minister of Mines will agree with me. At one point the publication says:

> The cultural tone of the province has always been set by the cities and towns in the south.

I would like the hon. Minister to comment on this. This may be the opinion of the people in Don Mills, but I do not think it is the opinion of the people in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, Mr. Chairman, we had quite a discussion on immigration last night, and the book, *Ontario Style* was discussed. The book was not prepared as the book to end all information on immigration. It was prepared to meet with the advertisements we are now running in Europe and the U.K. to get skilled workers. You will notice that the information in the book is directed to the type of people we have been advertising for: draftsmen, engineers, professional people. Miners were not included in that as skilled people. There is nothing wrong with it, but we were advertising in a specific area, which was the U.K., and in the U.K we were looking for the type of individual we discussed last night.

Now, if any miners in the U.K. read our ads such as we are running here: There is a coupon attached to the ad; they send it back in; if they are miners we would give them the same information we give to a draftsman or the engineer. That book was specifically directed to professional people along the lines outlined last night. As I say, we will probably get another booklet prepared for the type of people you have been talking about here tonight.

Mr. Thompson: But he has not answered, Mr. Chairman. He said that culture had developed in the south. That is a direct insult to the people of the north; that is to their culture!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not going to argue about who said what. That was a writing by Morley Callaghan, in *Ontario '66.* He was a paid independent author, and those are his observations. It was in *Ontario '66.* It was no reflection on the people up north or down south. I think some of the writers said a good word about the people up north.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in answering the hon. Minister: I presume that it goes out under your approval.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. Thompson: I would say it might have hurt some of the people in the north, for instance, the hon. Minister of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe you would consider that a reflection on the people in the south!

Mr. Thompson: No, I think it could have been a little broader. I think there is a great deal of vitality and culture in the north.

Let me refer, sir, to item 8. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, and I say this really because there is some apprehension about exhibitions or centennial projects. We

would assume that they would be ready in the year when we would hope they would be ready. I am thinking for example, of the centennial project, that it will be ready in centennial year. Perhaps some people think I am naive when I ask you, will the Ontario international exhibition be ready in 1967?

Hon. Mr. Randall: All I can say to the hon. member is we are right on schedule now with everything in the exhibition. Our interior designing, our construction are both right on schedule, and have been for the last several months. I see no reason why we will not open up on the date.

Maybe some will have some difficulties, they are late in getting started, but as you know we got started fairly early with our designs of both the building and the interior and I am confident that it is going to be opened on time. I do not see any problems. As you know, there was the threatened construction strike in Montreal a little while ago. It did not last too long, and it did not bother Expo because they have a special contract with the contractor. So our work was not delayed.

If anything, the strike in the city of Montreal may have helped a few days in Expo because the men who were on strike could go over there and do some work.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions associated with item 8, the Canadian and universal international exhibition.

First, the construction of our pavilion is being carried out independent of The Department of Public Works. I would be interested to know how the hon. Minister arrived at a contractor for spending the sum which, I think, is close to $7 million now, for the building of this pavilion.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, that is not correct. The programme is not being carried out without consultation with The Department of Public Works. They have approved everything that we have done in Expo '67. Here is the contract covering Expo '67 and D. G. Creba, chief architect, Department of Public Works, was in on everything with reference to the exhibition.

Mr. Nixon: When we asked the Minister during his estimates, he said certainly the responsibility would lie with you and we have waited until now.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. The responsibility is mine, but when it came to the construction of the building, like all Ministers we consulted The Department of Public works.

Mr. Nixon: What sums, in addition to the original requirement, have you had to spend in order that the pavilion would be ready on time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I recall, in 1964, as you know, the exhibition people in Montreal made the contract with the World's Fair Corporation. I believe it was in early 1963. When I joined the government it was under discussion as to what the government in this province was going to do in Expo '67. In the discussions in Cabinet it was decided that the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information would take the Ontario centennial programme and I would take on Expo '67 in Montreal.

At that time, when the decision was made, in January 1964, the St. Lawrence seaway was flowing down where our building is standing right now. There was nothing there, it had to be filled in. The bridge across from the mainland had not been built. We picked out the site, as represented by plans, and the first thing we did was get the architects busy on the kind of a building that we wanted, the designers busy on the kind of interior that had to be designed for this, and we went along and got this work started.

Now the sum of $5 million was originally suggested to Cabinet. The sum of $7 million was later suggested to Cabinet, because we did not know what cost we could get the building for. We said, well, let us put a sum of $5 million on it and see what we can do for $5 million. I am very glad we did, because if we had put a sum of $10 million on, I think we would have been up to $15 million. This has been the experience of many at Expo '67.

Now, a lot of the increase is not entirely due to not having sufficient foresight. If we had not made the decision to get the architects going on the building in January 1964 and the designers going on the interior, I could not answer the hon. member as I did tonight that we would open on time.

When the building was designed, of course, this immediately gave us some idea what we would have to put into the building in the way of air conditioning, in the way of heating, in the way of other facilities; and naturally the design of the building had a lot to do with the design of the interior. The design of the interior had a lot to do with the kind of services we were going to put in there. As far as we were concerned,

up until, as I told the House a few months ago, up to November last year, using quantity surveyors, we were right on schedule with the estimated cost. The cost increases came in the last three contracts. One was the entire roof of the building; the other was contracting out the job when the building was designed and ready for contract. We could not let it out until it was designed. When we did let it out, which was last year, there were only two contractors who bid on it and we took the lowest bid. Some countries building out there could not even get one bid, they just had to give it to somebody at cost-plus. So we took the contract we felt would get the job done for us in time to move in and, of course, there was an increase here in the contractor's bid; we had no choice.

Mr. Nixon: What was the specific increase?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The specific increase—I have it here—it was $1,119,000 increase in building construction costs.

Mr. Nixon: What reason would you ask for that extra money? What reason did you give for the increase?

Hon. Mr. Randall: What reason did we ask?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I can remember there was some controversy in the press because the officials at Expo seemed to disagree with the reasons that you had given.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think what happened was that somebody asked the Expo people had costs gone up, and they said, "no," theirs had not. But a few days later, the hon. Prime Minister, I think, announced that the deficit of Expo '67 had risen by some $20-odd million.

I think that was one place where, if they had added it on the contract of the Canada building, they would have had to say, yes, the cost has gone up. This has been the difficulty. I do not think it has been because of rising costs particularly, I think it is because the contract could not be let at the time we decided to go ahead with Expo, we had to wait until certain jobs were done—the building designed—before we could call in a man to build it. And by the time we called in the man to build it—we started in 1964—we called him in to build in 1965. Certainly there was a shortage of labour, a shortage of contractors—they were able to choose the jobs they wanted and this has perhaps been one of the main reasons for increased costs by all the people displaying at Expo '67. But I think what we should keep in mind is that this is not an expenditure, this is an investment. Already we have over $35 million of the business for Ontario manufacturers out of it. We expect $125 million in tourism through this province, extra tourism business. I think we will get another $35 million out of it this year, in 1966, before we finish. We estimate that.

There is going to be some salvage out of the building, certainly the restaurant facilities are going to be salvaged out of the building. So the total cost is around $8 million and I believe there is going to be some salvage, but I would not want to say today what it is because it is a six months' show. If we had built it as a permanent building, it would have cost, I think, twice as much as that, plus the fact that we would have had either to continue to run it and rent the ground from the city of Montreal for the next 100 years or try to sell the building to somebody else.

Building a building that is going to last only for six months is a lot more difficult than building one that is going to last for 100 years. I think the hon. member would know that if he had been in the exhibition business. We feel we are getting our value for the $8 million. I think it is wrong to say the cost went up $3 million, because the $5 million was a figure we tried to stick with. I can assure the hon. members we have had many battles with the architects and the designers who come in and say, "We cannot do it for $5 million, we need more money." And we say, "That is what you agreed to do it for, that is what you are going to do it for." However, when it comes to contracting, buying this deal at the last minute, we have no choice; you could not make a deal with those people because it was too late to make deals.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister intimated in his rather full explanation a few minutes ago that if he had not acted as he had, he would not have been saying now that our construction was on schedule. Naturally we are delighted that at least this part of our centennial effort is going to be on schedule. It would be unthinkable, of course, if the Ontario pavilion were not ready on opening day, which is not that far off. I know that it is going to be a continuing concern to the members of this House and the hon. Minister himself, because we will go down there expecting, for this expenditure, to be very proud of the effort of the province, indeed.

I would say that the enthusiasm of citizens of Ontario is very high for this project. The whole idea of the centennial exposition is a

magnificent concept and we are all looking forward, of course, to seeing the Ontario exhibit and other exhibits in action. There are a good many things associated with the planning, however, other than getting the building built, as the Minister knows. There was some reference in his remarks to the fact that the Indian culture would be one of the predominant themes. Is the Minister consulting with Ontario Indians as to what part they themselves will play in this or who has the responsibility for what goes into this exhibit? There is one question; I am concerned about that.

And secondly, the restaurant facilities and the staffing of the whole exhibit, which is going to be a very expensive and important project—what plans has the Minister made in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The design of the interior of the building is in the hands of very capable people. Their job is to depict the Ontario way of life, which includes our early citizens, the Indians. Much research by these people, as I understand, has been done with people in Indian Affairs to make sure that what we do there is authentic in our designs in the building, to depict the Indian life. Natural Ontario woods and mineral samples are being used; Indian artifacts, Eskimo sculpture, rust-coloured carpets; all the things that Ontario has been noted for, are being considered. I think when you visit Expo '67 you will find that we have not left out anybody who lives in the province of Ontario, whether they lived 100 years ago or those whom we think are going to be living here 100 years from now.

Mr. Nixon: Who is going to provide the restaurant facilities, did the Minister say?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have had the restaurant facilities designed and designs have been forwarded to us. We are looking them over now. We have not let the contract for restaurants yet. We have designs for the restaurants.

Mr. Nixon: Will this be let by tender?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it will not be let by tender because we cannot try to let the restaurant facility by tender—there are going to be restaurant facilities there to feed roughly 700 people almost in every hour, and if we go out to tender a restaurant facility now and we had to wait for people to send in designs, I do not think we would have a restaurant open a year from today. What we have done is this: We have asked various designers of restaurants to tell us what they could give us in the way of design; we chose the one which we felt was acceptable for the fair, the one that will do the best job for the province of Ontario. We will have a model of it here very shortly and I will be delighted for members to have a look at it. I think they will agree we have a resturant facility second to none. But we have no time to run any contests on the design of the restaurant—

Mr. Nixon: It is not the design, it is the operation—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The operation of the restaurant will also be considered when the design is completed, we will talk to people about running the restaurant. We have had three or four concessionnaires in to see us. We will pick the restaurant facility we believe—it may not have the lowest price but we want to make sure we have the best quality.

As the hon. member realizes, a restaurant facility cannot always be let out to the lowest concessionnaire because if we have these facilities to attract some of the 32 million people or the 30 million people going to Expo '67, we would certainly want to make sure right from a box lunch to a gourmet dinner, that the food is good and people get their money's worth. We are going to be very careful and very choosy as to who we give the concession to, I can assure the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, as the head of a family of six who is going down there for some days, no doubt, I hope that the Minister in his plans for the restaurant facilities is not going to be aiming to attract that group who will be there each day and who will be prepared to buy the most sumptuous meal in the very best facilities in the whole fair. I hope there will be a place for a family to get some food without going into bankruptcy. This is something that you should consider.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I mentioned this a few minutes ago. I think the hon. member will find when he visits the Ontario pavilion that you can take a family of six or a family of 12—

Mr. Nixon: Just six.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, things may happen between now and then.

Mr. Nixon: Not that fast.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is a good year all round. The restaurant facilities are going to cater to people of all classes and all appetites. In other words there may be many people who will want a very light dinner or a light

lunch. The prices will have to be in line with the kind of people whom we would want to entertain in Ontario '67. We are going to have people down there from overseas who want gourmet meals and we will have the facilities for those people. I would like to think that if my hon. friend comes down he will be my guest. I will take you to a gourmet meal. We are also catering for all tastes and all pocket books, and this is one of the major attractions, I think, to get people to Ontario '67, the facilities we have for feeding them.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I really admire the hon. Minister's technique. He dodges the specific issue. The point I think we are trying to get at is how you are going to determine who is going to operate the restaurant facilities. The hon. Minister said he has received three or four propositions. Does he invite, generally, a proposition for operating the restaurant facilities from anyone in Ontario or elsewhere who thinks they can properly operate according to the style and the various criteria the hon. Minister has set out? Is there a time in which various proposals are going to be put forward and considered? Once they are put forward and considered is the hon. Minister himself going to judge, is his deputy going to judge, is the Ontario economic council going to judge? How are you going to choose between them? Have certain people been invited to put forward propositions? Has the invitation been selective? One cannot again help but hear rumours, and rumour has it that certain specific people have been asked specifically to put proposals in to the hon. Minister. Is that invitation limited to certain groups of people, or is there a general invitation? Would the hon. Minister like to say through the medium of this House that he would welcome propositions about operating the restaurants? We would like to know exactly how this is going to be determined.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we sent out invitations, not tenders. We have no time, as I said earlier, to work on a tender basis for the restaurants. We will welcome any invitations. If anyone wants to come in and tell us what they can do for us in a restaurant, we are quite prepared to talk to them.

Mr. Thompson: Who did you send out invitations to?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We picked out the people we believe are capable of doing the job we want done in the six months' show we have.

Mr. Thompson: How many invitations did you send out on the restaurant?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it would be about five, or probably six, of the leading people who we feel would be capable.

Mr. Thompson: Could we ask you who the leading people are?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can get the names for you. I do not have them here; we will jot them down.

Mr. Thompson: I think my hon. colleague had some further questions. After you get these invitations, do you alone judge?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think you would have to leave it to us at this late stage to judge; who else would? I am charged with getting Expo '67 under way, and doing the best job for the province of Ontario. I said I would take the responsibility. I shall see the proposition of the people who received the invitations—I shall see what they are going to offer Expo '67—together with the knowledgeable people I have working for me in the department, plus what we know is happening down at Expo '67. We have talked to many people, including those at Expo, as to how restaurant facilities and concessions are being handled. In most cases —I will not say all—they are by invitation. They cannot afford to have a flock of people come in and take the lowest bidder or the second lowest bidder; you cannot operate on that basis. Some of the people to whom we have sent invitations are Canterbury Foods, Wall Foods, Versa Foods, Ports of Call. These are four that we have now that my friend has just given me.

Mr. Thompson: I think that there is a very real danger, let me put it that way, of a Minister assuming all the responsibility himself as to who will have the number of these concessions, or do a number of the jobs in connection with Expo. Let us be very frank about it; I would think that these people going into this, apart from pride in how they would gain a reputation for themselves, are also interested because it is very lucrative. I think this is a dangerous practice when a Minister personally is going to make all the decisions on the basis that he will judge who could best serve the type of food that will bring credit to Canada. I would say that there are several other ways that it could be done. I would think that you might get three top people in the hotel management business and ask them to make the decisions for you. With all respect to

the very wide range of interests you have, I do not know if you have a background in hotel management or the restaurant business. Perhaps you do.

But I think this is a fundamental point when we are talking now about something over $3 million that you want us to pass. Then we find that the hon. Minister is going to make a number of these decisions. I would say kindly to the hon. Minister, that I think you are putting yourself in a very dangerous position in taking the responsibility of deciding who is to run some of these very lucrative concessions; I think that for your own sake it would be very wise to get a committee of top people in some areas who would make the decision for you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me just say that we know that the federal government and Quebec and the Maritime governments are operating on the same basis that we are operating on. Somebody has to make a decision in view of the shortage of time. We have Mr. Black, one of the foremost experts on world exhibitions, working for one of our design groups. Clare Stuart of the design centre is on the board of directors. We talked to Mr. Creba who is in The Department of Public Works. They all know what we are having to do with reference to the restaurant facilities. We made a study of this for six months before we decided what we were going to have in the restaurants, what kind of food we were going to serve, and I believe we are quite capable—I say that egotistically—I think we are quite capable of making the right decision in the interest of the government; plus the fact that I do not think, like the other people have found out, there is time to have any kind of a contest to see who can supply the restaurant facilities.

Mr. Thompson: I am not suggesting a contest, Mr. Chairman, but even in the phrase that you used—I say this quite frankly; I am not trying to accuse you in any way of this—you say you are quite capable of making the right decisions in the best interests of the government. Now, you are leaving yourself open to the inference of all kinds of patronage in that phrase.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was the point.

Mr. Thompson: That is not the point and I want to clarify it; I am not making that charge to the hon. Minister, but I say that you represent the interests of the public and I would say that to ensure that you are getting expert and impartial advice, the approach to take in this would be to be able to say that we had some outstanding men who looked at the applicants, and they said: "This is the best one." But if it is left purely to a Minister himself who comes around and says: "This particular person has got it because I happen to feel he will do the job better," without having a background to assess this, I say, with all respect to the hon. Minister, that I think you are leaving yourself open to very dangerous charges.

Vote 401 agreed to.

On vote 402:

Mr. Singer: Vote 402 is the economic council vote, Mr. Chairman. My friend and colleague from Brant put forward at some length a most effective and intelligent criticism of the economic council. He compared its efforts to that of the economic council operated by the government of Canada. He criticized very substantially its apparent lack of a long-term view and direction. Some of its efforts are not too well appreciated by some of your Cabinet colleagues; at least one earlier this evening did not seem to have much confidence in what is on their books that comes forward from time to time. I think we should get some real understanding about the efforts of the economic council. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, the public accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965. I have been very interested to note that Mr. W. H. Cranston, the chairman, received on a per diem allowance basis some $19,950. In addition to that, he received travelling expenses of some $4,951.62. Last evening, I had the opportunity of talking to one of his colleagues on the economic council. He explained to me, as I know this gentleman personally, that Mr. Cranston works very hard and, in his opinion, very efficiently, in his position as chairman of the economic council.

I am quite prepared to take this gentleman's word for it. But what puzzles me, sir, is why it is necessary to pay to someone who is not in government service a salary on a per diem basis of some $19,950 which is, according to these same public accounts, an amount some $200 above that of the salary paid to the Deputy Minister?

I have long been an advocate in this House of paying proper wages to people in government employ, so that we can attract the best people available to the public service of the province of Ontario. It has been my concern that throughout the public service of the province of Ontario, in such fields as the Attorney General's department and running

through almost every other department, we have been very niggardly in the salaries that we pay to our top people.

I have no objection at all to paying to Mr. Cranston a per diem allowance of $19,950. But what I do not understand at all, Mr. Chairman, is this. If Mr. Cranston is as good as this—and the gentleman I was talking to last night said he deserves every penny of it and perhaps twice as much—why do you not take him into the civil service? Why do you not make him a full-time government employee and give him $40,000 a year, if he is worth that much, or $50,000 a year, instead of putting him on a per diem basis and only having part of his time?

I understand that this gentleman has a shoe factory in Midland and undoubtedly he must spend some of his time making sure that his business operation functions properly. I do not know how you reduce $19,950 on a per diem basis. Perhaps $100 a day; this would be 199 days, and if you add in Saturdays and Sundays, he would have approximately 50 days left to his own business. Well, you are taking pretty well his full time. If he is as good as that, and the gentleman I was talking to last night, whose opinion I value very highly, said he is—he said he is twice as good as that—why do you not take him in? Why do you not give him a full-time job in the civil service, and why do you not pay him what he is worth? If he is as good as that, Mr. Chairman, why is he not the Deputy Minister? Because in the per diem allowance, not on a full-time basis, you are giving him $200 a year more—or you did in this year—than you gave to the Deputy Minister.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making, and I want to make it just as strongly as I can, is: Surely the time has come, in this department and in every other department, to begin to analyze the salaries that we are paying to the people we are using for valuable and important work? What we have in here is a subterfuge. Why cannot you do as the government of Canada has done, and if you recognize a person like Donald Gordon being of sufficient value to the public service of Ontario, pay him $75,000 a year to run your CNR, or pay him $40,000 a year to run your economic council? But be frank with the people of Ontario and put your salaries here so we can see them.

Pay to your economists, and pay to your lawyers, and pay to your accountants, and pay to your actuaries, salaries that will bring into the public service of the province of Ontario the best people; because when we come to look at a so-called per diem allowance, which is $20,000 a year, and which is higher than the salary that is paid to the Deputy Minister, then, Mr. Chairman, we begin to wonder whether or not you are just not playing games with these figures.

I am not questioning for a moment the value of the services you get in this regard. My friend from Brant dealt very competently with the role of the economic council. What I do question is what appears in these public accounts, and I say that you are being far less than frank with the people of Ontario. The civil service of Ontario is being starved because the government of Ontario is not prepared to recognize that, if we are going to get competent people in government service, we are going to have to pay them.

When my friend had the responsibility of bringing to government service, even on a per diem basis, a man like Mr. Cranston, he had to recognize that the government was going to have to pay him more than you are presently paying the Deputy Minister.

Mr. Chairman, this is a plea that we have been making in almost every department. This government is starving its civil service. The government is not doing the service for the people of Ontario that it should, and it cannot show up any more clearly than in these public accounts that we have before us.

What is the hon. Minister going to do about it? For a while, his predecessor indicated a bit of a change in heart. His predecessor set up a new department and somehow he was able to browbeat his colleagues in the Treasury benches to establish, by and large, a higher salary level than any other department had. But this hon. Minister seems to have slipped back into the same old rut that the rest of his Cabinet colleagues are in; and the salaries are really not salaries that attract to government service the best public servants that the province of Ontario should have.

I think this hon. Minister, having at least recognized this—and these figures, sir, are a year old, these are the only figures we have to go on—having at least recognized the problem to this extent, should be prepared to tell us what he thinks of salary levels, how he is going to justify them, and what his opinion is. It is no good to say he believes what he has told the Treasury board. How effective has he been, or tried to be with his colleague, the hon. Provincial Treasurer?

The hon. Provincial Treasurer, as charming as he is, is a very tough man to extract any dollars from, he hangs on to every one as tightly as he can. But I say, sir, that the

people of Ontario are being done no service when you will not pay to the people in public service sufficient salaries to attract, to the service of Ontario, the best people available.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of opinion as to whether we have been able to do anything for the employees in our department. I find that the salary ranges that have been submitted to the Treasury board have received consideration. The Deputy Minister in my department is earning almost $4,000 to $5,000 more than the gentleman we were talking about a few minutes ago—the the chairman of the Ontario economic council. Most of our staff, from the clerks—

Mr. Singer: Which year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This last year.

Mr. Singer: Oh, this last year. What is he earning?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The Deputy Minister is earning $21,000 this year. That is his salary at the present time—last year.

Mr. Singer: And what would be the per diem payments to the chairman of the economic council?

Hon. Mr. Randall: $100 per day.

Mr. Singer: What is the total amount?

Hon. Mr. Randall: $17,500, nearly $18,000. Let me just clear up this position of the chairman of the economic council. I should know something about it, because I was the first chairman, and I worked for free. I did not even take expenses. I was the first chairman for 18 months.

Mr. Singer: Preaching for a call.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, I was not. I had no idea I was getting into politics, I can assure you; but somebody once said, "If you want to play a piano hang around piano players." If you want to be a politician, hang around politicians; so here I am.

Mr. Singer: Maybe you can get Mr. Cranston.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I just want to say this: The position was a position of public service, which I accepted in 1962, when Mr. Macaulay asked me if I would form the first economic council. When I left the Ontario economic council to come into government, he said, "Can you find another businessman like yourself who would have the time to devote to it?" I asked Mr. Cranston.

Mr. Nixon: For nothing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, for nothing; that is right. I asked Mr. Cranston how he felt about it. He said, "Well, I am going to retire from active service in my company. I am going to be on the board of directors. I want some time to myself. But if you think I can do the job, I will be glad to go on."

I said, "Well, I have recommended to the government that this job should be a job where there should be some remuneration for the man who gives of his time and his talent, because I spent many hours and did not get a dime for it; and I enjoyed every minute of it." But on the other hand, I felt that if we were going to have a permanent chairman, or a chairman that we felt could give leadership to the economic council, he must get some financial support. And, in talking to Mr. Cranston, he set his own income which, I think, he will be glad to tell you out of this House.

Now, if it is not sufficient, I can assure you that Mr. Cranston is quite free to come back and talk to us. I can talk to the hon. Provincial Treasurer down here, who is a very tender-hearted man who gives me everything I want—most of the time. I have no doubt that if we want to increase the income for the chairman of the economic council, we can; but I think that there are many public-spirited citizens—we have a number and you have some working in the Liberal Party who work very hard—who, perhaps, do not get a dime.

We have Mr. Ken Soble of the housing corporation who does not take a dime and devotes a lot of time, too—and he would not take any money for the job that he is doing. Mr. Ted Emmertt of Hawker-Siddeley, one of the busiest men in Canada, is on the Sheridan Park Corporation; these people, like myself, want to make some contribution to their province and to their country, and it is not always measured in monetary terms. They make sure that the people below them are well paid, that they get a reasonable income for doing the job they do.

I do not think that there is any argument on the part of the chairman that he is not being paid enough. If anything, he knows exactly where he can come to get more money and I am sure that the government would agree with it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think that the economic council is a fifth wheel. Mr. Macaulay, a few years ago, got one of his innumerable brainstorms and out of it came

the economic council. He did not think through what function it was to serve and nobody has thought the problem through yet.

It is a sort of glorified research agency that does some research work. I am not criticizing the studies that have been produced by it, or in its name—some of them are quite good—even though the hon. Minister of Mines apparently does not think much of their reliability, or of the reliability of one of them at any rate; but they are studies that could be produced by the economic staff of the department. In fact, I have a suspicion that that is the way that many of them were produced.

I doubt if the council itself did any significant amount of research. It probably got either the economics branch of the department to do the work for them or it may have hired somebody from outside, or a group of people from outside.

In fact, in Canada today it is fashionable to have an economic council which turns out to be a sort of a bastard research organization. It consists of a large group of distinguished citizens who, I suppose, meet once in a while and take a casual look at what some research worker is producing, but I really think it is a very inefficient way of doing research.

The same comments, actually, could be made about the economic council of Canada. The only thing I would say about them is that they do have quite a substantial and competent research organization and they are at the present time producing information that nobody else is producing. From that point of view, it is useful to have them around.

I am by no means convinced that this is the most efficient way of producing research material, but at any rate the economic council of Canada has been trying to prepare studies that represent a co-ordinated approach to the future development of Canada. They have produced two of them so far. I do not think the Ontario economic council has even attempted that fairly limited function as far as Ontario is concerned. It does spot studies on individual problems. It did one on manpower; it did one on the economic situation in some of the rural areas—the underdeveloped parts of Ontario. They are quite good studies but they are still just research studies.

The hon. Minister, in his introductory remarks this year—and every year—talks about targets, and so on. That is where I can see a role for an economic council as a body that could consider the targets that are desirable. It would be of assistance in arriving at targets and then could also be of assistance in enlisting the co-operation of labour, industry, agriculture, and others in achieving those targets.

That sort of "indicative" planning—as they call it—is done in some countries of the world now, and done with considerable success. This government, of course, does not really believe in planning at all. It talks about it from time to time, but it does not really believe in it. Thus, within the framework of the philosophy of the government as it has been manifested to date, there is no role for a body of this kind really.

I do not think that we need a committee—which is what it is—of a substantial number of quite distinguished people from various fields of endeavour to consider research studies that are to be undertaken. It is like cracking nuts with a sledge hammer. You can get the studies without the council. What else the council does is beyond me; I have never been able to find that it has any function and I do not think that the government itself knows what its function is. It has it there, that is all it knows for sure, and it has had it there ever since Macaulay gave birth to it unexpectedly one day a few years ago. So it uses it for various odds and ends of studies that—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I will not go into the manner of the birth. I will leave it to our medical adviser to explain how it happened. I take it he acted as midwife.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if I can get back to what I was talking about and perhaps conclude it in a sentence or two.

The economic council has no function in terms of economic planning because the government does not believe in economic planning. It does a certain amount of research, largely unco-ordinated. I am suggesting to you that you could do the same work in a more co-ordinated and systematic way if you did it under some sort of centralized co-ordination which, I would suggest, would properly belong under the office of the chief economist.

It seems that you are striving to co-ordinate your economic research and related research work, but there was a time when it looked as if you were going off on half a dozen tangents. As I recall it, it was not so long ago that the chief economist was called the provincial economist and he seemed to be a sort of *factum factotum*

attached to the Prime Minister's office. I could never quite figure out what his relationship was to the people in the Treasury, and more particularly to the people in the economics branch, but that lack of co-ordination now seems to be in the process of being remedied. In fact, it probably has been remedied, as far as I can make out from what the *Ontario Industrial Review* says and from the hon. Minister's speech. But we still have this sort of satellite out in orbit by itself that does a few useful jobs, but really has no basic function in the total picture.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sure that the hon. member would not mind if I disagreed with him.

Mr. Bryden: I do not mind at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The party of the hon. member, and also our hon. friends in the Liberal Party, should be very indebted to the economic council this year because three of the reports: The tourist report that has been used this afternoon and that was used earlier; the Krueger report; and the "Land and People in Transition" report were all produced by Mr. Cranston's department, the economic council.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to make one interjection, Mr. Chairman. I would not like the other people in the government to be overlooked. We have also used reports produced by your regular economic sections and indeed by other branches of the government to bat you fellows over the head with, so there is nothing special in that respect as far as the reports of the economic council are concerned. I agree though that they have sponsored some very good reports. I certainly would not want to take that away.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me suggest this: That yesterday I spoke, or the day before I spoke, for 90 minutes, and I think the hon. member for Woodbine spoke for 80, and the hon. member for Brant 70. If I had listed all the things the economic council did last year and what they are going to do I think I would have spoken for 190 minutes. I would be very glad to provide anyone in the House with a list of the activities of the economic council for last year and the coming year. I think you will find from this that regardless of the research we are doing in other areas—and we are co-ordinating our research—certainly the economic council is going to work very closely with the chief economist. They have to. We do not want duplicate research, but there are certain things the economic council can do with the people who sit on that board that I think they can do as an independent body which they can do perhaps better than we could if we had civil servants getting that kind of information. There are many things we have been able to get information on at the federal level through connections that people on the council have that I am sure we would have difficulty getting through civil servants.

Now, I do not say it cannot be done, I think they have served a very useful purpose, they have built up a very close liaison with Dr. Deutsch's Canada economic council. As the hon. member said, perhaps in time we will come closer together, but I think right now they are performing a very useful service to the government of Ontario and the province of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, to make a start then let us take item No. 3 under vote 402. This is one of those goat's breakfast type of items that recur over and over again throughout the estimates, not only of this department but of other departments as well. The following is its description: "Maintenance." This word maintenance has a most unusual meaning in the Ontario government. However, here maintenance is described as including "allowances, fees, conferences, research and special studies." Can we break that one down, at least, by the functions, by no means closely related to each other, which are listed there in the book?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think I followed the member's question.

Mr. Bryden: This item is described as "maintenance, including allowances, fees, conferences, research and special studies." Now, let us just take each one: how much for allowances; how much are the estimated fees? In short, what are the allowances, fees, conferences, research, special studies and anything else that may be thrown in there?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have it broken down but I will be glad to get it for the hon. member.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under vote 402, the economic council has made many studies, the Minister has indicated here tonight. We have in the province of Ontario the complaints of consumers about the high prices of food and also we have the producers of food, or farmers, who say—and we know it—that the price they are receiving for food products is actually going down; also, Mr. Chairman,

those in the fishing industry. In this Legislature a few weeks ago I mentioned that some producers of fish were receiving only six cents a pound whereas the consumers were having to pay $1.20 to $1.30 a pound. I wonder if the hon. Minister, as he says in his remarks at his opening—the economic council is made up of consumer organizations and many other people from practically every walk of life. Has there been a study in regard to the increase in food prices in the province, or is the Minister giving consideration to making a study on why the price of food has increased to the point where consumers are complaining?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are not making a study in the economic council. I understand the Canada economic council have a study under way with reference to food prices. As the hon. member suggests, we have people representing all facets of the economy on the board of the economic council. I do not attend all their meetings. I know that some of these things are discussed. We try not to duplicate the work that we can get through the Canada economic council and as Mr. Cranston informed me, they are making a study on food prices at the present time.

Mr. Spence: Would those reports be available to the members of the Legislature or the people in the province?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, if the Canada economic council publishes them, they will be available to all of us.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister—and I agree with many of the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine in that I do not think the Ontario economic council is really taking a large-scale project. Let me dwell on that a little bit. The Canada economic council is required by statute to produce annual reports to the federal government. In 1964 we all know the reports that were developed. There was the economic goal for Canada to 1970. In 1965, it was towards sustained and balanced economic growth. There is no statutory provision requiring similar reports from the Ontario economic council. Its reports and facts do not concentrate on the general economic assessment of the province, but they are dealing with specific problems. I could take a number of examples here.

I think they are very worthwhile projects on the whole but they range all over the place and they are small in the area or in the dimension that they cover. I am thinking of some of them—changes in employment patterns at the Lakehead cities of Port Arthur and Fort William; we had the report of tourism. These were good reports. In addition, the council makes available certain reports which were presented to the conference on productivity. That, I think, was a joint ECC and OEC venture.

But Manitoba's economic council produces an annual report on the province's economic prospects and that is based on the economic council of Canada annual review. I have often felt when the Provincial Treasurer brings down his budget, it might have more coherence and logic for not only us but also for the government members, if with the budget, it was an economic review. It might help him a bit as well. And I would like to see, frankly, under statutory law, a statute saying that this would be a function of the economic council.

Because I am sure that, as my hon. colleague mentioned, he picked one thing, and the Minister said it would keep us here for half the night if he were to report all the studies the economic council is doing. I think the first major study that should be done is on prospects for the coming year so the Provincial Treasurer could give some substance as to why he puts on a sales tax or why he has at this time such a large emphasis on public works, when we know we are facing inflationary tendencies.

If the economic prospects were able to justify the kinds of budget that are put out and if the economic council were giving a factual report, something like the tourist thing, I think there could be some meaning to the budget. But I am a little concerned that one of the reasons why the Treasurer does not ask to have an economic prospects survey done when he brings his budget in is because he is concerned that it could not relate to his budget. I think the Minister would do a service to the people of Ontario and to the Provincial Treasurer if he gave him some guidelines through a study each year.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can answer the question partially. We do not do a general economic survey in Ontario, but we are going to talk in the chief economist's branch about the statistical work in the department we are setting up and I think from that some of the information suggested will be available, through the chief economist's office, to the Provincial Treasurer and he will be able, perhaps, to give you more information, such as the hon. member has asked for.

I would also like to indicate again the

difference between the Ontario economic council and the Canada economic council. They make a general review of the entire economy, as you well recognize. What we are trying to do with the Ontario economic council is to make specific investigations in specific matters affecting the province. For instance, we talked about tourism, we talked about regional development, land, and the people; there is going to be a report released very shortly on the $50 million spent by the federal and provincial governments on training unemployed people. This report is the first comprehensive report done on this expenditure by both governments. The federal government want very much to have a look at this and so do we. This is where the economic council can be very specific and can zero in on the kind of job that we believe should be done, so that not only ourselves but the rest of the country can benefit from that kind of specialization. This again, as I can say, is the difference between the Canada economic council, and the Ontario economic council.

Now, the hon. member asked me what that $140,000 was a few minutes ago, in maintenance. It is printing and stationery and general, $7,000; telephone and telegraph—$1,500; furniture and equipment – $1,500; which is a total of $10,000. The other is for publication of reports – $10,000; conferences and publicity – $10,000; consulting fees – $10,000; committee expenses–$5,000; per diem allowance is $20,000; research and special studies–$75,000; for a total of $130,000. Add the two, that is $140,000, item 3.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to get a little more information on the $75,000.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, and I would remind the members that there are certain other matters on the order paper: second readings, House in committee. And I would like to remind them also of an outstanding debate with respect to my own estimates pertaining to the workmen's compensation board. I think in the immediate days ahead, if not tomorrow, they should be ready for that to be concluded.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask the House leader: Do I take it that Monday is, in its traditional way, a holiday?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes, Monday will be a holiday and tomorrow morning we will have something further to say on that.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the House leader clarified so ably for us what will come tomorrow. At this point I understand he said we will have Economics and Development, and then we might also have workmen's compensation, and a number of other things.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I was putting hon. members on notice. I am trying to put them on notice as gently as I can, to be prepared for the items to which I have made reference.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.53 o'clock, p.m.

(APPENDIX A)

Number of Establishments and Selling Value of Factory Shipments—Ontario, 1961.

DBS, Type of Ownership and Size of Establishment Engaged in Manufacturing in Canada—1961

$	Establishment No.	%	Selling Value of Factory Shipment—$	%
under 10,000	1,097	9.08	6,115,353	0.05
10,000 – 24,999	1,538	12.72	26,031,015	0.22
25,000 – 49,999	1,606	13.30	58,125,892	0.49
50,000 – 99,999	1,622	13.43	117,233,678	0.98
100,000 – 199,999	1,604	13.27	231,118,048	1.93
200,000 – 499,999	1,843	15.23	593,045,768	4.96
500,000 – 999,999	1,022	8.50	725,928,516	6.07
1,000,000 – 4,999,999	1,368	11.32	2,974,049,890	24.87
5,000,000 and over	381	3.15	7,225,681,493	60.43
	12,081	100.00	11,957,329,553	100.00

No. 116



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 20, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 20, 1966

Marriage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 3741

Statement re first seminar for municipal jail governors, Mr. Grossman 3741

Questions of Mr. Grossman re death of Anatol Chomenko, Mr. Young, Mr. Thompson 3741

Statement by Mr. Stewart re assistance in purchase of livestock 3744

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 3744

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3767

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 20, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Alexander Muir public school, Toronto, and Nelson A. Boylen high school, Downsview; and in the west gallery, Holy Name of Mary high school, Port Credit and Holsgrove public school, Westbrook.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, an amendment in the Act provides for the appointment of a marriage licence issuer in Indian bands.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister. Perhaps I could give it.

In view of the estimate by Mrs. McLellan, new director for the recruitment for the Ontario civil service commission, that the government could use 100 to 200 social workers a year, will the government reconsider its position not to provide grants for the development of a school of social work at the Waterloo Lutheran University?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have an announcement which I am sure will be of interest to the hon. members.

The first seminar for municipal jail governors will be held under the auspices of The Department of Reform Institutions at the staff training school, Ontario reformatory, Guelph, for four days from May 24 to May 27; 36 of the 37 present jail governors will attend.

Speakers for the seminar include these Department of Reform Institutions personnel: Mrs. I. Beal, administrator of food services; Mr. Douglas Penfold, assistant Deputy Minister; Mr. A. S. Nuttall, director of information; and Mr. David Dougall, administrator, inspection and jails branch. Topics to be covered by the speakers and in the general discussion sessions will include those suggested by the governors, and such subjects as: general administration; statement of purpose; good public relations; and many others of specific interest to municipal jail governors. This seminar should prove a breakthrough in more uniform operation of municipal jails and the treatment of inmates.

Mr. Speaker, on March 7 the hon. member for Yorkview asked a question in the House concerning the action I proposed to take following the inquest into the death of Anatol Chomenko, an inmate of Guelph reformatory who died while he was a patient of the Kitchener-Waterloo hospital. On the same day the hon. leader of the Opposition asked me for details of the medical treatment received by the same inmate.

At that time I had not received a copy of the report of the coroner's inquest, so I advised this House that when this report had been received and studied in detail, I would advise members of the results of our study and of any action taken as a result of the said report.

The member for Yorkview, at that time, also asked if I would make a copy of the transcript of the evidence available so that members could study it. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to table a copy of the transcript of the evidence, and also a copy of the statement which I will now read to the House.

The verdict of the jury was as follows:

> Anatol Chomenko came to his death at 5:40 p.m. on December 5, 1965, in Kitchener, and death was caused by bronchial pneumonia, due to a bronchial obstruction, cerebral anoxia due to cardiac arrest

(bronchial obstruction due to bronchial adenoma).

We feel there was no brutality on the part of the prison staff.

We do not feel that any of the fighting by the inmates, which appeared to be of a minor nature, had any bearing on the death of Anatol Chomenko.

Due to the extended length of illness and recurring pneumonia, and because of the frequent spitting of blood, we feel the medical staff of Guelph reformatory were extremely lax in that they did not call in a chest specialist long before it was done.

This is the end of the quote insofar as the verdict is concerned, Mr. Speaker.

The latter finding of the jury, of course, caused us considerable concern. As a result I have studied the complete transcript of evidence taken at the inquest. Because the verdict and recommendations deal largely with medical matters, I have discussed the matter with members of my staff qualified and competent in such matters.

I should point out that our senior physician and director of psychiatry, Dr. R. E. Stokes, is an extremely well-qualified physician with some ten years of practice in general medicine prior to study for his specialist certificate in psychiatry.

I shall, after quoting each recommendation as made by the jury, refer to Dr. Stokes' opinion relating to same.

Recommendation (a) of the jury is as follows:

In the event of releasing or discharging patients we feel the reformatory physician on call must examine the patient and give his written release.

That is the end of the recommendation.

Dr. Stokes' comment is as follows:

As in a community general hospital, the patients in the hospital within the Guelph reformatory are visited at least daily, but usually more often, by the medical staff who are full-time medical practitioners within the reformatory. Discharge from the hospital can only be accomplished by a physician's order.

However, on occasion, the physician may be called on the telephone regarding an order to discharge a patient. This is common medical practice in any hospital in the community, especially when only a few hours have elapsed since the patient was seen by the physician. The order is then formally signed by the physician when he returns to the hospital, thereby confirming the telephoned order.

Recommendation (b) was as follows:

Consideration should be given to the advisability of compulsory hospitalization when it is the decision of the reformatory physician.

Dr. Stokes' comment is as follows:

This is always a difficult issue for a physician. It is generally held that one does not infringe on the rights of an incarcerated person any more than is necessary to confine him. In the outside community, a physician cannot compel a patient to enter a hospital unless it can be established it is for the public good—for example, a contagious disease. If an inmate in a reformatory refuses to be hospitalized and the public good is not jeopardized, then it would be an infringement on his civil rights to force hospital or medical care upon him.

Recommendation (c):

Consideration should be given to making more readily available specialists in all fields to the medical staff of reform institutions for consultation.

Dr. Stokes states:

There is no limit or restriction on obtaining specialist consultation when, in the opinion of the institution medical officers, it is advisable. It has been found to be more practical to send the patient to the specialist's office, or, more often, to arrange admission of the patient to a community hospital and have the consultation and appropriate laboratory, specialized X-ray examinations, etc. carried out.

That is the end of the comment insofar as the recommendations are concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the actual verdict is concerned—after recording a verdict of "death caused by bronchial pneumonia, due to a bronchial obstruction, cerebral anoxia due to cardiac arrest," the jury expressed the opinion that the medical staff should have called in a chest specialist earlier than they did.

On this opinion, Dr. Stokes reports as follows:

Anatol Chomenko, aged nineteen years at the time of death, was a truculent, uncooperative patient who had little regard for his medical welfare. This attitude existed before his incarceration; he signed himself out of a hospital in Kitchener in November 1964. He was being treated for

pneumonia by a physician in the community who did not believe Mr. Chomenko was ready to leave the hospital, but was unable to persuade the patient to remain.

While incarcerated in January 1965, Anatol Chomenko contracted pneumonia and failed to improve on the antibiotic medication he received from the medical staff at the OR Guelph. Because of the patient's failure to respond to medication and a past history of frequent chest infections, the medical staff at the Guelph reformatory arranged for surgical and medical consultants to examine him at St. Joseph's hospital in Guelph. Mr. Chomenko was admitted to that hospital and remained there for approximately three weeks. Surely this indicated there was no hesitation to provide specialist consultation for this patient and the medical staff were aware of the need for these services because of the recurring chest infections.

The patient did not seek further medical services for a chest complaint until August 30. At that time X-rays revealed a small pneumothorax which, in a man of Chomenko's age, is more apt to be related to severe recurrent chest infections than a tumour.

The course of the illness was followed by X-ray examination and the X-rays were studied by the two physicians of the reformatory medical staff and a consultant radiologist. The pneumothorax improved and almost cleared by the end of October; furthermore, during this time, cultures of his sputum were collected and sent away for tuberculosis testing, an illness that was a distinct possibility. These tests proved negative.

Throughout this period, the patient was a severe problem in management and repeatedly refused to comply with the regulations of the hospital within the reformatory at Guelph. He became such a disturbing influence one evening that, since his temperature had been normal and daily physicial checks indicated he was well enough to be discharged, the physician in charge was notified and ordered Chomenko to be removed from the reformatory hospital on October 1.

He was readmitted on October 15 and in November developed a fever and an apparent pneumonia, whereupon the medical staff arranged another consultation with a surgeon in Kitchener; to effect this, the patient was admitted to the Kitchener-Waterloo hospital on November 28, 1965. Within an hour of his admission to that hospital, the nursing office telephoned the reformatory to enlist help to control the patient who was creating a disturbance on the ward and not complying with the hospital rules.

The cardiac arrest which was a prime factor in Mr. Chomenko's death occurred after administration of the anaesthetic and relaxant drug, a not uncommon anaesthetic complication and a risk that is inherent whenever a general anaesthetic is given. During the inquest the surgeon stated, "Even if I had obtained the patient sooner, it was still possible that he would have had a cardiac arrest during surgery."

The report of the inquest was forwarded to the registrar of the college of physicians and surgeons by the coroner. It is a task of the registrar to review complaints of medical conduct and if he deems it appropriate refer them to the discipline committee. The registrar stated that he saw no evidence of medical misconduct and saw no reason to proceed further with the case. This would indicate that the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario were satisfied that the medical staff of Guelph reformatory were conducting themselves within accepted medical standards of practice.

That is the end of the quote of Dr. Stokes' opinion.

In view of the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of the department, I cannot in all conscience conclude that Anatol Chomenko received anything but proper and adequate medical care.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: The member may ask the Minister a question, if he wishes to answer it.

Mr. Young: I gather from a part of the hon. Minister's statement that Chomenko was not willing to enter the hospital. The Minister indicated that force could not be used to make him go there if he did not want to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact is that he was in hospital and refused to stay there. Of course if he does not want to stay in hospital and cannot be convinced to stay there I think the hon. member will agree that he could not be forced to stay.

Mr. Young: Was this prior to his admission to Guelph reformatory—if you are referring to that incident?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At the moment, Mr. Speaker, I would rather not answer without going through the statement again. The hon. member, of course, will probably study the statement and the transcript; and, if he has any questions as a result of that, I would be very glad to answer him at that time.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the House will be interested to know that in order to assist farmers in northern Ontario in improving the quality of their livestock a programme has been developed under the provisions of The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act which will subsidize the purchase price of good breeding dairy and beef cows and heifers and breeding gilts purchased outside of their territorial districts.

High costs of good type beef and dairy cows has been a deterrent in the expansion of livestock production in northern Ontario. The new policy, together with the existing provincial programme to defray transportation costs of good breeding stock, will assist farmers in northern Ontario to increase the size of their herd and improve their income.

Complementing the policy for beef and dairy cattle, the plan will provide assistance in the purchase of carload or truckload lots of breeding gilts which will permit the building up of good swine herds.

The plan provides for a subsidy of 20 per cent of the purchase price of beef and dairy cows or heifers up to a maximum of $50 per head.

Thirty per cent of the total cost of purchase and transportation for open and bred gilts will be allowed up to a maximum of $25 per head.

The local administration of the programme will be handled through the offices of the agricultural representative.

All of us are aware of the livestock potential in northern Ontario and I am confident that this long-range programme will materially assist in the further development of the industry in that section of the province which comprises all territorial districts.

This ARDA project will be in operation until March 31, 1970, and will be financed on a 50-50 basis with the government of Ontario and the government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order: House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*continued*)

On vote 402:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned last night I was in the middle of asking the Minister certain questions with regard to item 3 under vote 402. The question that I was on the point of posing related to the $75,000 in the item that is being requested for research and special studies for the Ontario economic council. I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would give us at least a general indication of the studies that are envisaged under this item.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): I would be very glad to, Mr. Chairman.

Some of the studies that we will be doing through the economic council this year, include the index of research products, public and private, in the physical sciences; and the examination of the impact of the Ford engine layoff in Windsor.

As the hon. member will recall, this was brought up last year. That study will be completed, as I think I mentioned in our presentation the other day, and is going to cost between $12,000 and $14,000.

Another study, employment potential in the personnel service field, covers a survey in the service industries to see what type of employment is available and what has to be done to fill the needs of the service industries. One that comes to mind is the professional cleaning services, which I think have been talked about in newspapers recently, and the lack of people to clean the new office buildings going up. I have had some visits from these personnel service agencies, asking what we can do to get employees, and if we get them is there any way we can participate in the training of these employees.

The fourth study will be a review of the training and retraining of the unemployed. This will be a study on which we will be cooperating with the federal government, and which will cost about $20,000. As you know, there has been roughly $5 million spent on this programme in the past year or so, and the federal authorities, as well as ourselves, want to get some ideas of what the results are. There will be a specialized study in this field.

There will be a survey of forward labour requirements for 1970 with selected Ontario

industries in, again, co-operation with the Canada economic council. We are using this as a pilot project in Ontario to ascertain what certain industries are going to require in the way of manpower between now and 1970. I might say that some of these studies were undertaken on a shared basis with the Canada economic council. This one will, we expect, cost about $7,000.

Then there is a series of case studies and skill acceleration in which both the unions and the management of a number of the larger companies are participating to see what we can do to accelerate the skills that are required.

Then there are studies of barriers to labour mobility in the professions and the skilled trades done by our own department. That is an internal study we are making to see what would come out of the mobility factor. There is a great deal of talk about mobility now that we have pension plans, and a mobility programme between other provinces. We feel that perhaps there should be a good look taken at the mobility factor, particularly in the skilled trades and in the professional ranks.

Another one that comes to mind is the survey of factors influencing industrial location outside of the metropolitan area, which is one thing the hon. member for Bruce touched on the other day as "How do you decentralize industry?" I think the first thing we should do is find out the factors which influence people to go into certain areas.

We know that the federal government has had the designated area programme in which the major factor, of course, is the capital cost allowance. The second factor must be that there is labour available. One area that comes to mind is Midland, which is in the designated area. I think this year RCA Victor went in there with a colour television tube plant. One of the other companies, Sylvania, was going to go in but recognized that if they went in there perhaps the labour they would want would not be available. I believe now they are going into another location—Cornwall, if I recall the factors.

These are just a few of the studies that we believe the economic council of Ontario can do in conjunction not only with our local people here—union officials and management—but also the Canada economic council. Again, I think it points out that with our department and the chief economist, plus the people in the Treasury department, we have access to general economic information. There would be perhaps a duplication if we tried to do the same thing as some have suggested to the economic council of Ontario. This, we feel, in view of what we have done in the past and what we intend to do in the future, gives some indication of the service that we can get from the economic council that will be of more benefit to the province of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I said last night that I do not want to cast any reflections on the value of the individual studies that the hon. Minister has mentioned. I am a little surprised, I must say, to find that we are only now getting around to studying the factors that might lead to industrial decentralization. The government has been talking about this for as long as I have been in this House, and now they are getting around to studying what is involved.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They did not have the permission of the hon. Minister of Mines before.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, I see. Well, at any rate, my admittedly superficial knowledge of the subject leads me to the conclusion that it is an extremely complex problem. It takes more than capital cost allowances, and so on, to induce a manufacturer to locate in some area outside the main market centres—and also outside the area where his suppliers exist.

As a matter of fact, I believe that studies in Italy have indicated that this is one of the great problems. It is hard to get a manufacturer to move away from the area where people in the same industry are located because he is dependent upon them for supplies; or, alternatively, he may be supplying others. Italy is a country where, as I understand it, a great deal of study and effort has been put into this problem through the Cassa del Mezzogiorno, or whatever it is called. I remember reading in *The Economist*, a year or two ago, that they were developing a new tack: they were trying to develop a plan whereby an entire complex would be moved to a new location. That would overcome the difficulty of one manufacturer being isolated from the main body of his industry.

That, of course, would be quite a large undertaking, and I am not sure how far they have proceeded with plans like that in Italy or if they have had any success with them. However, Mr. Chairman, that really is not the main point I want to deal with. I have said that I am not criticizing any of the individual studies the council is contemplating, but I do not retreat from my point of last night that the elaborate machinery of the

economic council is, in my opinion, not necessary to have most of these studies undertaken. I am by no means satisfied that we have to have a chairman of the economic council who gets fees ranging up to $20,000 per year, plus other members of the council, in order to get research work done.

There is one point that the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to briefly last night that I would like to pursue for a moment or two now. Does the hon. Minister see no value, and does the economic council see no value, in trying to, shall we say, fill in the details, so far as Ontario is concerned, of the primary studies of the economic council of Canada as reported in their two annual reviews?

In the first annual review, the economic council of Canada attempted to arrive at certain targets between now and 1970 which it considered feasible for Canada, assuming that the policies were of the right kind. It took the position that these targets were within the capacity of the Canadian economy. It did not by any means suggest that they would be realized. It just said that it would be possible to realize them having regard to our capacities.

One of the criticisms I have of the economic council of Canada is that it poses problems but has not shown too much disposition yet to indicate how the problems might be solved. It has given considerable emphasis to the problem of labour mobility in all its ramifications, and I think that is very important; but it really has not attempted to recommend any overall programme to achieve the targets which it says are achievable.

The great problem is that it is basically a research agency and there does not seem to be any integration between the research function it undertakes and government policy. They seem to be in two completely different compartments. I think most people have read the annual reviews of the economic council of Canada, although I begin to wonder sometimes if the government of Canada has read them. It does not seem to adjust its policies in any sense to relate to what the economic council of Canada is suggesting. I have not seen any evidence anywhere that any government is trying to develop any overall plan to try to achieve the targets that the economic council not only says are possible but which it also says are essential. It says that if we do not achieve those targets, we will not be able to absorb our expanding labour force between now and 1970.

That seems to me to be a great deficiency in the whole conception of the economic council of Canada. But then, when you bring it down to Ontario, you get an even more serious deficiency. The Ontario economic council does not make any attempt at all to do the same sort of forecasting for Ontario as the economic council of Canada does for Canada. The hon. Minister talks about targets for Ontario—that is the part that his department and presumably the government has in mind. Well, I would like to know how those targets are arrived at. As far as I can make out from reading what the hon. Minister has said, the government has simply taken the economic council of Canada's targets for the whole of Canada and transposed them to Ontario.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we should have a somewhat more sophisticated approach. We can take, if we want, the targets set forth or suggested by the economic council of Canada as a starting point, but then within that framework surely we here can develop targets for our own province. I suggested earlier, and I repeat, that by and large the targets for Ontario, in terms of economic growth and the growth of productivity, necessarily have to be higher than those for Canada as a whole.

Canada as a whole will not achieve the targets set by the economic council of Canada unless the performance of the Ontario economy is better. The government seems to be satisfied if its performance more or less matches what is suggested by the economic council of Canada for the whole of Canada. I do not think that is good enough. I would like to ask the hon. Minister: Why does the Ontario economic council not try to do—since it exists, it is there—why does it not try to do for Ontario what the economic council for Canada is doing for the whole of Canada?

I do not think it is good enough for us just to accept the Canada economic council's analyses for the whole of the country and say, "Well, we can just translate that to Ontario." I think we now have to work the whole thing out in terms of Ontario and arrive at targets which are feasible for Ontario and are also essential. I think we should note the point the economic council of Canada stressed. It is not only a matter that we can achieve those targets, we must achieve them if we are going to keep our economy operating at full capacity.

I think the government—and presumably the Ontario economic council would be the body to do the job within the framework that the government has established—should be prepared to set targets for Ontario, even

though it has no policies to achieve those targets. I am not even going to bother with that argument. I know I will never persuade the government that once one sets targets then government policy ought to be devised so as to achieve the targets. But at least let us have the targets; let us have an analysis of what this economy here is capable of and must achieve between now and 1970. Why is it that there appears to be no interest in that subject at all as far as either the economic council of Ontario is concerned, or the government as a whole?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would like to answer the question of the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. I would like first of all to discuss with you for a second the reason for making these studies, those we talked about a minute ago – these studies in depth. As hon. members well know, the auto pact has thrown a whole new set of circumstances into Canadian manufacturing. We now have an opportunity to become continental manufacturers and I can only use Sault Ste. Marie as an example of a discussion that came up when I was up there, I think it was, last November. Sault Ste. Marie is a steel town, most of the men are employed in heavy industry. There are many hundreds of women up there who would perhaps like to get into industry; but it must be a light industry, it must be a sophisticated industry.

Up to now, perhaps all the carburetors in Canada were manufactured en masse in the United States, it may have been an import item. I just use this as an illustration. Now, with the opportunity for Canadian automobile manufacturers to produce an item like that in quantity on a continental basis, if they are going to produce it here then they undoubtedly would be looking for an area where there is female labour available in quantities.

Sault Ste. Marie, to me, is a good example. It is only three or four hundred miles north of the heart of "motordom" in Detroit, Michigan. They can produce that part in Sault Ste. Marie, put it on a truck at night and have it in the General Motors plant in Detroit the next morning. I do not think distance would be a factor in discouraging anybody to open up a plant of that kind.

Now, that is one reason why I think we certainly have to go a little further than we have gone in the past. I would also like to say to the hon. member, if he will take the time to come into our office one of these days we will show him how far we have gone in having this information available for manufacturers who want new locations.

With the change in the economy over here we are going to have to do a lot more of this if we want to get diversification of plants.

That is one of the reasons for this study. When we talk about studies in depth by the Canada economic council, I can think of one we have been doing since the economic council got finished with it, a chemical study which took place a few years ago. We have had that in our department, we have examined it. There is something like $200 million worth of chemicals still being imported in this country and the object of that study was to decide whether we could replace those imports by manufacturing them here in plants of Canadian manufacturers already in the business. If this was not possible, could we invite some financial group to set up a new chemical plant here to manufacture a number of these chemicals involved in the $200 million imports; or could we entice some foreign manufacturer to come in here and set up another plant to manufacture some of that $200 million worth?

This is what we have been doing with the chemical study and we have one or two others that Ottawa has done in depth. The information is available to us and other provinces. We are taking the information as it is available and trying to make a further study and see if we can fit it into our economy and get something out of it for our manufacturers.

Insofar as targets are concerned: Yes, we do get the data from DBS. A lot of the data, of course, is ancient history, but on the other hand matching it with what we know here—and we will know more when we get our statistical centre set up which we are going to talk about under perhaps the next vote—we feel that we will be in a position to do some of the things the hon. member mentions and have a more comprehensive picture of the economy of Ontario. In the meantime, until that information is available, we must take the facts as released by DBS and try to match them with the facts we have here.

One of the things we will do—I am out of context here, but I might say that we have already arranged with DBS that when they send out their forms to industry in Ontario to get the next DBS figures there will be an extra copy provided for us, and perhaps attached to this will be information that we as a province would like to have.

This is without duplicating effort and driving business crazy by trying to ask too many questions. They get enough questions thrown at them now, we think the form could be

changed somewhat to incorporate more provincial information that would be made available to us. We could feed this into our statistical centre and we would have the information that the hon. member talks about. So I do not think we are just buying or begging or borrowing facts from the economic council and using them to make statements as to what we are going to do here.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is borrowing objectives from them—the objectives drawn up in relation to the whole of Canada, which is not Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Ontario's targets have been arrived at, I can assure the hon. member, very carefully. The Canada economic council's overall growth rate has been adopted for Ontario and this has been done by taking a higher productivity rate for Ontario.

We talked about productivity earlier this week, and a slightly lower rate of growth in employment. This still implies a faster employment growth than our previous projections.

Now, I think we must look at the overall picture insofar as the facts are available to us. We can do some second guessing here, but again I say the only facts we do have are those that our Treasury department is able to compile through provincial transactions and the special surveys we have been making. But I feel that if we do not use Ottawa's facts and figures as a base we could be a lot further off than perhaps we have been. Perhaps, as the hon. member saw from our presentation the other day, we have met all the goals set for us in the context of the Canada economic council's predictions. I am quite sure we will have better control of those objectives and be able to add some of our own objectives when we get our statistical centre set up.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, there is something I would like to add. I think, for example, of the auto parts agreement and the new needs this obviously creates for Ontario industry, the need of certain kinds of skills and tool and die workers and so on. How closely does the hon. Minister know of such pending agreements between, say, the United States and Canada?

I understand there has been a feeling, and I just suggest this, there has been a feeling on the part of the provincial government that this thing came on them suddenly, the auto pact. They would like to have known about it several years ahead so they could have been studying the effect and the needs for Ontario.

I cannot quite accept that. It would appear to me that everyone knew they were trying to negotiate an agreement. But because of the obvious economic implications of an agreement such as the auto pact agreement, has the Minister any suggestions that he feels should be carried through with the federal government?

Let me throw one out! Does the Minister think, for example, that Ontario should be present when they are negotiating agreements with the United States?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I think this is the prerogative of the federal government. I think there are certain things—international matters—that have to be negotiated by the federal government.

Let me answer the question this way: We knew negotiations were going on. But as to with whom and on what basis nobody but the federal authorities, the American authorities, and the manufacturers involved had the facts. As you know, when it was jointly announced by Mr. Pearson and President Johnson, it was an agreement not with the United States particularly but an agreement with 18 some-odd manufacturers, and each one had a different quota to meet by 1968.

Those quota agreements have never been made public on an individual basis. We know that the overall fact is that we will be producing in this country, $268 million worth of additional automobiles and automobile parts by 1968. We know that the federal government in the United States did not pass its legislation as quickly as we passed ours in Ottawa to rescind the tariffs; and as you know, we paid 7.5 per cent on all of our products and parts going to United States for almost a year before Congress passed it. Now this is a negotiation that quite frankly I believe is in the hands of the federal authorities, and perhaps for some reason they could not tell us what the impact would be.

I just simply say that when it did break and the automobile manufacturers then said they had to have so many toolmakers and diemakers and were going to require another 27,000, or 28,000 people in the industry; the problem then became one for our Department of Labour and ourselves to see how we could co-ordinate our activities. Once the announcement was made, we went to Ottawa and sat down with Mr. Drury and

his people and asked them where we could fit. We have had a committee in our trade and industry branch under the director, Mr. York, working with the director of Mr. Drury's department trying to solve some of the difficulties that are bound to arise, particularly when about 97 per cent of the automobiles are manufactured in the province of Ontario.

Now this is as far as I think the federal authorities could go. I do think this, that they have already recognized that there were some ramifications. As you probably read in the newspaper the other day, the next industry they are going to look at is the heavy machine tool industry and they have announced there what will happen with reference to tariffs if they can negotiate an arrangement.

That gives us a better opportunity to try to estimate how many people are going to be needed in the manufacturing of heavy machine tools with the lowering of that tariff. I might say that same thing applies to the tariff agreements going on in Geneva. We have been warning manufacturers in this country that they must become competitive if world tariffs are being reduced; I do not think you can read any speech I made in the past two or three years, even before I came into the government, that I was not advising, not only my own people, but other manufacturers, that they must recognize that one of these days they may be in a market where they have very little, if any, tariff protection. The automobile pact was one of the first indications, and if tariff negotiations in Geneva wind up this year, there may be some shocks for many people in various industries, not only here, but I think in the United States. I think you also, by reading the American papers, can see the concern that is appearing in some industries in the United States as to the automobile pact. Already they have in process payments to those unemployed by the pact, until they are reestablished in other industries.

I do not feel that we can insist that the authorities in Ottawa take us to the bargaining table. I simply say that if they have confidence in us, which I think they should have, they can say: "If this arrangement works out without giving any details, you are going to require this, this, and this." Then, I think we would be in a better position to cooperate and help them, instead of perhaps being in a critical mood.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that every province can go to the bargaining table in international agreements. However, I do feel that there could be a forewarning so that a province can start studying what the implications of the trade agreement is going to mean. It appeared to me that you did not start any kind of study concerning deficiency of other labour skills and so on until after the agreement was made. Am I right?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would think that in essence you are right. We did not know what the impact was going to be. We had a shortage of labour, as you know. We had a shortage of labour in almost every industry before the automobile pact was announced, so that any work we were doing was on the basis without the auto pact, which certainly supplied some information. But I say the impact of that one industry could not be contemplated until we knew what the facts were.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, as we get further and more involved with the auto trade pact, we note it is having an effect on stamping plants. Is the department doing any studies at all concerning the long-range effect that the auto trade agreement will have on these stamping plants? I understand the plants can foresee sufficient work up until the end of 1967, but some of them are concerned that in 1968 more and more of this work is going to be rerouted into the U.S. rather than be kept in Canada. Has the hon. Minister any comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is one of the ramifications. Let us, without attempting to be facetious, look at it this way.

Suppose we are making fenders in General Motors plant today. It is decided tomorrow they can manufacture a fender more economically in the United States than they can here. That means that that equipment becomes redundant; they are not going to manufacture fenders. By the same token, they may decide they are going to manufacture all the car radios in Canada that go into not only our automobiles, but the ones that are being imported from the United States, plus those that we can ship to the United States. This means that if you take the same worker off the stamping machine, we have to train him to manufacture radios.

This is one of the problems that undoubtedly is going to happen. What happens to the equipment at the moment has not, I think, been a major problem. When they stop manufacturing fenders, they start manufacturing something else. This equipment is

versatile. A piece of equipment is not manufactured to produce just one item. The tool is made to produce one item, as you well know, but can be taken off and shipped somewhere else, or thrown on the scrap heap. A new tool can be made and you can start stamping some other part. So I do not think the stamping plants are going to become redundant. But I think in this period of transition, some of this equipment may be off today and on tomorrow, but I do not think there is going to be a wholesale junking of stamping equipment.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the stamping business, the Canadian industry—the Ontario industry, really—at one time used to stamp probably 100 different types of articles. Today, as a result of this trade pact, they are only stamping eight, nine and ten in some of these factories. If, as you say, they find that they can perform the operation a lot cheaper in the U.S., they are even going to take these eight, nine or ten operations out of Canada. This becomes quite a concern to the stamping plants.

As we continue with this auto trade pact, there is the request for wage parity. Has the department undertaken studies on wage parity and its effect on the economy of Ontario? Or is it contemplating one?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me answer your first question. Wage parity is going to come with the same rate of production. If it does not, somebody is going to be subsidizing the cost of automobiles. The two go hand in hand. I think it is understood, even by union officials, that if we are going to have a comparison in prices of automobiles, you must have a comparison of output. This is not under study by us at the moment, but it is being looked at by everybody. We are concerned with it, and we are interested in looking at it, but we have no particular study going on. Perhaps we will when this session is over, but we do not have one at the present time.

Answering your second question, I think you have an example of what happens to stamping plants right in your own town. We talked about Ford laying-off workers last year to produce three models of car engines instead of 11. It is obvious that the three engines are going to be manufactured for a total continental production of almost nine million automobiles, of which Ford will get their share and be able to participate in. It is obvious that some of that equipment Ford were using in Windsor to make 11 models of engines will not be used here; it will probably go to the States. But by the same token Ford has got something like $60 or $70 million down there with which to put in different equipment to produce more of the three models they are going to manufacture.

I think this is true of anybody engaged in automotive production, whether it be fenders, carburetors or anything else. If they have the equipment, and they are only making nine or ten items today or nine or ten per cent of the items, this is where the manufacturer has to become continental in attitude, and get over to the United States and get his share of the business. If he does not, he may well be a casualty. There is no other way out.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, as they become continental, it is only natural that the request for wage parity is going to become stronger and stronger. And as the request comes in for wage parity you are going to have the request, as today, for a price parity as far as the car is concerned.

Are studies being undertaken as to the possibilities of price parity in the automotive field?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are not being undertaken by us. Mr. Drury's department has some studies going on.

Mr. Newman: Then may I ask the hon. Minister if this department has undertaken any studies concerning the rents in communities? Not necessarily the control of rent, but a fair rent for a fair accommodation, because the rents have a direct effect on the economy of a community, too. You cannot attract the worker into a community if he is going to find rents excessively high.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have some information on rents in Windsor. I would prefer to discuss it on the housing board, if you do not mind.

Mr. Newman: Right!

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Before we leave vote 402, I would like to comment on the automobile trade agreement, because I think the government has a responsibility with the auto trade agreement coming up for renewal, I believe, next year. There are three particular objectives about which I think this government should give an assurance in this House that it will make its representation to Ottawa; it will be in close consultation with the federal government prior to the time that the pact comes up for renewal to make certain that the government at Ottawa is appraised of what the views of the Ontario government are.

The three areas are, first of all, the question of wage parity which the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has raised. There seems to be little doubt that having embarked on the course of integrating on a continental basis the automobile industry, there is no alternative but to go the whole course in the integration of that industry. There is no turning back now from the plan, so we must accept the plan, the logical consequence of which is wage and price parity. I do not think it is sufficient or adequate for us to continually receive announcements either from the automobile industry or from the federal government that only in the course of time is there going to be price parity for automobiles.

I think it is absolutely essential, if we are going to avoid distortions in the automobile industry so far as it affects the economy of the province of Ontario, that there be, in the shortest possible time, price parity in automobiles on both sides of the border. Whether we take the very conservative view put forward by the hon. Minister of Industry in Ottawa—that if you take the factory cost of the automobile and you eliminate all the excise taxes and everything else, that the only differential is really $150 or $175 between Ontario and the United States—or whether you take the actual fact of the marketplace —that automobiles are being made in Canada and are being sold in New York state for anything up to $500 or $600 less than the same automobile in the province of Ontario—it does not affect the position that this government should take.

It is a technical and difficult problem, but I think that, in the course of the negotiations which are going to take place between Canada and the U.S., this government has got to make a point to Ottawa that, because 90 per cent, or better, of the automobile and trucking manufacturing operation is carried on in the province of Ontario, one of the objectives of this government should be price parity as soon as possible; and that this government should have and obtain, either itself or from the federal government, the information on when price parity will be achieved.

I do not think it is sufficient for this government always to be talking about the automobile trade agreement in the past tense. I would think that it is absolutely essential—if the government has not now got the information—that there should be full and complete disclosure by the government at Ottawa to the government of Ontario, about all the information relevant to the manufacture of automobiles in Canada, mainly in the province of Ontario. I understood, from what the hon. Minister said, that in fact the government of the province of Ontario does not know and has never been informed of the quotas which the various automobile manufacturers have agreed with Ottawa as their objective. It would seem to me that this information is peculiarly the information that the government of the province of Ontario should have.

I think also that the financial affairs of the U.S. affiliated operations in Canada—the main companies that are engaged in the business—should be fully available to this government. If even that basic information is not available to this government I do not think that this government can possibly give informed and intelligent views to the government at Ottawa on questions such as price parity and wage parity.

On the question of wage parity, the hon. Minister knows as well as I do, that if we permit lower wages to be paid in Canada, in the province of Ontario and in the automobile industry, over a very short period of time the automobile industry will have unrealistic disruptions in its affairs as it moves towards this parity. Surely it is possible, with Ontario this close to the United States market, to provide now that the wages paid in the industry be identical with the wages paid in the United States. The whole purpose of the integration of the automobile industry is to provide continent-wide benefits of an efficient automobile manufacturing operation. Efficiency in automobile manufacturing operations on a continent-wide basis must, of necessity, mean that the wages are the same, and that the prices of the automobiles are the same. This must be the object of the exercise. It cannot be some—

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask you a question? You agree that the output must be the same, that the use of the same capital equipment, the same capital investments, the same wages and the same amount of units per hour must come out of our Canadian factories to get wage parity. Do you agree with that?

Mr. Renwick: I think that is perhaps an oversimplified statement. My understanding of the industry—

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is very important if we are going to stay in the business with the competitors.

Mr. Renwick: No, the whole purpose of the integration of the automobile industry, as I understand it—and I am not certain

of the exact figures, but the number of models and the number of types of cars which are put out, for example, by the Ford Motor Company in Canada, prior to the agreement showed an inefficient method of operation. The purpose of integrating the automobile industry on a continent-wide basis was to reduce the number of models which are put out by Ford Motor Company in Canada so that it could be done on a highly efficient basis and so that those automobiles could compete in the United States, and could be shipped freely back and forth across the border. I do not think that integration means that we are going to reproduce in Canada an automobile manufacturing industry that has a counterpart in the United States. That is not the purpose of the integration scheme. The plan is to integrate the Canadian operation into the U.S. operation without reference to the border. By doing so, you are going to make the automobile industry efficient. It is still something which requires the decision of this government as to its position, because the people of the province of Ontario are not going to accept what appear to be invalid arguments put forward by the automobile industry and by the government of Canada as to why an automobile made in Canada sells for anywhere up to $500 or $600 less in Buffalo or in upper New York state, than in Canada.

As I understand it at the present time we have, for practical purposes, one automobile going to the United States from Canada for every vehicle coming into Canada; and it has at least reached that particular balance between the two countries. Whether, when General Motors begin to ship automobiles—I do not think they have to date, but when they do begin to ship them to the United States, it may very well be that the balance in automobiles going out of the country is going to be greater than the balance of vehicles coming into the country. That does not alter the fact that, because of the higher cost of automobiles coming from the United States—and particularly the very expensive trucks that are coming into Canada from the United States—there is still going to be a tremendous trade deficit in the automobile industry with the United States.

That is another question. It is not one that the hon. Minister can deal with, but what the hon. Minister can deal with is the question of making certain that this government advises the government in Ottawa that it must insist that there be a definite, scheduled target based on studies which this government does in conjunction with whatever information is available from the federal government; that there be definite targets on which wage parity will be reached when this new agreement comes up for renewal in 1967. I do not think that it is any longer sufficient for the hon. Minister—as he was in the position of having to say, I think a year ago—to say that he was not consulted about the automobile trade agreement, that he did not take part in the discussions and he did not give any views of this government to the government at Ottawa, despite the fact that 90 per cent of that industry is carried on in the province of Ontario.

I would think that those two objectives and a third one which I should like now to mention, should be put forward to the government at Ottawa.

The third one, of course, is the one we referred to when the estimates of The Department of Labour were before this House. It was clearly asked of the government at Ottawa over a year ago that advance warning be given of any changes in manufacturing operations in the automobile industry, which are going to lead to a disruption of the labour force in any part of the province of Ontario, or which are going to lead to the disruption of communities. The hon. Minister had to tell us at the time that the Studebaker plant was closed down without any advance warning of any kind.

Over a year ago, representations were made to Ottawa to ask that among all the other items which could be dealt with, one of them definitely was the requirement that the automobile industry give advance notice of any substantial changes in their production methods or in their operation so that there will not be unnecessary disruptions in the labour market. As a result of that failure, we had the ridiculous situation where the Studebaker company were permitted to close down without, for practical purposes, any notice. This posed a problem which the government of the province of Ontario was not then able to cope with because it did not have an undertaking by the federal government that there should be advance notice.

I would think that this government can, before the trade pact is renewed, insist that Ottawa take up the three questions of wage parity, price parity, and the question of advance notice of dislocation in the automobile industry from the automobile manufacturers to the federal government. I think that the government of the province of Ontario, ancillary to forming its views and deciding whether or not as a considered matter these

three objectives can be obtained in the renewal of the automobile pact, has got to get from Ottawa every bit of information which is relevant to the government coming to a considered position which it can place before the government at Ottawa. I would hope that these three objectives are things which this government might very well undertake, and I would like the hon. Minister to comment on them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be glad to comment on them, because I think that this is something on which we are in a position, as the hon. member said, to make suggestions to Ottawa on a constructive basis. We could not make suggestions a year ago, because as the hon. member has admitted, we did not have the facts; so if you do not have the facts you do not make any constructive criticism.

We can certainly talk to our friends in Ottawa from here on in about the new pact that will be signed, as I think the hon. member mentioned, in the next year. We know what their goals are, and I believe today that if we want to get 18 or 19 contracts each and go over them paragraph by paragraph, we could be as well informed as Ottawa on each individual contract. Whether that is necessary or not remains to be seen; but, as far as this government is concerned, we are now in a position, knowing what the first facts are in a contract, to talk with our friends in Ottawa and to co-operate with them and make suggestions if the contract is going to be changed.

The second question the hon. member asked was: Are we aware of the differences in price? Well, certainly we are aware of the difference in prices and so is Ottawa. In the last budget, Mr. Sharp made some changes in order to assist the automobile parts manufacturers and automobile manufacturers here by reducing some of the costs on imported machinery and dies and tools. We think there are some other things that have to go into that; and these form part of the discussions that are taking place right now with the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Benson, to see what can be done.

We have made some recommendations to Ottawa with reference to some of the costs, not only in the automobile industry but with Douglas Aircraft at Malton, who are going to employ perhaps 7,000 or 8,000 people by 1968. They are in somewhat the same position as the automobile industry; they need many millions of dollars worth of equipment in here. If we are going to tax them, as we have been taxing equipment coming in, the chances are that we will not have that aircraft industry. Ottawa is aware of this and I have made some recommendations through contacts I had with the automobile industry, as well as with Douglas Aircraft.

As far as the differences in cost factors are concerned, I think that in the next year, as we have already seen, they will be levelled out so that those outside factors, outside of wages, will be equalized; so that we can compete as a continental manufacturer. But I want to assure my hon. friend, from my experience in industry, that you cannot buy a $100,000 piece of equipment to stamp out a product, run it eight hours a day, pay the same wages you pay, and compete against a manufacturer in the United States who may run two shifts a day with the same kind of equipment and the same kind of investment.

You have to get the same productivity out of that machine or somebody has to subsidize the difference in cost. And, like you, I would be delighted to see increased wages in every industry in Canada. This is prosperity, but let us not lose sight of the fact that if we want to compete with a product we produce here we must not only get the same number of products per hour as our competitors in the United States; but we must get the same efficiency in operations—not just from the fellow on the machine and not just the fellow carrying the lunch pail. I maintain that that same efficiency has to go right to the top level.

If it does not get to the top level I do not think that you can blame the man who is down below with a lunch pail. I think we must recognize that we cannot operate the same kind of equipment, and I take Ford as an example. At Talbotville they are putting up a $70 million factory—the world's latest equipment to manufacture automobiles the same as they manufacture them in the United States to compete in world markets. Unless they get the same output per hour—but I think this is going to happen very definitely. I do not think you can brush off these factors by saying that it was just an agreement and we have to go along with the difference in production—because we cannot go along with a difference in production unless we get the same pieces per hour, and I think this will come about.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave it, my concern is that on the two items of wage parity and price parity there appears to be, coming out of Ottawa, from the presidents of some of the automobile manufacturers, statements which would lead

people in this country to believe that it was not an objective of the trade agreement—that there would be price parity and that there would be wage parity.

It is not just a difference in emphasis that we are talking about. Of course, I realize, the same as the hon. Minister does, with what little knowledge that I have about the matter, that your prices are related to the extent to which your plant is fully employed in the industry. And if a plant is employed only one-half the time that a plant across the border is employed in producing vehicles, you cannot pay the same wages.

I think this is true; but the total integration of the automobile industry requires a determined schedule of targets laid down by government. And if the government at Ottawa is not prepared to do it this government should say: "We require, on the basis of our studies, that this is the schedule at which wage parity and price parity will be reached under this agreement.

When I say that there is no turning back, there is, in fact, no turning back on this agreement. That does not mean that we must be in this never-never land for the next several years as to whether or not the full benefit of the integration of the automobile industry is going to be achieved, or is not going to be achieved. This is the point at which government must, even at the extent of departing from its traditional philosophy of non-interference or not bringing any pressure at all on anybody in the industry, actually say to industry: "On the basis of our studies, or on the basis of whatever studies you want to put before us, we insist that this year, the next year, or the year after, the differential in prices and the differential in wages will be reduced in such a way that at a point where this government can say, whether it is 1968, 1969, 1970, or whenever it is, whatever the proper study decision is, that we will insist there be wage parity and price parity."

This is not an idle remark, because if one had read the statement of, I believe it was Mr. Todgham, of the Chrysler company, last January, you would definitely get the impression that it was never really a part of this agreement that there would ever be price parity between Canada and the United States for automobiles. Certainly, regardless of what took place in the last budget in Ottawa, the statements of Mr. Drury would indicate that if there was going to be price parity it was something which the government really had nothing to do with — and it was going to take a long, long time to achieve it.

I do not think that when the government of Canada is entering into this kind of agreement, to integrate an industry which is predominantly based in the province of Ontario, that the province of Ontario can be other than both fully informed, intelligently informed, and on its own initiative, carrying out whatever studies are necessary—so that it can say to the government at Ottawa: "This is what our view on the trade agreement is. We insist that at a specific time, and in a very short time, there be this progress made towards wage parity and this progress made towards price parity."

The hon. Minister has not commented on it, but I think the third item, which may not be as important as wage parity and price parity, is the question of advance notice of changes in the automobile industry, because the very nature of this integration programme is that there are going to be drastic changes. The government at Ottawa does not see fit to require anybody to give them notice at all, and I think this government must say to Ottawa: "Whether the automobile manufacturers like it or not, we require advance notice of any changes that will disrupt the labour force."

That is the third point. The hon. Minister did not comment about it, but I think now he must state that it is the objective of this government to insist on wage parity, on price parity, and on advance notice.

There may well be many other things—I know very little about the Canada automobile trade agreement. But at least those three things require a determined definitive stand by the government of the province of Ontario, made known publicly, and made known to the government at Ottawa, prior to these negotiations.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 402 carried?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I wonder —are we through 402?

Mr. Newman: No, I wanted to ask a question on 402, Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister mentioned the fact that the per unit cost of various parts made in Canada was much higher than that in the U.S., and that was one of the reasons why we could not get price parity and wage parity. May I then inform the hon. Minister that most of the parts manufactured in the car are made by small manufacturers, both in Canada and the United States. Ford Motor Company and General Motors, if they find they can job a part out by giving it to some small manufacturer, do just exactly that, so that the

small manufacturer is not putting this out in the large numbers that the big manufacturer would, or could, if he were to put his facilities to work.

It is put out at the lowest possible price; so, whether it happens to be Canada manufacturing that article, or the U.S., the per unit cost is almost the same. But there still does not seem to be a price parity, and there should be a greater attempt towards a price parity on these.

I would like to turn to a different topic concerning this vote, and that is the labour content. Does the department have any figures as to the labour content in the manufacture of an automobile? Because, even though we may have an imbalance in monetary and financial trade in the automobile industry with the U.S., maybe the imbalance in labour content is substantially greater. And maybe by this trade pact we are actually harming ourselves, in the long run, by exporting our employment to the U.S., and bringing back more of the finished article.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not set myself up as an authority on that, and I cannot. I do not have the facts and the figures. All I say is the automobile pact was made on a basis that at least 60 per cent of the automobile must be produced in Canada; and, automatically, I think some companies are—I think General Motors are producing 60 per cent. The rest are getting up there very quickly. To me, I do not care how you look at it, whether we are using a screwdriver or a blowtorch, you are going to have more people working in the automobile industry. They may not be doing the same job they are doing today, but they are going to be working in the industry. Already the facts and figures I released to the House the other day indicate that there are some 15,000, 20,000, 30,000 more people going to be employed in this industry.

What the labour input is here, compared to what it is in the United States, I could not tell you. I do not have those facts. I simply suggest one thing: that almost overnight we have adopted an entirely new structure in the automobile industry. Millions of dollars of investment money. The little people on the street who invested in General Motors and the automobile companies, are pouring their money into facilities over here. It will have to be set up, it will have to be built, and when those facilities are in operation, the economies we talk about, I think, are going to come about.

But the worst thing you could ever do in any industry, and again I speak from experience, is that if you develop a product that costs you $1 million to develop, and if you try to get back the cost in the first year of production, I can show you a guy who is going to go down the drain within 12 months. Now the automobile industry is no different to any other. I think it is the most automated industry in the world, the most scientifically operated, but it cannot pour this $5 million-some-odd in here, plunk it on the first year's production of cars, and expect to get all the things done that we would like to see done.

I think these will come about, but we are in a transition period. The problems with labour, the problems of layoffs, the problem of notice before layoff—all these things are, in my estimation, working out, but I do not think we should get so impatient that we kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I am just as impatient as anybody; I would like to see all these problems settled yesterday. But I do not think it is going to be that easy, because I see and I know some of the problems in the manufacturing field. I spent many sleepless nights worrying about the same things which, I know, worry the people in the automobile industry.

I think these are things that the hon. member for Riverdale and the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville recognize will come about, but they are not going to come about overnight, sir. We want to work toward them just as quickly as anybody else. As I said earlier, just to finish this off, certainly we are very anxious to work with not only the automobile people, but also the people in Ottawa, to make sure these things come about as quickly as possible, because the less difficulty and confusion we have in this province, the better.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. Minister's comments and concern, but do you not think, Mr. Minister, you should have the information concerning the labour content in the manufacture of a car, so that maybe three or four years from today you will have a talking point?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that information can be secured, if we feel it is necessary; yes.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402 carried?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, do not be so impatient.

Mr. Chairman: Who is the member speaking to?

Mr. Renwick: I was speaking to the Chairman; and if he felt it was out of place, I apologize.

Without looking around, Mr. Chairman—and I have noticed this on other occasions when you are in the chair—without looking around, you put your head down in the book, and you say "Vote so-and-so carried." Now, in my view, this is not a proper way—and I say it with great respect—for the chair to conduct itself.

Mr. Chairman: Well the member may some day be in the chair and then he can conduct it in the way he sees fit; but at the moment I happen to be in it, and I will do things the way I see fit. I certainly do not need any lectures from the member. Now proceed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I was not lecturing you—and I will make this point. The Chairman is the servant of this assembly. He is charged with the responsibility of conducting the business of this House in an orderly way. It is not an orderly way to ignore a member when he stands up, in order to rush the business of this House through.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think, as the Chairman, I have ever rushed any member. Having been in the House for quite a number of years, I realize that things have to be talked out, and it has not changed for years.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, what is the import of that remark? I do not think that members of the House have to be insulted by the chair. People may have different interpretations as to the methods by which we discharge what we conceive to be our duties, but I think that the Chairman should act on the assumption that we are acting in good faith. He may think that we are taking a long time, but it is really not for him to make that decision. We have to accept our responsibilities as an Opposition, and I resent remarks from the chair implying that certain things are being talked out when members are pursuing matters that appear to them to be important.

Mr. Chairman: Well, this could go on indefinitely. Proceed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I had not anticipated that the automobile trade agreement would come up under this vote. I had thought it would come up under the trade and industry branch.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was hoping that we would get through this vote and go to the trade and industry vote because my trade and industry people are going to be tied up at a meeting all day Tuesday. If we could bypass the next few votes and go to trade and industry, I would appreciate the privilege of doing so. I think we are discussing what we will discuss in the next vote if the hon. members are agreeable to that.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to revert to the economic council itself as I had not had an opportunity to intervene at the point when it was the major topic of discussion.

I would like to just comment and follow along on my views, which are the same views the hon. member for Woodbine has expressed. The concern we have about the economic council, which the hon. member for Woodbine has expressed, is that there appears to be no acceptance by the Minister or by the economic council that they are engaged in economic planning in any significant sense in the province of Ontario. I think the purport of the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine was that, within the Canadian framework, they appear to have accepted the goals and targets of the economic council of Canada as goals for the province of Ontario. But there does not appear to have been the additional step which involves making the goals and interpreting those goals in the sense which is peculiarly related to the province of Ontario, that this economic council—it would certainly be my view—without usurping the function of the economic council of Canada or duplicating work which has been done, should clearly provide not just an adoption in a passive way of the targets of the Deutsch reports, but should make peculiarly its own the adaptation of those economic objectives to the province of Ontario and to embark at least upon a programme of indicative planning if nothing else.

I know that the government is reluctant ever to co-ordinate the areas of planning within the government itself or to bring any form of effective pressure on the business community to reach those goals. But I think that the economic council in Ontario, at least, could issue its own report, setting out what it as a council believes to be, within the framework of the economic council of Canada, the indicative goals which it expects and wishes the province of Ontario to reach so that the business community, the labour community, the social community in the province of Ontario can all be aware of the targets which this government has in mind for the province of Ontario.

I think one of the weaknesses of the economic council of Ontario is this passive adoption of the economic goals of the Deutsch committee, without rendering its own definitive study and report on how those goals are related to, peculiarly to, the province of Ontario. Because, if it did this, if it did put out its overall annual report in an affirmative sense as to what it expects are reasonable goals for the province of Ontario in all fields, then these various isolated studies which the economic council is engaged in—many of which, as the hon. member for Woodbine said, are first-class reports and very good reports—would have a basic cohesive meaning within the framework of what this economic council could do.

My understanding is—and I was not here at the time—that certainly within the framework of the economic council and without any changes in its format or its purposes or its objectives, it could in fact do this. It could issue its own report supplemental to the annual report of the economic council of Canada, and relate to that report all the various studies which it is doing. Then we would have some sensation of an integration of the activities of this council in making public for the people of Ontario what the government has in mind about economic planning. Because, in fact, planning is taking place in the economy and we think that the position of the government in that economic planning scheme should be unequivocally known both to the people of the province of Ontario and to the government at Ottawa.

It is this kind of council which would serve a most useful purpose by putting that kind of report before the people of Ontario. Our principal criticism is that, valid as these various studies are, which are being implemented by the council and carried out, they do not seem to be related in any way to an overall acceptance by the economic council. We can, therefore, only assume a reluctance by the government to assume a specific role in the economic planning of the province of Ontario, related not only to the economic planning in the narrow sense, but economic planning in the broad sense of the relation between the private sector and the public sector, the relation between the social needs and the private needs of the manufacturing and production community.

I would hope that the hon. Minister would say that he would ask the economic council to put out, even just as a trial balloon, that kind of report which the people of the province of Ontario could read and could understand, so that we would know exactly where the economic council thinks the economy of the province of Ontario in its broad aspect should be directed at this time.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, in conjunction with the request for a report on the council's activities, perhaps the hon. Minister could give us some idea of the timetable relative to some of the most important studies that the council is undertaking, since the studies at the moment are all we have to go on. They do not appear to be part of an overall framework of economic planning, but at least we might know the schedule. And perhaps I could ask for specific information on what appears to me to be five of the major studies which are presently under way. You have first the study on training programmes for unemployed persons in Ontario and whether or not they are adequate. Can the hon. Minister give us a completion date for that? I have been trying to arrive at a timetable.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is expected to be finished in 30 days, I am advised.

Mr. S. Lewis: In 30 days?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The second one, I might add—the Ford layoff plan—will be available in about September or October, the fall of this year.

Mr. S. Lewis: In the fall of this year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what about the project which strikes me as a rather important one—the likely trend of professional and skilled manpower requirements? To what extent can information on this vital subject be made available to governments which plan for and provide, etc?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am advised it is under way, we expect this fall also that it will be released.

Mr. S. Lewis: Also in the fall. Then the eighth: how successful is the vocational—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps I could help the member. These are short-term studies, they are not long-term studies.

Mr. S. Lewis: They will all be ready then within the next—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The majority will be ready this year but they may run over into

1967. But they are not four- or five-year studies, if that is what the hon. member is thinking about.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine.

Vote 402 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, may I ask that we move to trade and industry, vote 406, if the hon. members would permit it?

Mr. Bryden: In relation to the Minister's request, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to do everything possible to accommodate his staff, but I think the hon. Minister is being unrealistic if he thinks that that vote will be disposed of in 50 minutes. When I make that statement I want to make it clear that I personally have very little that I want to raise under it. What I have to raise will take five minutes maybe, but my experience in this House is that there are a great many members who want to raise a great many points under this vote. After all, it does cover quite a wide range of activities. I would suggest to the hon. Minister, if he wants to accomplish his purpose even if we do go on—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was not endeavouring to get it finished this morning. I thought if we could answer most of the questions while the staff was here, I could release them for Tuesday, but if the hon. members would sooner have it the other way—

Mr. Bryden: It does not matter to us; we will meet your convenience, but I would just point out that I do not think the vote will be carried this morning.

Mr. Thompson: I would say that our side would move to vote 406 if that is what the Minister wants.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would prefer it that way if the hon. members would not mind.

On vote 406:

Mr. Chairman: Could we take it item by item? Item 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I may be getting into a discussion that should come later; I am really talking about the last trade commission to Jamaica. That is not under any item but I was referring to salaries to get this question in. Am I in order to continue it there? Well sir, I would like to point out—I know there is an item here for the High Commissioner to establish plants in Jamaica. As a matter of fact if I could just quote this from the London *Free Press* of January 15. It says:

> Jamaica offers many opportunities for Canadian businessmen to establish manufacturing plants in the Caribbean countries, the High Commissioner in Ottawa said in London yesterday.

I understand that Canada's reputation in Jamaica is riding pretty high because of the results of recent shipments of school supplies from Ontario, but I am wondering what attempt is being made to follow up on the goodwill that is created between Canada and Jamaica. I understand that Quebec is trying to capitalize on this goodwill, that they have been down and are looking for opportunities for greater trade between Quebec and Jamaica. Therefore, sir, I would like to ask these questions of the hon. Minister: When was the last trade mission to Jamaica? What was the direct result of the mission? What are the plans for the next one?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it comes under item 6, but I can answer it for you. We had a mission down there in January, 1964; that was the last mission we had in the Caribbean. I think, if you will recall, the hon. member for Timiskaming brought up the fact, as you recall, in the House one day of why were we not doing more business in the Caribbean. The following morning, of course, there were import restrictions, not only in Jamaica and Nassau but in many other areas. As I say, we do not want to go anywhere unless we are sure of getting some business. Our missions went elsewhere. We have not had a mission to the Caribbean since then. I am quite sure one will be planned; there should be another one planned next year. None is planned for this year. I have had two meetings in recent months with the acting Prime Minister of Jamaica—one in Jamaica, when I was down there in December; prior to that he was in Toronto for three or four days and we had a session with him with reference to taking advantage of the opportunities of setting up manufacturing in that country.

Most of these countries, as I think you will recognize, would have light manufacturing, as is going on at the present time. There is opportunity down there for Canadian manufacturers to get into industrial production in the Caribbean. The markets at the moment are small. The majority of them are going down there, if it is in the matters of food or clothing, to produce for that market down down there. But if it is other items, what

they hope to do is get manufacturers down there where they can supply probably lower cost labour and hope to export out of there to the markets of the world. This is the true objective—to not only supply their own needs but also to produce goods that they can ship to other markets. I think there is a great interest in this country, in Ontario, for the possibility of manufacturing opportunities, not only in Jamaica but I would say also in Trinidad. We have had some discussions with Trinidad, too.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under this vote: With the trade missions going overseas to seek food and things along that line, do these missions make reports of prices at which they can sell food in England, Jamaica, or any other country? Is a report given by the mission that goes overseas?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can best answer this way. Again, let me assure you that we do not want to take people on a mission just for the sake that when we get there we hope we can sell something. Before our missions go anywhere, one of our trade and industry officers, along with the trade and industry branch office in that area, if we have one, goes there working with the federal authorities. Before he goes he is briefed in Ottawa as to what can be sold in that particular part of the world. When he goes there, appointments are set up for him to call on the federal trade officers there. He goes with the federal trade people and talks to various purchasers and manufacturers to see what they would be interested in buying from Canada. On the basis of those findings, he will come back and we pick out ten or 15 of the people who are most likely to get an order. It is no use taking anybody there if he is not going to get an order; we have no time to waste and no money to waste. One of the reasons for the success of the missions has been because we have done, as they say when you are going to rob a bank, a good casing of the joint before we went. This has helped immeasurably in getting manufacturers to participate in our programme.

Mr. Bryden: Is that not an unfortunate analogy?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Maybe it is, but this has helped in getting us an order. When a manufacturer gets an order, this is the reason why many go back on their own. They do not have to be taken by the hand and led back to the market.

This is a little different to what was being done previously. I do not say this to disparage the previous efforts, because I was involved with Mr. Hees and some other trade Ministers on some missions. But they were not the same type of mission; they were the fact-finding missions and they issued reports. I still maintain they get business, but we do think they had a concentrated effort at getting business such as we got out of here with a smaller group.

To complement that, our English friends, who used to bring 18, 25, or 30 people over here, move across the country, go back home and tell people how hard it was to sell in Canada, now have our system setting up smaller groups. In fact, we had three of them here just last week, doing exactly what we are doing, bringing a group of 15 manufacturers from various industries. It does not have to be the president; it can be the junior salesman, as long as he can ask for an order. They are beginning to recognize that they can get more business with these smaller missions the way we have been doing it. Before we go, we have this information on the food prices; that information is available to anybody that wants to hear, whether it be a manufacturer or another department.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, one would have to contact your office in order to secure the prices that you could receive for a product in, say, England. It is only through your office that we could secure this information. It does not come out in the daily papers.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it does not. If you contact our trade and industry department, we could give you any information we have on file with reference to the various markets of the world. We have a pretty comprehensive list of what the situation is in markets.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, looking back through some of the Minister's speeches, I see there was another speech given by John Parkin, printed in the *Board of Trade Journal* of May, 1965, in the midst of which, in a box, was a quote from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. It read as follows: "What is more, I firmly believe that, persistently given a choice of reasonably-priced Canadian merchandise, faithfully styled and functionally designed, Canadians will, indeed, shop Canadian." A resounding phrase from the hon. Minister in his style.

How seriously does the Minister take this "Shop Canadian" business? How strongly does he feel it? How strongly does he promote it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I take it very seriously, because this is why we finally go to other markets around the world. You go to Japan and in all the store windows it says: "Shop Japanese." You go to Germany: "Shop German." In Belgium: "Shop Belgian." In England: "Shop British." Everywhere you go they have their own domestic shopping programme. If we do not insist that your wife and my wife ask the retail clerk to let her have a comparison, it is obvious that they are going to take the first thing that is offered. The first thing that is offered could be four imported items; the Canadian item would not even have an opportunity to get on the shelf.

My own wife, as I have told the story before, went shopping for a pair of gloves in one of the major department stores. They showed her four pairs of gloves. She said that they did not fit; had they anything else, perhaps some made in Canada? The girl said she must be one of Mr. Macaulay's girls.

We hope that this goes on every time we run a "Shop Canadian" programme, because we must make people aware of the fact that we Canadians are selling ourselves down the river if we do not talk about the good, high-quality products we can make here at competitive prices. This is what has happened to some of our importing friends. They say Canada is now a tough market to sell in. Canada is not a tough market to sell in—if you manufacture a good product of the right quality. We are simply asking those who come in to participate in our market to give us the same opportunity to compete on our own retail floors. I do not think this has been done in the past few years. I hope that answers the hon. member's question.

We get the same kind of programme in every country we go into. They want to buy the domestic products. I had pictures taken off a signboard in Jamaica when I was down there in 1964. They read: "Shop Jamaican and create jobs for Jamaicans." So everybody has a similar programme.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the hon. Minister feels that this is a fairly personal business when he says "your wife" and "my wife" and relates the story about his wife. I suppose he is saying, in effect, that even the members in this Legislature should assume some responsibility for the "Shop Canadian" theme; certainly in his family there would not be any difference on this score, I assume.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think Canadians are more international in their buying habits than most people I know of—and again we go back to the import figures. We import more per capita in manufactured goods than any other highly industrialized country in the world, and I do not think that anybody can argue that our markets are not open to imported goods. We simply think—getting personal again—that our families, including the hon. members of this Legislature, should say, "Well, before I buy can I see a Canadian product? I think it is in the interests of our personal incomes and our personal standard of living to ask to have the opportunity of seeing Canadian goods, and I do not find our friends from overseas getting mad when we do this. In fact, they recognize that it is part and parcel of the competition.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree: I do not take it quite as seriously as the hon. Minister. I must submit that I do not always peruse things so carefully but I did get an interesting Christmas card in the mail, and I assume that this applies to all things. It had a very cheerful reindeer on the outside and Santa Claus moving in a little boat off into the horizon, and on the inside it said: "Merry Christmas and Happy New Year—Peg and Stan." That may be Peg and Stan Randall of Toronto. On the back, at the bottom of the card, it said "National Artcraft" —and there is a peculiar little imprint here, it said "Printed in U.S.A." I thought to myself that the promotion of Canadian industry—

Hon. Mr. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You will be off the next Xmas list.

Mr. S. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I did not even get the Christmas card, and I was not really personally offended; but it seems to me an interesting illustration of the problems inherent in always "Shopping Canadian."

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I say I have the same problem in my own home to make sure that my wife does "Buy Canadian"?

Mr. S. Lewis: I do not assume that that is a reflection on your wife.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might say that the first year I was in government I had some cards left over from my former employer that he could not use. I took them home with me and when I got into politics so many new friends sent me a Christmas card that I ran out of my own so I used these. The first thing I knew, an item appeared in a local paper to say that the Minister is not practising what he preaches; he sends out Christmas cards printed in the U.S.A. I was chagrined, but there was nothing I could do about it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, not too long ago we had quite a prosperous textile industry in the province of Ontario. Now it seems to be concentrated in the province of Quebec. What efforts has the department made to promote the textile industry, primarily in the cotton and wool goods, here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The textile industry in Quebec is due, in large part, to the fact that they had the facilities down there and the labour rates were much lower than they were in Ontario. But in the last year or two we had some of the textile plants come in here. We had a big textile plant open up last year in Cornwall—Dominion Textiles. There was a choice there two years ago. They were going to build some extra plants and they put their first one in Quebec and their second one in Ontario. I was talking to another manufacturer the other day who wants to open up a textile plant in Ontario and we are trying to get some of that business back.

First of all, I think there has been a great change in equipment in textile plants so they can produce good textiles at competitive prices.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the hon. Minister's travels to both Italy and Japan, was he able to convince any of the manufacturers there to come into Ontario to set up a textile industry?

Hon. Mr. Randall. No, not in textiles, that I know of. We did not talk textiles. Obviously the Japanesese manufacturers would like to ship textiles to us. I might say that in Formosa also, where there are great textile manufacturers, they would like to ship more textiles here; but the textile business is one in which the competition moves from country to country.

If you go to Japan the Japanese are complaining about the Formosans cutting the price on textiles; and a few years ago we were complaining here about the Japanese shipping in low-cost textiles. The British lost their market in here, as you know, for a few years; but now the British are starting to come back into our market because this competition has forced them to put in new equipment, adopt new methods, become more efficient, and produce better designs. I think that this is the answer to the textile business. You have to produce at a competitive price and you have to have good designs.

Mr. Newman: What is the big drawback in Ontario? Is it wages that seem to be a deterrent to the textile industry in settling here?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think so. I I think it is a matter sometimes that when a manufacturer is located in an area in a province he may put his other plant in that province because the textile business, as you recognize, goes through many phases before it is a finished product. For instance the textile plant that Dominion Textiles put into Cornwall this year was put there to be close to the one they have in Quebec. They do part of the operation in Cornwall and they have to finish the operation with different kinds of equipment in their Quebec plant. This is another reason for keeping these plants in the same general area.

I do not think it is wages. I think that we recognize today that wages are not always the stumbling block to producing a good product—if you have the right kind of capital equipment and good management.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a couple of questions in regard to the "Buy Canadian" campaign. The matter I want to refer to has been raised in the House before. How does one know whether a product has been made in Canada? I know that there are some products that carry labels on them reading, "Made in Canada"; but words, of course, are cheap. Is there any regulation regarding the use of a label of that kind?

I would state, further, that many products you can buy on the market do not show their point of origin at all. In some cases they may show the name of the manufacturer and if you happen to be a person who knows where the manufacturing plants are located you may be able to deduce from that where it was made. But just how does one determine this point, especially with regard to products that may have been finished in Canada, although most of the work on them may have been done outside the country? Is there any formula for determining what content, in terms of value added, is required before the product is considered to have been made in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. This has been one of the—Over the years, through the Canadian manufacturers association, this has been one of the most difficult things to pinpoint. Let me tell you why: If we invited a manufacturer to come in here today, a highly sophisticated manufacturer—I am thinking now of Litton who have something like 2,000 employees on their payroll at the

present time—when they first came into Ontario, if we had told them that they could not put "Made in Canada" on the product until they got, say, 60 per cent Canadian content in it, the chances are that they never would have got started. So you cannot go on a content basis very well, because the man who is putting ten per cent in today has as a major objective to get it up to 100 per cent tomorrow.

It is the same as we talked about in the automobile industry. It is to his advantage, and I would say in most instances, to get Canadian content into it as quickly as he possibly can. So to me it would not be a fair and equitable way to assess Canadian content. But if a man sets up a manufacturing plant here as an investment in equipment, bricks and mortar, and he employs people, if he starts off producing ten per cent Canadian content I think it is up to us to try to convince him, if he wants to be competitive and to be a good corporate citizen, to get as much Canadian content in there as he possibly can.

This has been the history of many of the subsidiary companies, from any part of the world, coming into Canada. They come here because they feel there is a market, plus the fact that they get a good component part manufactured in this country.

We have talked to many people about the markings on the packages. As you know, in the United States, the country of origin must be clearly stated on the package or the product. This is not a federal law in this country. A province itself could not do it.

I did it in my business. I stamped everything in my business—some 7,000 items had "Made in Canada" on them. But there is no federal law that says the product must have clear markings of the country of origin. The Americans have it. I think that if we had a bureau of standards here, similar to what they have in Washington, we could move in that direction and the public would not be kidded in many instances.

Because we have had toys brought to us, where a man had taken the toy home and he said, "I thought I was buying a Canadian product and I find it comes from Germany or Japan"; the product is stamped country of origin, but the box says "Packaged in Canada." Well, the average person shopping will pick it up, see "Packaged in Canada," and they automatically assume, if they do want to buy Canadian, that it is a Canadian-made product. We have taken this up with the manufacturers, but there is really no law against it as yet, and I think it would have to be a federal regulation, as you will recognize. That this is one of the problems we have; and it is one of the reasons why we should continue to make people conscious of the fact that they should ask for the Canadian product. In this way, the retailer will also become conscious of the fact that people are going to be more critical of any store that sells them a product without telling them the facts of life, or trying to kid them that it is made in Canada, when all they do is package it here.

Mr. Bryden: I am not objecting to the hon. Minister's trying to make the manufacturer conscious of it, but has he got anything to try to make the government of Canada conscious of the problem? After all, if there is no regulation of the use of words of this kind, what is to stop anybody from putting on the product, "Made in Canada," whether it is made in Canada or not? It seems to me that if you are going to conduct campaigns to induce consumers to buy products made in Canada, where they are of equal quality and the price is comparable, then the consumer should have some reliable indication of what is made in Canada. It is not merely that the manufacturer should be persuaded to put this on the product, it is also that the consumer should have a reasonable assurance that he is not being sold a bill of goods, that in actual fact the product is made in Canada or meets some sort of standard set by some independent body that qualifies it to be labelled as being made in Canada.

Have you ever taken this up with the federal government? I should think that the federal Department of Trade and Industry would be as much interested in this problem as you are. I agree with you that it requires action at the federal level. Have they shown any disposition to consider legislation in the field?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Up to now, the answer is "no." We have discussed it on many occasions. The answer is "no." I am hoping that we can keep putting on the pressure, but I think the greatest pressure you can put on is have a purchaser take it back to a store.

I know most of the retailers are reputable people – the big retailers – and if they get a product back which they have sold to a consumer, believing it to be Canadian because of its markings, I am sure that if it goes back and there is an exchange and they find out the reason it has been returned, they will correct some of the problems if

manufacturers are trying to pull fast ones, and this has happened.

Mr. Bryden: If no one else wants the floor under vote 401, I raised a question with the hon. Minister, and he told me that he would have a clarification for me under vote 406. I am referring specifically to his statement in his introductory remarks that Ontario gained 178 new manufacturing establishments in the last year, compared with 163 new branch plants in 1964.

I pointed out to him that if you actually look at the *Ontario Industrial Review* for 1965 and 1964, the comparable figures are not 178 in 1965 as compared with 163 in 1964, but 178 in 1965 as compared with 214 in 1964. I arrived at that conclusion simply by studying what was said in his industrial review, and I wonder if the hon. Minister is in a position to comment now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are correct in your assumption. I did not have the mathematics yesterday and I did not have our last year's book. Last year, as we pointed out, we had two sections in there. Formerly we computed the number of new plants coming into the province annually, on two bases, which was put in our 1964-65 report.

New branch plants in 1964, as you state, were 163 and in the next section there were 51 plant expansions away from the present sites, which does bring it to 214. So that is the 1964 total. The 1965 total was 178 new firms establishing plants in Ontario including plant expansions away from parent site. The reason we did that—and we made a statement here—was that the list consolidated in our last report the listings previously reported under the new branch plants, and expansions in new locations.

We felt that for a number of reasons. I think, if you go back a few weeks ago, *Financial Post* was comparing the number of plants going into various provinces. They used a figure of 713 in Quebec, and 862, or something, in Ontario. We got interested in it, and talked to our director, and he said that it was rather confusing, because it included fish and chip shops. This is what we are getting into. We are interested in plants of a certain size, employing a certain number of people. So we decided to consolidate the new plant operations away from site, and the new plants coming in, and for that reason, we changed our industrial review book this year.

But one of the interesting factors is this, that to indicate the meaning of a plant away from site would be as follows: the Union Carbide Company went to Arnprior this year and built a brand new plant. They manufactured a brand new product, never before made in Canada. To us, that is a brand new establishment. Also, Goodyear went north in this last year, into a designated area, and they opened two new plants, one in Collingwood and one in Owen Sound, to make two products that were formerly imported, or never made here before. They are new plants, new establishments.

The reason for the explanation on page 32 is pretty clear, but what has happened in this last year? The net difference is down 17 establishments over 1964. In 1964 it was 214; and in 1965, we have 178. So it is down 17 physical establishments, less than in 1964.

Mr. Bryden: Your arithmetic is as bad as Macaulay's. Surely that is down 36, from 214 down to 178.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, it is down from 214 to 178. So what we have been looking at is whether we should be talking about units or should we talk about square footage and investment? Now what has happened, even though we are down this number, is this. The plant area for 1965 was 8,290,000 square feet, compared with 5,659,509 in 1964. The number of jobs provided for new employees was 17,501 in 1965, as against 8,622 in 1964.

The investment in plant and equipment was $203,155,000 in 1965, compared to $98,788,000 in 1964.

In other words, while we had these establishments less, the square footage increased by 46 per cent over last year, the jobs by 103 per cent, the investment and plant equipment by 106 per cent. And I apologize for the arithmetic.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the Minister's statement that the number of units is not necessarily the significant factor. The point is, however, that the number of units has gone down. The Minister has now given us figures to show that in terms of other, perhaps more significant, comparisons the trend is up. This gives rise to another point that I want to raise. The figures the Minister has given us—he gave the figures actually for 1965 in his speech, we had not got the figures for 1964 until now, unless he may have given them last year, I did not check—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did, yes.

Mr. Bryden: He did. But one of the difficulties that we on this side have always faced with The Department of Economics and Development—and more particularly with this particular branch of the department—is that they trot out great reams of figures that it is almost impossible for anybody to verify. They produce them when they see fit; they do not show us how they were arrived at; their tables, which are supposed to be dealing with these matters do not contain any of this information, and never have as far as I know. I am not suggesting that the hon. Minister is giving us incorrect figures, but I am just one of that old-fashioned school who has a certain innate distrust of statistics. When I see statistics, I want to see how they were arrived at.

I would suggest that the Minister satisfy the sceptics like myself, just in terms of providing information. When you produce several pages under a heading entitled "new establishments" in which you list establishments and the places where they have located and their point of origin—why does the Minister not give us some of this information that he now trots out in the House? Why does he not draw up a proper kind of table that will show us not only the information that is now there but also the estimated number of people to be employed, the estimated increase in plant capacity in square feet or whatever measure you want to use, and also the estimated investment?

I can realize that to begin with these figures probably would have to be preliminary, it is hard to get them precisely, but then you can always, a year later, refine them and correct any errors in the preliminary figures. It seems to me that this sort of information is at least as important, and in a way more important, than the information that the Minister publishes under the heading "new establishments." It also gives some of us an opportunity to use our own adding machines and just see how the totals that the hon. Minister overwhelms us with in this House were arrived at. We are always getting all sorts of glowing reports from the Minister, well supported by a great many different figures. We really do not know whether they are right or wrong, or even how they were arrived at.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the hon. member suggests more facts and figures; perhaps those later figures that I gave this morning could be incorporated in the industrial review. I think it is a good suggestion. I will look forward to doing that when we put out our review next year. I apologize for the 17 —I meant 17 per cent—the girl forgot to put the per cent sign in and I just read it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on this vote, I have no further comments to make about the Canada-U.S. automobile agreement but, since we are now on this vote, I would ask the Minister if he would comment, even tentatively at this time, as to the position of the government on the three questions of price parity, wage parity, and advance notice of any dislocation in the automobile industry in the province of Ontario.

Surely the Minister must be in a position to indicate whether or not the government considers these important matters, whether they consider that they will institute the studies as a matter of urgency so they will be well prepared to give Ottawa the views before the renewal of this agreement comes before the government of Canada, and whether they will this time take effective steps to make their views known in Ottawa on those points? If the Minister would deal with that I then have some other remarks on another matter.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can deal with it very quickly. I think the hon. member's comments are well taken and I will take them into consideration. Certainly we will discuss it with our group working with the automobile people now, plus Ottawa. We will see what is in our jurisdiction. Perhaps all these three things are in our jurisdiction.

I would like to take the opportunity of looking at it before saying aye, or no. As I said earlier, the member's comments are in order. We are interested in the very things that he has outlined and I think before we come back here for the next session we will be well informed on the three things the member is talking about and see where we can fit into the overall picture, co-operating not only with Ottawa but the automobile people themselves.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the other area I would like to speak with the hon. Minister about is this question of industrial decentralization throughout the province and the recognition of the important part it does play in the whole of the regional development of the province of Ontario.

Now, what concerns me—or let me put another way: I think the Minister does a tremendously effective job in promoting export sale by Canadian manufacturers, Ontario manufacturers, in other countries of the world. And I am sure that his talents for sales-

manship are reflected in the other way, that is, in his ability to put all the arguments forward as to industries in the United States and other countries to locate plants in the province of Ontario. I think this is a peculiarly significant contribution that this Minister can make, which not very many other members of this House, in my opinion, could make.

But within that framework, I would like to know when the Minister persuades or facilitates a decision in, say, the United States, for a company in the United States to establish a plant operation in the province of Ontario on some form of affiliated relationship, whether it is a subsidiary one or a licensing one or whatever the basis is, whatever the capital participation is in that operation, does the Minister indicate to that company, the foreign company, that he is interested in locating an industry in the province of Ontario. Does he indicate to that company the so-called, what have become known as, the rules of good corporate citizenship? I am referring, of course, to this rather innocuous list of rules of corporate citizenship, to focus my remarks, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the hon. Mr. Winters, enunciated some time ago. I think the Minister will agree with me that not only are some of them innocuous but two or three of them defy any intelligent interpretation.

But for the sake of the point that I would like to discuss with the Minister, I would like to briefly specify what they are, and even on this minimum basis ask the Minister what steps he takes to indicate to industries that are going to locate in Ontario as affiliates of foreign companies or of international companies, what steps he takes to indicate to them the rules and the way in which he expects them, or the government of the province of Ontario expects them, to integrate themselves into the Ontario community and how the government of Ontario expects them to conduct themselves in the province and the part they expect them to play in the communities which they are going to join.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce set out 12 principles.

One was the pursuit of sound growth and full realization of productive potential, thereby sharing in the national objective of a full and effective use of resources.

Two, was the realization of maximum competitiveness, recognizing the desirability of progressively achieving specialization within the international group of companies.

Three, the maximum development of markets in other countries as well as Canada.

Four, greatest possible processing of natural resource products.

Five, a pricing policy designed to assure a fair return to the subsidiary for exports.

Six, to search out and develop sources of supply in Canada.

Seven, to develop as an integral part of the Canadian operation, wherever practicable, research and design capability necessary to develop products suitable for home and export markets.

Eight, retention of earnings sufficient to support the growth of the subsidiary having in mind a fair return to shareholders.

Nine, work toward a Canadian outlook within management through training programmes, promotion of qualified Canadians and inclusion of a major proportion of Canadians on the board of directors.

Ten, have as an objective a financial structure providing opportunities for Canadians to buy shares in the Canadian operation.

Eleven, publish periodically, information on the financial position and operations of the subsidiary.

In this one, give appropriate attention and support to Canadian national objectives and government programmes for economic development and encouragement and support of intellectual, social and cultural advancement in Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not for a moment want anyone in the assembly to think that this would be my idea of the way in which effective results could be achieved. But certainly, since the time has come within the framework of economic planning, industrial decentralization, community planning—almost any aspect in the affairs of people within the province of Ontario—that the time has come when the hon. Minister, with all his enthusiasm for doing so, when he invites someone to come to this country and to establish an industry should also make certain that those persons who come here with that in mind understand what part this government wants them to play?

Now, within the framework of the economic independence of Canada, which is so much to the forefront at the present time, he expects them to comply with, not inflexible rules, but certainly some form of basic understanding on their initial participation in the economy of the province of Ontario, so that he will always have a basis on which discussions can effectively take

place between the government of the province of Ontario, and the industry as it is established, to make certain that it does meet some, at least minimum, objectives of this government as to the way in which the economy of the province of Ontario will develop.

I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would comment about that, let us know whether in fact he does anything along this line, whether he plans to do anything in the future. I would also like him to comment upon whether he thinks there could be a more effective phrasing of the kind of rules, or code, that he would like to ask those who come to this province to adopt.

Hon. Mr. Randall: First of all, I have had experience on both sides of the border. I believe I know what the manufacturers, in the United States particularly, expect when they get here. I believe I also know what the Canadian businessman would expect in the way of competition from these subsidiary companies.

I have served on the boards of both companies. I do not agree with the philosophy expressed by some of our economists and politicians today. I think philosophy is a very easy thing to suggest, but it is much harder to execute, as you yourself have already said. It has been my feeling, and my experience, that the foreign businessmen in this country operate just as efficiently, and with a national interest at heart, as our businessmen operate in other countries.

There may be a difference of opinion on both sides of the border, not only by American politicians but also here; but when we talk to American businessmen about coming into this province, we talk to them on a basis of a climate for investment, the opportunities that are here for them if they invest their money in plants and equipment and research facilities, and people in this province. That is the first thing they want to know: What are the opportunities, if we put our money in here or take it and put it in some other country?

The second thing is: We have not laid down any rules. This rule situation has just come up in the last few months. To me, a lot of it has no bearing whatsoever on the way business acts in various countries. I think the average businessman is sensible enough to know that he has to be a good corporate citizen. If a government introduces some rules and starts to put the pressure on him I think the answer is obvious.

The financial statements released, not only by our own government but by the American government recently, show these so-called guidelines have not had very much of a major effect on changing the business rules. I think they are beginning to realize that the average businessman, working either here or in the United States, whether he be a Canadian in the United States or an American here, does try to be a good corporate citizen. I do not buy it that the foreign investor in here is not a good corporate citizen, and if anybody wants to disagree with that that is their privilege. I speak from personal experience.

When we talk to businessmen in the United States the only rule that I suggest to them is one I followed myself. I say: "When you come into Canada I think that you are very wise to get Canadian management as quickly as you can. If you have not got it you should get it and train it. I think you would be very wise to have Canadians on your board of directors." I think this is good in your interests as well as for the Canadians? This has been done with all the companies I am associated with, or have been associated with in the past.

I also suggest that, if they possibly can, they should list their stock on the Toronto stock exchange and the Montreal stock exchange, so that Canadians can participate in their company. I have not had anybody tell me that this is too difficult a procedure to follow. Companies that have come in here, have come to us after they have invested here and said: "Who can you recommend for the board of directors? Who would you say is a good Canadian businessman to go on our board?"

I have made some personal recommendations, that they should contact this gentleman or that gentleman; he has a wide knowledge of Canadian industry and I think he could be of service to you. But as far as laying rules for foreign investment in this country is concerned, first of all, I do not think a golden rule is necessary. I disagree with those who insist that it is. If governments want to change the rules when a man gets his investment in here, that is something that we will have to deal with at the federal level.

Personally, I feel that the talked-about guidelines policy, and these people not being good citizens, is not factual. I have not found that in any companies I have been associated with. I think Mr. Winters stated that himself, when he made a survey of some 114 companies here. Sometimes these things are like bush fires. Somebody makes a statement on it, it is grabbed, it gets into the press, it gets on radio and television, every-

body becomes an authority, including myself, and the first thing you know is that we haven't achieved very much. When the smoke all clears away and we get down to basics, we have had lots of conversation, everybody beats their gums but nothing basically has changed.

I think what will come out of it perhaps is an awareness on the part of investors coming into this country, that they must be very careful that they do operate like good corporate citizens and do nothing to bring pressure to bear on them from any government—whether federal, provincial or municipal. Most of them very definitely have good PR relationships; they do not want to be considered unwelcome in a community. I think it is too bad, when they get their investment in here, that suddenly we decide that foreign investment is a bad thing to have and we change the rules.

As far as I am concerned, when we talk to foreign investors we tell them what the facts of life are in the province of Ontario, in the Canadian economy, where they can export to, what they can expect in the way of taxation, what the privileges are if they go into designated areas; but, beyond that, beyond what I said a few minutes ago, we do not have any golden rules.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can finish this discussion in the minute or two that is left. I would like to leave it and then come back to it again. I am delighted to know that the Minister feels as I do that the 12 rules of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa are not only innocuous and meaningless, but serve no useful purpose. I think if I could just leave it at that point we could pick it up again, and perhaps have a useful interchange as to just what we could accomplish in this difficult field.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of supply rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns today it do stand adjourned until two of the clock on Tuesday next.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Prime Minister the list of estimates? Will that still follow the same order?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There will be no night session on Tuesday due to the press gallery follies; we will proceed with these estimates on Tuesday.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 117



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 24, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 24, 1966

Artificial Insemination of Cattle Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3771

Plant Diseases Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3771

Weed Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3771

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, first reading 3772

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 3772

Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 3772

Tabling report, Mr. Davis 3772

Question of Mr. Stewart re collection of urine for estrogen, Mr. Thompson 3772

Question of Mr. Robarts re liquor licensing, Mr. Sargent 3773

Tabling documents re Metro Toronto and region transportation study, Mr. Haskett 3774

Questions of Mr. Wishart re death of Anatol Chomenko, Mr. Renwick 3774

Questions of Mr. Wishart and Mr. Grossman re hospitalization of inmates of reform institutions, Mr. Thompson 3775

Questions of Mr. Robarts re national Medicare plan, Mr. MacDonald 3776

Question of Mr. Robarts re winter works on centennial projects, Mr. MacDonald 3776

Questions of Mr. Haskett re motorcyclists, Mr. Thompson 3777

Statement by Mr. Robarts re shipping tolls 3777

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 3779

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3806

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Beverly Acres public school, Richmond Hill, and St. Alphonsus separate school, Peterborough; in the east gallery, Toronto board of education New Canadian classes and Oro township school area A, Orillia.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION OF CATTLE ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Artificial Insemination of Cattle Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would say that these amendments clarify the definitions of the licensee and the area in which he may operate to perform service to livestock owners.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This matter of The Plant Diseases Act amendments, Mr. Speaker, provides for the clarification for the municipalities to draft bylaws and to enforce the carrying out of those bylaws as they pertain particularly to the control of Dutch elm disease. Hon. members will recall that a year or so ago we introduced an amendment to The Plant Diseases Act whereby municipalities could draft bylaws. If approved by the Minister of Agriculture, the municipality then had the right to require that trees be removed, where Dutch elm disease was affecting them, at the expense of the municipality. Many municipalities have already implemented such bylaws, but there are some, particularly the city of Toronto, which felt that they needed further clarification to the Act in order that they, as a municipality, might enforce their bylaw in having their inspectors designate such trees to be removed and actually having them removed at the municipality's expense. This amendment introduced today should clarify this for the city of Toronto.

THE WEED CONTROL ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Weed Control Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides that weeds must be cut on the direction of the weed inspector. There have been, particularly in areas that are growing and expanding rapidly, cases of farms or land changing hands several times through a season, and where the local weed control inspector was unable to determine who actually was in possession of the land. The old Act required that the owner of the land should be responsible for the destruction of the weeds. The result has been that in certain cases weeds have been left to mature and go to seed, but the greatest offence has been to the sufferers of hay fever from certain weeds that are under The Weed Control Act. They have been left to mature when they should have been cut before they ever got to that stage.

These amendments provide that whoever is in possession of the land is required to remove the weeds, or have them destroyed, thereby, we hope, eliminating some of the problems that have accrued to the hay fever sufferers and to others who do not want the spread of these noxious weeds.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the bill contains some 24 amendments to The Highway Traffic Act, some of which are for the purpose of clarifying existing provisions. Included in the bill are a number of new provisions, the more significant of which are as follows:

1. Two new sections are being enacted, one of which gives authority to require and regulate safety devices for motor vehicles, and the other grants authority to pass regulations governing tire specifications and markings.

2. Section 105 is being amended to permit the right of action to the gratuitous passenger in case of gross negligence.

3. A requirement that a person is prohibited from operating a motor vehicle where the windshield and side windows of the driving compartment and the rear window do not afford a clear view to the driver.

This provision is primarily intended to overcome the winter hazard of persons operating vehicles with snow- or frost-covered windows.

4. Leasing of motor vehicles, rather than purchasing, has become a widespread practice, especially by business concerns, and the new provision extends the liability of the owner-lessor to cover the liability of any person driving a motor vehicle with the consent of the lessee.

5. Another provision recognizes the use of an international driver's permit by foreign visitors to Ontario.

I might mention at this time that arrangements have been completed to provide for the issuance of the international driver's permit to residents of Ontario, for use in over 70 foreign countries.

6. The requirement to stop for school buses, discharging or taking on passengers, has been extended to require vehicles in both directions to stop, except approaching vehicles on divided highways.

The bill will go to the committee on highways and tourism.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister be so kind as to read the part about gratuitous passengers? It was only one sentence.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is with regard to section 105; it is being amended to permit a right of appeal to the gratuitous passenger in gross negligence.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister means a right of action, does he not?

Mr. Haskett: Right.

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION ACT, 1965

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, these are three rather short amendments; one clarifying the position of the institute with respect to properties that are leased with respect to municipal taxation, and the second to acquire the assets of organizations if some agreement is made. The third amendment is for purposes of clarification only.

THE RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a short explanation this bill provides for the transfer of certain properties presently vested in the Crown to the board of governors of the institute.

Before the orders of the day, I would like to table the second annual report of the province of Ontario council for the arts.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture: Is the Minister aware that on April 11 a magistrate in Prescott, in sentencing a North Augusta farmer to a two-year suspended sentence for wilful neglect of animals, recommended the regular inspection of farms where urine is collected from pregnant mares for the preparation of the drug estrogen. Do staff limitations prevent the SPCA from carrying out such inspections

throughout the province; and if so, would the hon. Minister advise the House whether his department will consider drafting legislation to regulate the method of collecting urine from mares?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of the question, I must confess that I was not aware that a charge had even been laid in eastern Ontario or anywhere else in Ontario in this particular regard.

This matter of the collection of urine from pregnant mares has been of big concern to our department. We were concerned, I should say, at the time the article appeared in one of the Toronto newspapers—the *Globe and Mail*, I believe, under date of March 24, 1966—and it generated a great deal of interest across the province. As a farmer myself and a great lover of horses I was shocked, to say the least, and greatly distressed.

I immediately called the director of our veterinary services branch in our department and asked him if he would investigate as quickly as possible the charges that were contained in the article. He carried out a cross-section examination by veterinarians of our department in connection with Department of Agriculture officials across the province. The inspection took place as far west as Listowel and as far east as Alexandria. Some 20 farms were visited and this was roughly 10 per cent—a little better than 10 per cent—of the number of farms so producing in the province of Ontario.

On these farms were contained well over 700 mares producing urine for estrogen and in not one case could they find, in their opinion, that the animals were in any way being inhumanely treated.

I must confess—if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker—that as far as our own farm is concerned, a number of years ago we had horses and I recall very well that an opportunity presented itself to lease a pregnant mare to one of these farms. I made further investigation as to the diet and as to what the animal would receive in the way of feed in the winter and all the rest of it, and was satisfied beyond a doubt that the animal would be well treated.

I recall very well that when the mare returned to our farm after the period during which the urine may be collected I was amazed to find that she was in much better condition than when she left. She produced a very healthy, normal foal and raised that foal, and in fact the foal is still living up in our part of the country.

This was the experience we had, and hon. members can understand my concern and regret that such an article appeared making the charges that were made. There was a question asked me in the House concerning this matter of urine production some time ago and I said that if, in the opinion of the humane society officers, there was any inhumane treatment being afforded any of these animals anywhere, whether it be mares or any other type of livestock, the Criminal Code provides for charges to be laid; if this is indeed their opinion.

I think it is significant to note that only one charge has been laid among the almost 200 farms that we know are collecting such urine in the province of Ontario. Now it may be that the standards on all farms are not everything that we would want them to be; this is something that anyone can determine. I do not think you can lay down the law and say, "Thou shalt do such and so for every animal in the province of Ontario." I think if we get in the business of drafting legislation to control these types of farms, we will get into the business of drafting legislation to control every type of farm across the province of Ontario.

The humane society, I think, has done an excellent job in looking after the interests of livestock as far as inhumane treatment is concerned. Charges have been laid from time to time across the province for a variety of reasons, and our department and our government support the humane society in the work that they are doing in this particular regard. It is a matter, of course, that falls under the Criminal Code and I would say that the statutes of the Criminal Code are sufficient to look after the interests of the livestock industry satisfactorily.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister, notice of which was given last week. Would he inform the House when a report from the liquor licence board can be expected explaining, not "why"—I have changed—but "if":

1. A club licence was issued to the Talisman club in contravention of statutes of Ontario, 1961-62, page 345, chapter 73, section 2, subsection 24(a); and, 2. A member of the board of directors of Labatts brewery is involved in such licence contrary to the laws of the province?

Supplementary to these questions, would the Prime Minister take steps to review all licensed premises in the province to determine if other areas of conflict of interest exist on the part of the breweries and distilleries having interests in licensed charters?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House, last week I believe it was, that I would carry out an investigation of this and ask the liquor control board—this I am doing. There are other questions of course that the member raised other than those he has mentioned in his question this afternoon and I will produce answers for those allegations at that time.

When I have this information, Mr. Speaker, I will present it to the House.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table a number of documents relating to the work of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study and direct the attention of members to copies of the documents which are being placed on their desks.

A year ago in discussing the estimates on this matter, it was indicated the study's work was coming to the point where it would be yielding some of the results of its two years of investigation. These investigations into the problems of transportation in the highly populated region contained within the perimeter of Hamilton, Barrie and Oshawa have been complex and time-consuming. The reports which have been placed before the House reflect but a small portion of the great detail that is involved in order to arrive at a formula of evaluation to determine an integrated transportation system in this region for the future.

While all of these documents represent a major contribution to the study progress, they do not in themselves present conclusions. They are but steps in the ladder leading to a series of final reports, the most of which we expect will be presented to the government by early next year.

One of the present documents—the 1964 home interview survey, methods and results —provides a capsulization of the travel habits within the region for the base year on which all transportation predictions are to be made. Behind it lies a great wealth of detail that has been programmed in the study's computer transportation prediction model. While the information contained in this report is quite clear and readily understood, an accompanying report entitled "Model split analysis" is somewhat more technical in that it deals with the computer analysis formula that has been worked out to estimate the future volumes of travel in the regions by various modes. Apart from the results that will be derived from it, I mention it because of the considerable time and effort that has gone into this work. It will be regarded as a basic technical document in this field for many years to come.

Because of its highly technical nature, I have not included it in the documents that are being delivered to the desks of the members, but if any should desire a copy of it I shall be pleased to see that it is provided.

A third report placed before hon. members is a study of the structure of administration and finance of transportation in the study area. This document, prepared for the transportation study by independent consultants, is a comprehensive bibliography of this highly important aspect of transportation. This is the first time that a document of this nature, dealing exclusively with Ontario transportation, has been compiled with such clarity and thoroughness. It offers a solid foundation upon which the transportation study's experts can appraise the administrative and financial requirements for an integrated transportation system in the future.

Finally, there is a copy of the transcript of public hearings which the transportation study conducted in various parts of the region late last year. These hearings were scheduled to allow municipalities, organizations and individuals an opportunity to present their views on transportation requirements as seen from the local levels.

Although these hearings received wide publicity at the time I have included the transcripts of all 22 briefs so that members can see for themselves the variety of problems and views that were raised, and at the same time satisfy themselves that the study group is endeavouring to avoid overlooking any important factor that could affect the conclusions that they will be compiling early next year.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General.

Does the Attorney General agree with the Minister of Reform Institutions concerning the finding of the coroner's jury at the inquest into the death of Anatol Chomenko?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have read the finding of the coroner's jury in the death of Anatol Chomenko. I have not yet, however, been able to get a transcript of the evidence and I do not know what the details were as to the medical attention which was given and from that point of view whether the verdict of the jury was based on sound findings or not.

Therefore I am scarcely in a position to pass judgment on it. I do know, and I have now before me a copy of the statement made

by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, that he has made a protracted study of the matter, a detailed study. Until I have the transcript of evidence which was before the jury I do not feel I can pass judgment either on its findings or on the statement by the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney General permit a supplementary question? Does the Attorney General intend to make a study of the evidence to find out whether or not the finding of the jury as to laxity amongst the medical staff was or was not supported by the evidence given at that inquest?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am getting a transcript of the evidence which was presented before the jury.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General.

Does the Attorney General share the opinion of the Ontario chief coroner, Dr. H. B. Cotnam, and the senior physician in The Department of Reform Institutions that hospitalization of inmates of reform institutions solely on the recommendation of a qualified medical practitioner would be an infringement of the civil rights of inmates?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible, I think, and would be quite apparent immediately, to answer in a generalized way such a general question. Persons in reform institutions are, by virtue of the fact they are there, deprived of certain of their civil liberties. By virtue of that fact they have to conform to certain other disciplines and regulations. In fact, The Prisons and Reformatories Act, which is a statute of Canada, chapter 217, of 1962, provides:

> Section 12: Everyone who is sentenced to imprisonment in any jail or other public or reformatory prison is subject to the provisions of the statutes relating to jail or prison and to all rules and regulations lawfully made with respect thereto.

Now, to take this generalization and break it down, let us assume for a moment that the prisoner is suffering from a contagious disease and there are 500 other inmates. Is the welfare of the other 499 to suffer because he cannot be ordered to go into a ward and be isolated? I would say that one cannot generalize in this situation at all.

So it seems rather useless to talk about civil liberties in this respect for a person who is deprived of civil liberties to a certain degree and made subject by statute to certain other disciplines and regulations for the protection of the other inmates in the prison. I would think you could not generalize and say that direction that he must go into an institution for health reasons would be a further deprivation of his civil liberties.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. Attorney General a supplementary question?

Assuming that it is not a contagious disease and it is the decision of the individual which will do no harm to other inmates but may harm him, does the Attorney General believe it is an infringement of civil liberties if he should decide he does not want medical attention when the medical practitioner says he should have it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps one could speculate, Mr. Speaker, on a certain situation where if he were a wholly healthy individual and some arbitrary acts were simply taken to direct that he must receive treatment. I suppose it could be very well argued that would be infringing on his remaining civil liberties. But I do not think we can generalize.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has a related question to the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, which I hope he will answer more clearly than the hon. Attorney General.

Does the Minister share the opinion of the Ontario chief coroner, Dr. H. B. Cotnam, and the senior physician in The Department of Reform Institutions, that the hospitalization of inmates of reform institutions solely on the recommendation of a qualified medical practitioner would be an infringement of the civil liberties of inmates?

And I have a second part to the question —I know the hon. Minister answered this previously to some extent: Is the Minister satisfied that in the case of Anatol Chomenko all proper steps for his medical care were taken? If he disagrees with the verdict of the coroner's jury in respect of the death of this man, would he inform the House of the precise grounds of his disagreement?

Mr. Sopha: That is a good question.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question: as I read Dr. Cotnam's statement in the press, he does not refer to the hospitalization of inmates per se, but to the compulsory hospitalization

of inmates. I therefore presume that the question was incorrectly phrased and the hon. leader of the Opposition means the compulsory hospitalization of inmates.

It is my understanding, and I certainly have had it confirmed by what I heard a few moments ago, that this is a fine legal point upon which there is no consensus of opinion among legal authorities. It is my opinion, however, that when in doubt, no force should ever be used.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, it should be clearly understood that Mr. Chomenko at all times, while in our care, was in hospital when this was recommended by our senior physician and received the necessary medical care as prescribed by him.

On the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, insofar as to my views in regard to the verdict and the recommendations; this was, as the hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out, answered in my statement to this House last Friday. I will quote the last two paragraphs of that statement in which I was, in turn, quoting Dr. R. E. Stokes, the senior physician of The Department of Reform Institutions.

I quoted him, as follows:

> The report of the inquest was forwarded to the registrar of the college of physicians and surgeons by the coroner. It is the task of the registrar to review complaints of medical conduct, and if he deems it appropriate, refer them to the discipline committee. The registrar stated that he saw no evidence of medical misconduct, and saw no reason to proceed further with the case. This would indicate that the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario were satisfied that the medical staff of the Guelph reformatory were conducting themselves within accepted medical standards of practice.

That is the end of Dr. Stokes' statement, and I concluded by stating:

> In view of the foregoing, as Minister of the department I cannot in all conscience conclude that Anatol Chomenko received anything but proper and adequate medical care.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions to the hon. Prime Minister. The *Telegram* of May 18 quotes Dr. Keith Reynolds as stating that national Medicare would bring new taxes, and still higher taxes if Ontario joined. Would the Prime Minister indicate whether this is an official view of the government?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would say this, that Dr. Reynolds was not speaking on behalf of the government. This government has spokesmen to speak on its own behalf. I have expressed the official view of the government in this whole area on several occasions, and in the same area from which your quotation was taken, I believe I was quoted as saying that Ontario will be contributing about 50 per cent of the money to be spent on Medicare by Ottawa, whether she joins the plan or not, or words to that effect. I think that anyone must agree that the money spent by Ottawa in this area will be raised across the country. Ontario contributes approximately 50 per cent of that money. I do not think anyone thinks that such a scheme can be imposed in this country without it resulting in being paid for by taxation in one form or another.

Mr. MacDonald: I trust we can both come to the same conclusion as to the logic disclosed from that fact.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not follow the hon. member on that one, but I will discuss it with him outside sometime.

Mr. MacDonald: The logic is simply that we are paying for it. I hope we get the service.

Mr. Speaker, my second question to the hon. Prime Minister is: Has the government given consideration, as requested by a number of municipalities, for an early announcement of the 1966-1967 winter works programme with respect to centennial projects, in order to enable municipalities to proceed with plans for proposed projects?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, once again this is a matter in which we are involved with the federal government. I have had several letters from municipalities asking about this and I have asked the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, under whose jurisdiction the winter works programme comes. As far as this government is concerned, I have asked him if he would go into the position taken by these municipalities with Ottawa to see if there is something that might be done to accommodate their wishes.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I had a supplementary question to the Prime Minister, but I was cut off by the Minister of Transport. May I ask it now?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the member should have asked his supplementary question at the time.

Mr. Sargent: I had it ready, but I did not have a chance to give it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not prepared to accept a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister states that he is not prepared to accept a supplementary question, so that ends the matter.

Mr. Sargent: I do not blame him a bit.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport. Would the Minister inform this House whether he would consider drafting legislation to regulate the operation of motorcycles and to force all motorcycle drivers to undergo a driver's test? Perhaps I could qualify my question. I am thinking of the article by Sydney Katz in which he said that apparently you can get a 90-day driver's licence and you can keep doing this indefinitely without actually taking a test.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part of the hon. leader of the Opposition's question, motorcycles are now regulated by the same laws that apply to the operation of all motor vehicles on the highways. In addition, motorcyclists, while operating on an instruction permit (a) may not carry a passenger except a holder of an operator's or chauffeur's licence, and only when such licence holder is seated in a sidecar, and (b) may not operate a rented motorcycle. Before getting an instruction permit, I am sure all members realize that an applicant must pass vision, sign recognition, and written rules of the road tests. I think the present legislation affords ample scope for any further regulations that may from time to time be required.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask a supplementary question? Is it possible, under the present regulations, to actually do what Sydney Katz suggests? That you can take a 90-day beginner's permit and keep having that indefinitely without taking a test?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I would say that you can keep doing it indefinitely, but an applicant does apply, first of all, for a learner's or instruction permit which is of a 90-day duration, and at the end of that time he may take out another driver's permit. I do not see any alternative to that at the moment, because if an applicant for a driver's permit does not pass his test at the end of 90 days, the only way he can learn further is to take out a further learner's or instruction permit, and during that time—

Mr. Thompson: How many times can he keep doing that? I think that is the problem.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I say I do not know what the possibility is of putting a termination on this, but I am sure applicants are scrutinized more carefully having taken one or two tests and failed. In the absence of finding some alternative to it, I think that it is the only way we have so far designed to qualify drivers for drivers' licences.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a few comments concerning the proposed revision of tolls with regard to the St. Lawrence seaway and the proposed reimposition of tolls on the Welland canal.

By a notice published April 22, 1966, this government became aware that hearings would be held in Ottawa on May 25 by the St. Lawrence seaway authority on its proposals to increase tolls on the St. Lawrence locks and to reimpose tolls on the Welland canal. By the original agreement between Canada and the United States, the St. Lawrence seaway authority and its American counterpart, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, were empowered to recommend charges for the use of the seven canals in the St. Lawrence river that would provide for the repayment of the capital debt within a 50-year period, and which would provide sufficient revenue to cover operation and maintenance costs as well. Operational costs include interest charges on the capital debt and interest on accumulated interest. Unfortunately, the 1958 estimates of future seaway traffic have not been attained in the seven years of operation. As a result, by the end of 1965, the debt to be amortized by both authorities in the remaining 43 years has increased to $496.4 million from approximately $400 million as at December 31, 1958.

The combined annual requirements of the two entities for servicing the debt in 1965 was $24.7 million, or $2.9 million in excess of the total revenue from tolls of $21.8 million, without regard for the $5 million of other operational and maintenance costs.

The changes proposed by the authority would increase the charge for gross registered tons of a vessel from four cents to 45 cents and increase the charges on bulk cargo from 40 cents to 44 cents per ton, and on general cargo from 90 cents to $1 per ton. In general, these increases would amount to a 10 per

cent increase in the tolls on bulk cargo and 11 per cent on general cargo. It is to be emphasized that these increases relate only to the toll charges on the St. Lawrence river portion of the seaway.

With regard to the reimposition of tolls in the form of lockage charges on the Welland canal, the position is somewhat different in that the Welland canal charges do not form part of the Canada-U.S. agreement providing for a 50-year payback. The suggestion for the reimposition of lockage charges is thus purely at the instance of Canadian authorities.

The St. Lawrence seaway authority, in proposing to introduce lockage charges on the Welland canal, has suggested an initial rate of $20 per lock beginning in 1967, increasing $20 per lock per year to reach a total of $100 per lock in 1971. This implies a per vessel charge of $160 in 1967 for complete transit and $800 in 1971 for complete transit. The cost of these transit charges, if it were related to the cargo carried, will therefore vary with the size of the vessel and will be chargeable even when the ships are in ballast. No proposal for comparable lockage charges on the remaining canals, notably the U.S. or Canadian Sault Ste. Marie locks, has been made.

The province of Ontario, is of course, concerned in determining the impact of the proposed revisions on its economy. We have therefore, in the short period of time allowed to us and our own economic analysts and consultants, reviewed the position from an Ontario standpoint. As the result, we are today making a submission to the St. Lawrence seaway authority and we shall be preparing a supplementary submission following the conclusion of the hearings. The hon. members will appreciate that the loss of a company in a particular community may not loom large in the overall economic view of the consultants retained by the authority in preparing their proposed toll revisions. For the community concerned, however, its loss may have enormous impact at a time when we are bending every effort to develop the various regions of the province and to provide equal opportunity for all of our regions. We have felt that we must be zealous in expressing their economic interest and ensuring that due weight is given at the federal level to the impact of the tolls on the whole of the province.

Our submission to the St. Lawrence seaway authority involves three major points: 1. We propose that no tolls be introduced on the Welland canal at this time. In addition to serving as part of an international waterway, the Welland canal connects Lake Ontario with the other Great Lakes and has been traditionally toll-free throughout most of its modern history. As a result, many industries have been located deliberately in relation to it in order to obtain the value of low cost domestic water transportation. Furthermore, the separation of Lake Ontario by a toll barrier from the other Great Lakes will leave the industrial complexes on Lake Ontario at a disadvantage, compared with their American counterparts running from Buffalo, Cleveland and Detroit in the east to Duluth and Chicago in the west. The heavily industrialized United States shore of the lakes will continue to have toll-free shipping for their raw material supplies from other United States sources and from Canadian sources on the upper lakes, while our industries on Lake Ontario will have to absorb the Welland tolls on the one hand or the seaway tolls on the other.

Of even greater importance, our analysis of the traffic between Canadian ports on Lake Ontario and the upper Great Lakes indicates that more vessels of smaller gross tonnage are utilized than in the case of other users of the Welland canal. This arises both because of a lack of berthing, docking or other navigational facilities for the larger ships in many of our upper lake ports, and because the area of the upper lakes is one of our developing regions that does not provide cargo opportunities to justify economically the use of larger capacity vessels. The effect, then, of tolling ships of all sizes at the same rate will be largely felt in that region where we are most concerned with providing future opportunities for industrial development.

We believe that if tolls are to be considered for the Welland canal at all, they should be imposed only within the framework of a national transportation policy that applies to all methods of transportation equally and which does not unilaterally single out Lake Ontario domestic water transportation from that in the other Great Lakes.

2. With regard to the increases proposed for the St. Lawrence seaway canals, we are conscious that these are recommended in conformity with statutory requirements in the United States and Canada that provide for the repayment of the original capital investment and all operating and maintenance costs within a 50-year period. We are suggesting to the authority, however, that as a result of the seven-year experience of the seaway, it is time for a reappraisal of the benefits and the respective costs and revenues of the entire Great Lakes system to both Canada and the United States.

3. We have requested that 90 days be given following the hearings in Ottawa and Chicago for a supplementary submission by all parties. This we believe to be essential in order that we may analyze the overall impact of the proposals on the entire Ontario economy as a result of the evidence then available. The recent announcement that came in the latter part of last week of proposals to construct a whole new Welland canal system reinforces our view that a thorough and extensive study is required. Primarily, the authority has directed its studies to the effect of the proposed increases on coal, iron ore and wheat, which from their standpoint provide a substantial proportion of the total seaway traffic. There are, however, many other commodities of comparatively smaller tonnage which do have great significance to smaller industries and to particular communities. At a time when we are embarked on regional development and import replacement programmes and are aware of the necessity of creating substantial further employment opportunities in this province, we should like to be assured that the consequences of the proposed toll increases are carefully weighed against these programmes.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*continued*)

On vote 406:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, are we continuing on this vote?

Mr. Chairman: We were discussing, as I understand it, vote 406; it has not been completed as yet. Is it the wish of the House that we complete this vote now?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the offices in Europe and the functions they play in the whole matter of immigration. I gather that these offices will, as the hon. Minister said, assess the need of certain industries in Canada, and will talk to prospective immigrants in the United Kingdom and other places, trying to match skills with jobs that are open here.

Do these offices promote immigration and try to bring people here from various parts of the United Kingdom? I understand this happens.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): To answer the hon. member's question, Mr. Chairman, we have an immigration office in Glasgow solely for immigration in that area. Our main office for immigration is Ontario House, where we have an immigration department. The other two offices are trade and industry offices. If we get any inquiries from those areas say in Italy, or the areas covered by that trade officer, he will get information on immigration for them. But our main objectives in immigration are carried out through the Glasgow office and Ontario House.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask is that I had a call this morning from an immigrant who came in six weeks ago, and I think he came from Dublin, but this would not be the hon. Minister's purview perhaps, this would be the Canadian immigration office there, would it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, it would be.

Mr. Young: But the problem is the same, he arrived. He was told in Dublin, or Belfast, he would not have any trouble finding a job and he evidently had the job before he came here, but he was also told he would have no trouble with accommodation.

Now, his wife and five children are on the high seas, they are arriving on Friday morning and he is desperate because he cannot find accommodation for them. He has been searching desperately, he called me this morning. I called the Minister's office and I will say this—and I would like to put it on the record—that I think that his department is doing an outstanding job in finding places for emergency cases.

I have referred a good many to them. Mr. Suters and Mr. Whaley, particularly, have taken these cases and have come up with answers when it seemed that no answer was possible, but in this case, they are faced with a problem. For one year they have their hands tied because this man has just arrived and until he is here for a year he can have no place in Ontario housing. This is perhaps something that should be changed, but it just seems incredible that we should bring a man like Mr. Robert Cooke, who is now living in Weston, boarding there, into this country with the assurance that there will be plenty of accommodation for his family.

His family will arrive on Friday and there is nothing! I have gone through the housing registry. I hope that something may be

done. There is an opening but that still has to be passed on by Mr. Stinson, I understand, and something may turn up. But so far the man is facing this kind of a problem and it seems to me that the offices on the other side of the water should make it absolutely clear to these people that they should not bring their families, if they themselves are determined to come, until such time as they are absolutely certain that living accommodation is ready for those families.

Now, he took the word of the immigration people over there at its face value and he has found himself in this predicament. Perhaps the hon. Minister will be able to offer some solution to this kind of a problem and so I will give him the full details this afternoon during the estimates.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I should explain to the House that when we discussed Ontario immigration we decided at that time rather than deal with it under vote 405, Ontario House, we would deal with it under vote 401. It has been dealt with by the House, and I would ask the members, if they will, to stay with trade and industry under vote 406.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the offices on the other side of the water—

Mr. Chairman: That is right, under European offices.

Mr. Young: —and the information that they are giving. And I wonder if the hon. Minister has any information about it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That information is from the European offices, not from Ontario House. In this vote here we are talking about the European offices on trade and commerce. As far as immigration is concerned we discussed this with the chairman of immigration the other day. I think perhaps that we should take a closer look at the possibility of families getting into this kind of difficulty. I had a report on my desk this morning outlining housing accommodations in many areas across Ontario which I put a note on saying that we would discuss this later in the week. I think it is one of the services we can supply to a prospect of immigrants coming this way.

I am not quite sure whether the hon. member said that the man had been here for some time and had then sent for his family—

Mr. Young: Six weeks!

Hon. Mr. Randall: As a rule, when they get here, the first thing they do is get a job and look around and see if there is accommodation before they start moving the family. In this case, the man did not have accommodation and asked the family to come over. Is that right?

Mr. Young: Yes, but he was assured on the other side that he would have no trouble and so he did not start looking for accommodation until he sent word to his family to come.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have a note on it here; I will speak to our housing people about it, and also the immigration people.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I have observed that the hon. member for Yorkview addressed a question to the hon. Minister related to the subject of immigration. Now, do I understand that it is your intention to cut off discussion?

Mr. Chairman: We have discussed Ontario's phase of immigration under vote number 401. It was decided by the House earlier that we would either discuss it under 401 or 405, Ontario House. The House decided, under the Minister's guidance, that we would discuss it under 401, which we did.

Mr. Sopha: That is unfortunate. I was not here; I make no apologies for that because I was engaged in the public business elsewhere. I did have a question that I wanted to ask the hon. Minister about immigration and I would ask your leave, Mr. Chairman, if I might address that question to him.

Mr. Chairman: We have dealt with the vote and with the concurrence of the House, there is no reason why the question could not be asked and the Minister answer it, if it can be brief, and then we can carry on with vote 406.

Mr. Sopha: I understand with a complete degree of comprehension why the government ought to be concerned, and is concerned, about the fate of immigrants—the conditions affecting them when they arrive here in Ontario. I am curious to know what is behind the government policy that impels the hon. Minister to invade the federal field

of jurisdiction in the matter of immigration. I observe that in The British North America Act, section 91, head 25, the naturalization of aliens is one of the spheres of jurisdiction of the federal government; there is nothing in section 92, the provincial sphere, that even approaches that and gives the province any power.

Now, the Prime Minister is always talking to the federal government; he is there in conferences with them two or three times a year, with his advisers and, indeed, with his Ministers sometimes—I suspect—and if this government is not satisfied with the way the federal government is carrying out its responsibilities in the field of immigration, whether in numbers or quality, then why is not the device of the federal-provincial conference used to make their views known to the federal government, rather than, on the other hand, this department engaging directly in the field of immigration? That is point 1.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I suggest the hon. member look at section 75.

Mr. Sopha: Is the hon. member a constitutional lawyer?

Well, I merely reply by saying that for many years the federal government has had a Department of Citizenship and Immigration which long preceded the establishment of the portfolio in this province. Ever since Confederation the federal government has assumed the responsibility of immigration into this country. I think the first departure from that, if we want to get historically accurate, the first invasion into the federal field occurred when Premier Drew initiated his celebrated air lift after World War II. I hope that clears that up.

Mr. Bryden: It certainly is not true.

Mr. Sopha: The second point is that having launched itself into the field of immigration directly by the use of Ontario House, and indeed offices in Glasgow, what is the rationale behind that policy that limits the establishment of these offices only to the United Kingdom? Why are they not established in Italy, Greece, Portugal, West Germany and any one of a number of other countries where desirable immigrants, and particularly skilled ones, might be attracted to this country? Is there some inarticulated major premise, in other words—to put it bluntly—that the complexion of this province ought to be such that we must attract increments of Anglo-Saxons into the country, rather than additional numbers of central Europeans? And in that regard, I say that this province has already become multi-national; it is a multi-national province. People from many lands inhabit this province and work to make it great. Perhaps the government disagrees with that—the large predominance of Anglo-Saxons who sit on the Treasury benches. Only the hon. Ministers of Municipal Affairs and Public Welfare and the hon. Provincial Secretary, I think, only they could not be called Anglo-Saxons; the rest are Anglo-Saxons.

Do these Anglo-Saxons run this province; do they want to attract a predominance of Anglo-Saxons to this province and indeed to cultivate the hegemony that we have experienced in this province of the Anglo-Saxon domination of our politics, business, industry, the arts, education and every other important field? For further elaboration, any interested member can look at Professor Porter's excellent book.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Minister answer this brief question?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say that if the hon. member were to read the discussions we had on immigration last week most of the questions he poses, would be answered. But in courtesy to him—

Mr. Sopha: I read them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a moment, now. I am not finding fault with the hon. member being away; I am simply saying that we are repeating what we said last week, and I am trying to answer his question as simply as I possibly can. Let me first of all assure him that we have had an immigration branch since World War II in Ontario House, with the co-operation of federal authorities, who welcomed it. May I also say that since I have taken office here I have worked very closely with the former immigration Minister, Mr. Nicholson. As you know we put out a report last July which indicated it was a co-operative effort on the part of all the provinces, as well as this one, to work with the federal authorities to try to get immigration from many parts of the world. Following that conference, Mr. Nicholson himself toured almost every office in the U.K. and established new offices over there, including one in Milan, one in Germany and one in southern England.

Our job, as we see it in this province, is to assist the federal authorities, not on mass immigration but to get the skilled workers required for this province. That is the job of almost every province. The mass, or the

sponsored, immigration, the federal authorities are quite prepared to look after and they want to look after it.

I think you have got to place yourself in the position of the federal authorities. If they advertise anywhere in the world for immigration the people arrive and they have to decide—eeny-meeny-miney-mo, where do you go? Now they cannot discriminate against any one of the ten provinces. Whereas a province, working in co-operation with the federal authorities, can supplement their efforts. That is exactly what we are trying to do. Certainly not to invade it. Because it is impossible, I think, for any one province to invade the immigration field without getting into great difficulties. We have letters, not only from Mr. Marchand and Mr. Nicholson, but the authorities overseas, extending a welcome to us anywhere in Europe where we have been trying to stimulate more immigration. As I said last week, many of the offices they have opened they have opened after consultation with us. We have been over there in Greece and Turkey and places such as you suggest, where I have had discussions with the federal authorities—they need to increase their offices and that is what they are doing.

My feeling is that in Europe we have many problems. You have a language problem, first of all, which means you have to have specialists. In the U.K. the people know the language; they can adapt very quickly here, and this is where we can be of the greatest help to the federal authorities. We have gone on record—I particularly—as welcoming people from any corner of the globe.

I think that answers most of the hon. member's questions. I can assure you we are not in any way trying to invade their field; we are trying to supplement what they are doing, and they welcome the effort.

Mr. Sopha: That does not answer my question at all. I asked you why you did not open offices in some of these other countries. You have not answered that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The question is a very simple one.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me. I think it was with the concurrence of the House that we are not opening up the vote. We have agreed to ask the one question, and here is the answer. I would ask the members if they would stay with vote 406, please, on trade and industry.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, on 406, I would like to ask the hon. Minister this: We have spent, in 1964-1965, $24,000-odd on the advisory council for women. What did the Minister spend this year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Around $40,000.

Mr. Sargent: What are you asking the House for in the next year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: About the same amount.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, even the hon. Minister himself should be embarrassed at this arm of the public relations section of the Conservative Party. He has inherited this. The kindest way I can say it is: You must feel guilty taking $40,000 from the taxpayers of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not a bit.

Mr. Sargent: —to do a snow job on the women of Ontario on this women's advisory committee, holding regional conferences in ten major areas of the province wherein you have top government officials, top Conservatives, telling the women of Ontario what a great Prime Minister we have. And what a great man the Minister, Mr. Randall, is; and giving glowing tributes to all the actions of the government in its entirety. I think it should be embarrassing for a Conservative to see the layout of the promotion here.

They have embossed invitation cards, and lots of newspaper advertising and direct mail. Advance agents go into the area.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Do you not believe in advertising?

Mr. Sargent: For the right things, yes. This is a complete takeover, I submit, Mr. Chairman, of the thinking of normally intelligent people to get into the hands of this public relations group here, which the people are paying for. I think it is highly unethical, to say the least.

We have this department going one step further. They go into an area, and they find out who the top Liberals are in an area. They approach them and say: We are having the Minister and this very important advisory council in here to tell you what a good job the government is doing. We want you to be on the reception committee. And so they very subtly set up the deal.

An hon. member: Is that subtle?

Mr. Sargent: They think it is subtle. They have these fashion teas with all the finesse

of Madison avenue, to present a snow job on behalf of the government.

The advertising to back this up is very—well, if I were paying for it I would be pretty embarrassed and angry about what I was paying for. But it says: Born recently, the women's advisory committee is already mother's helper and a girl's best friend, to tell the Ontario women—you—how to support Canada's economy and help yourself at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Sargent: It would be all right, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would bring in some intelligent members of the Opposition to tell the women of Ontario what really is going on, how their money is being squandered.

It does not stop here. This is one way that you are getting away with it. We cannot stop you. You have your hand in the till and you are going to dish out as much as you want to, when you want to.

I want to say this, Mr. Chairman. The smiling Prime Minister is here. He has the title of Honest John. I think I would have a guilty conscience if I would look back to the last election and say the things that he had told the people that had been done, and to come smiling before the public and take moneys along this line of this department to do a PR job for the party.

We go into every convention held at the exhibition ground here in Toronto—there must be 30 or 40 of them a year—and what strikes me is that every one is loaded with province of Ontario exhibits. Almost every department has an exhibit there, with plenty of staff around, spending a lot of money, building up the Minister, and always the Prime Minister. This is expensive. The Minister say this year he is going to spend $40,000, the same as last year, to step up the PR on this department.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the next time that the Prime Minister goes on the air, he tell the people of Ontario how much of their money he is using to promote the government and his smiling image across this province. I think it is unethical—it is corrupt—to take the public money to build the image when you should be paying for that out of the money you receive from your liquor friends. It has been established that you are getting this money, but you try to dodge the issue.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 406, please.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about public relations and spending public moneys for creating the image. It is all part of the old package; you take money, wherever you want to, to do this. I think it is time that the people knew what was going on. If the proceedings of this House were televised, we could tell the people of Ontario what you were doing, and how you are doing it. But it only gets into the press, Mr. Chairman; what is news, what makes headlines. If there was ever a steal going on in this province, it is done by this government. Nowhere across the Dominion of Canada has there been such glaring and blatant—

Mr. Chairman: On 406, please.

Mr. Sargent: —invasion of the public funds by such things as the women's advisory council, as an example.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to comment on what the hon. member for Grey North had to say. We work on the premise—and I think he will agree, being in the promotion and advertising business—that women spend 80 per cent of the dollars, so women should have an interest in the economy. I would like to ask him this: Does he think women should have anything to do with the economy? I am sure he would agree they should. And I would also like to suggest that we do not load these committees and meetings with our Conservative friends, because we do not know where they come from. There are ten women chosen—two women from every area. The women's organizations choose them, we have nothing to do with them. If the hon. member wants to check, the next time there is a meeting, on their political background, it is entirely up to him. We never ask what their political background is; we could not care less, as long as they have an interest in the economy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Are members interested in what the Minister has to say?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If they are not, I will be glad to sit down.

I would suggest to the hon. member I do not know how he would run the government if he ever got elected, but I am afraid he would run it on bottle tops because he does not believe anybody should spend any money.

As far as the exhibits are concerned: Certainly we display Ontario products, that

is what we are in business for. We are not going to display somebody else's, we are going to display Ontario products. We want to help Ontario manufacturers, the very people the hon. member is looking forward to have settling in his area.

So far as the women's organization is concerned, I can show members stacks and stacks of letters from organizations and industries across the country complimenting the government on the fact that they have the women participating in expanding the economy and creating jobs. When we say to the women the job you save may be your own, we mean their husbands, their sons or their fathers. As far as I am concerned, as long as I am running this department we will continue to have women in the department. I only wish I had twice the amount of money to get more women in this province working toward helping our economy.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to revert to the matter which we were discussing on Friday afternoon when the House rose. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister at that time stated that he felt that the guidelines which the hon. Mr. Winters, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, had laid down in Ottawa for subsidiaries were at the best irrelevant to the situation in the province of Ontario. He will no doubt have seen in the press over the last few days, of course, that the Prime Minister of Canada has reiterated this belief that those guidelines provide a very necessary part of the economic protection of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that the point we had reached on Friday was that the Minister was saying that the rules are unnecessary and that if the government of Canada wishes to enunciate rules, that is fine, it is their prerogative, but he feels they are irrelevant. I take it from his remarks both in this assembly and as later quoted in the press, I take it from his remarks that he in fact feels that there is no need for him to give any kind of indication to companies which are establishing their plants in the province of Ontario, and which are principally affiliates of United States companies, there is no need at all for him to give any expression of the viewpoint of this government in so far as the economic development of the province is concerned and the place that affiliates of U.S. companies are going to play in that development.

If that is a correct assessment then I would like to know whether or not the Minister is not concerned about the price which Ontario affiliates of U.S. companies are paying for their imports from their parent or associated companies in the U.S.; whether he considers there is some need on the part of the government to have the information on which they can establish whether or not the prices which they are paying for those imports are subject to some kind of a market test.

I would like also to ask whether he is at all concerned about the price which is being paid by affiliates in the province of Ontario for technological and engineering know-how, and for the use of patents; in general the cost to the Ontario affiliates of that kind of information, whether that is a realistic price, whether it is a fair price and whether part of those funds could not usefully be diverted to research and development of products in the province of Ontario.

A further matter on which I would like him to comment is whether or not he does not consider it essential that he advise companies which are proposing to establish in the province of Ontario that there are certain wage standards at which they are expected to aim and which they are expected in time to achieve in the province of Ontario, wherever they locate. Also whether or not it is not now time for the Minister to give consideration to obtaining this basic kind of information so that he can decide whether or not it is possible, realistically and intelligently and with informed opinion, to follow the progress of affiliates of U.S. companies in the province of Ontario to make certain that they are making a maximum contribution to the economic life of this province.

These are matters on which I think the Minister must have an opinion. I think if the government has not now a policy, it must in due course have a policy; because all that the Minister so far has said is if they will just come here and carry on their activities we will not infringe in any way upon them, we will not indicate to them what we think the policies of those companies should be and in fact we are quite prepared to let them carry on their activities in the province of Ontario with a minimum of questions, a minimum of requests for information from the government and with no real concern as to how their policies mesh with the policies of the government or the economic development of the province.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I thought we covered most of this ground last Friday morning, but I see the hon. member wants to go around again.

Let me suggest, I take back nothing of what I said the other day. I think that the

American companies and most foreign companies operating here are good corporate citizens. I am sure if the member had finished reading what the Prime Minister of Canada said, if he had read to the end of his speech, he said, "We are issuing these guidelines but we know that 99 per cent or the majority of these companies are good Canadian corporate citizens and are abiding by the laws of this country."

I simply say that is where he should have started. In my estimation that is where this province starts. We are trying to accuse many companies of doing something wrong before we have the facts to back it up. As far as I am concerned, I think most foreign companies we have operating here—and again I speak from my own personal experience—are here to make a dollar on their investment, to be good corporate citizens, employ people, pay the wages that we pay in this country, meet the operating conditions of the various provincial governments; and I see no reason why they should be subject to a new set of guidelines now.

If the hon. member has read the recent comments on both sides of the border about the former U.S. guidelines, he will come to the same conclusion I have. There has been a lot of conversation go over the dam but nothing very much has changed. They have not proven that these corporations investing over here have done anything but assist the economy.

I simply suggest to the member, regardless of whether it is federally or provincially, we make these statements as politicians and we have a right to do it. I concede the right to the Minister up in Ottawa to make these statements; I simply say I do not agree with some of the things referred in these statements, that these people have not been good corporate citizens.

Again I can go back to practical experience. When we held our four or five import replacement shows here, the American subsidiary companies were the first to join us in these shows across the country, to display the products they are importing, put the prices on them that they are paying from their parent companies and give Canadian manufacturers a chance to produce them here.

I can show you success story after success story of American subsidiary companies that are doing that today. They are coming into our office and saying: Can you find me Canadian sources of supply? I do not hold with the fact that someone made a statement that American companies come over here, operate without any profit and just import parts at a high price. I think that has yet to be proven.

As far as royalties and fees are concerned: No, I have no record at the moment. Perhaps when we can get our statistical department set up and get this information from federal authorities in Ottawa next year we will be able to find out what royalties and fees and engineering services are being paid for out of the country.

I mentioned what our guidelines were in the province of Ontario. They are very simple. I simply suggest to these people when they come in here that they abide by the laws of this country and this province. If they can I would like to see them list their stock on our markets so Canadians can participate in their companies. Also they should certainly try to put Canadian directors on their boards to guide them; and they should try to employ Canadians in their executive positions.

As far as imported items are concerned, I have covered that. I think that on the imported items our record shows there is more Canadian content in our manufacturing by subsidiary companies today than any time before in our history. I think it is going to get more so as competition becomes a little more fierce.

There is one thing I think we have to keep in mind. When competition is not fierce there is a chance that the purchasing agents will buy out of the country and not give too much consideration as to where the parts come from. But as soon as they go to the marketplace and they cannot sell their goods, I can assure you, again from personal experience, they make sure that we buy at the lowest possible price, whether it be here or anywhere else. I think you will find that the Canadian manufacturers, with their highly automated plants and the technical advances we have made, can provide bits and pieces here for manufacturing assembly as cheaply as they can get them from anyone else in the world. Again, I reiterate; So far, we have no guide rules, and I do not intend at the moment to consider guide rules. If they are necessary, that will be a matter for this government to decide. In my opinion, a lot of this guide rule situation is conversation. If you read to the end of the speeches that have been made by many people in the past, you will say that this is not happening yet but it may happen. All we are doing is warning others that they had better be good corporate citizens. If the same thing applied to us in the United States, Europe, or Japan, I think, perhaps, their authorities would take

the same attitude as we take here—that we appreciate the warnings, and we will try to be good corporate citizens.

Mr. Renwick: The point at which the House rose on Friday was when I opened my remarks. There is no wish on my part to rehash what was gone over on Friday. I think the hon. Minister has confirmed that he does not think that at this time there is any need whatsoever, first of all, for him to suggest, in the most innocuous way, any policies for affiliates of foreign companies, particularly U.S. companies in the province of Ontario. Second, I take it to be the substance of his remarks that he, in fact, is not interested in obtaining the information from the affiliates of U.S. companies in the province of Ontario, on which he can decide whether or not the purchasing policies of those companies are consistent with the objectives of the economic policy of his department for the province of Ontario. He is not interested in getting the information directly from those companies as to the amount of money which they individually are paying for technical information, know-how, and the right to use patents and licensing agreements. He is quite prepared to continue to let the matter just drift along in this optimistic hope which he has that everything those companies do in the province of Ontario is, of necessity, in the best interests of the economic growth of this province.

All that we urge on the government is that they make some effort to get the information on their own, to analyze it, to find out and to publish, as part of the studies of the economic council or part of the studies of the department, whether or not the activities in the province of Ontario of foreign affiliated companies are in the interests of the economic growth of this province. I do not think it is sufficient for the hon. Minister simply to say, in a most optimistic way, that they are going to get along well. So far as any guidelines that have been announced are concerned, immediately all the leading officers of the companies to whom they were directed enunciated how happy they were with them, because they had been adhering to them for the past 15, 20, 30, 40 or 50 years.

We are not suggesting that those guidelines are effective, but we are certainly suggesting that this government, this department, has a prime responsibility in the province of Ontario to get the kind of information which is necessary to find out whether or not some of the fears that have been expressed are based on facts in some cases, and are warranted or not. We, here, do not think it is possible that this hon. Minister can continually stand up and say: "In due course, if anything goes wrong, we will inquire into it at that time," because the continuing activities of those companies in the province of Ontario are matters which this government and this department should now be interested in. And the government should not wait to find out whether or not they have or have not been in the interests of the economic developments of the province.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, it is trite to say, of course, that in respect of the attraction of American or other foreign capital into this province, if we are to develop this country, and specifically this province, we have an immediate and very imperative need for foreign capital. It is true to say that 20 million Canadians, and six or seven million residents of Ontario, simply cannot save enough capital to permit sufficient accumulation to engage ourselves in the vast projects which we undertake, particularly in the development of industry, related to our natural resources. We have an impelling need for foreign capital. It just happened that that capital is American. That is not surprising because of the geographical contiguity to that great country. The attraction of the stability of our institutions, particularly our financial and parliamentary institutions, the stability of our currency, and just about every other factor of our national complexion makes us an inviting risk to them, shrewd businessmen that they are.

I do not suppose on the face of God's earth there is a shrewder, more intelligent businessman than the Yankee, south of the border. He is far beyond the acuity of the Britisher who had economic hegemony in the 19th century. With that background, I say to the Minister that it took me some time to recover from the intemperate nature of his remarks about his colleague in Quebec, made to this House earlier in the session. This Minister faces different problems than Mr. Kierans. Mr. Kierans has anxious problems about the economics of his province that must keep him awake at night. He was telling the Americans in his speech made in this free city, where free speech is an ordinary indicia of the way we live. The Minister does not agree with that; that we have free speech in Toronto. Actually we do, you know, sir. Mr. Kierans was really saying that if American capital comes into his province, it is going to come in subject to the terms that they impose upon it. We are going to be masters in our own house.

Maîtres chez nous—they are always talking about *maîtres chez nous*, one of the slogans of the modern day in Quebec. That was one aspect.

The other problem he faces, sir, is to replace those leaders of finance and industry in his province who have heretofore been English-speaking by people of the French language.

This is another grave problem. He came into Ontario, and really was telling a very distinguished audience here something about his problems. That irritated our hon. Minister, because he came into the House the next day, or a couple of days later, and for the first time in my life, I saw him beat his chest, if not the drums. He was telling us, who know better, that he wants to attract all the American capital he can get. They are good corporate citizens and they would not harm us; fine fellows, we want to get them. So as not to spoil our attraction of American capital into Ontario by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development in this province, he wished that Mr. Kierans would go down to Quebec and make those speeches in Quebec, not make them in the capital city of this, Canada's greatest, province, so as to interfere with us.

I said earlier, and I merely repeat it, that what Mr. Kierans ought to have done the next day was send him a wire, saying: Come down into Quebec and make any kind of a speech you want, on any subject, as long as you do not swear; we do not swear in Quebec. We will hire the hall for you and we will get you an audience, and we will show you we have free speech in Quebec. You can make a speech.

I just recovered from the amazement of the hon. Minister's remarks when they hold the thinkers' conference at Hamilton and the hon. member for London South adopts the continental approach. He is talking in the same vein, and he is lecturing George Hees about some of George Hees' concern about the dependence on American capital.

Well, I will not go into that, save to say this represents—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Briefly.

Mr. Sopha: —a 180 degree turn from the policy of the old Conservative Party of the '90s and the first decade of the 20th century. What was the slogan then; to show you the shift from north to south. The slogan was: No truck or trade with the Yankees.

No truck or trade with the Yankees, that was the slogan in those days when they fought the reciprocity election. The Tory party, albeit successful against Laurier, went across this country from one side to the other talking about the dangers of dependence upon American capital and the dangers of the relaxation of the tariff boundaries against them.

So we see in 1966, 55 years later, where they have come to. Now, we are the ones, the Liberal Party, that section of it, so far as he elicits support, led by Walter Gordon I am happy to say, and I say by interpolation—

Mr. Bryden: Neither of them knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Sopha: —that if Mr. Pearson wants us to pick sides, he has chosen Mitchell Sharp and he is the Prime Minister of Canada. I am a very minor and unwashed politician—not in the exact sense of that term but I am a very minor politician—and I use this forum to say to him, if he ever hears about it, he chooses Mitchell Sharp's side while I choose Walter Gordon's, I am in that crew; and if we are to be called the economic nationalists that is fine.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would stay on vote 406?

Mr. Bryden: If he can find it.

Mr. Sopha: In the view of the hon. member for Woodbine I could accumulate considerable evidence that nobody in the universe knows what he is talking about except the member for Woodbine.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): If you had been here, you would have heard the debate on this.

Mr. Sopha: There is lots of evidence of that.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would stay with vote 406?

Mr. Sopha: Let us not get into personalities. I am an elected member here, by 10,000 votes, and a lot of other people who did not vote for me said it is all right with them if I am the member although they did not vote for me. So I have as much right to be here as the member for York South.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: That is right; not always! Let us not get into personalities, because I remember—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, I would say to my friend from York South I am minded of a part of Skelton's "Life of Laurier" where one of the members who was assailed in a personal matter said that if the assailer wanted to get into personalities then it is a free-for-all, and I hope this Parliament does not turn into something like the House of Commons in that regard.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury is anxious to get back to vote 406.

Mr. Sophia: Yes, indeed!

Now in my view, and I want to make this point, all the talk about foreign capital and foreign control over major sectors of our industry, particularly the manufacturing and the mining industry, somewhat misses the point. The bugaboo that is raised in regard to that always seems to be related by the proponent to interference with our political institutions. That is to say that people who control important sectors of our industry are going to approach government, lobby them, see them in secret and propose to governments that they do something in a legislative or a regulatory or an administrative way that will favour that industry.

I for one do not think there ever has been or ever will be much danger of that type of interference with our politics. I cannot recall any instance of it, at least in modern times, and I do not think that the Americans, or any of their citizens, would exercise themselves to indulge in that type of interference. What I, in my personal opinion, see as somewhat sinister and dangerous is the fact that economic decisions, purely economic decisions, are made by the owners of our industry in secret in board rooms, and are often made in a foreign country. Important economic decisions that have a very pervasive and intimate effect upon the lives, future and welfare of a good many workers in this province are made outside its boundaries.

For example, if a decision is made in Cleveland or Chicago or New York relating to the moving of a plant from locality A to locality B, that is an economic decision that is made by foreigners and that decision affects the lives and future and welfare and the stability of perhaps many thousands of workers.

Now, in that regard it is very interesting to note that many countries of western Europe that consider themselves to be as democratic as we consider ourselves to be —not to mention countries of Central and Latin America—in western Europe many countries have taken the power to take such wide economic decisions away from the boards of directors, or at least have made those decisions subject to review by the government.

In that regard I am reminded of the speaker, I forget his name, that the hon. Minister brought here for the regional conference held at the Royal York. He told us about the decision that had been made by a motorcar company to locate a plant in Great Britain. They wanted to locate in locality A and the government of the United Kingdom, every inch as democratic as ours, said to the motorcar company, "No, you will locate in the Liverpool area where there is a certain measure of unemployment and where it would be in the best interests of our economy that you locate."

In many social and economic affairs we in Canada are not as advanced as some of the European countries and it takes us a little time, often a generation, to catch up. We have no such regulatory devices in this province. We will have them some day.

Other examples, of course, are the closing down of a plant where many hundreds or thousands of people are put out of work.

To sum it up: As I said I am not concerned about political interference, I am very worried and anxious about the economic interference. Again, that is what Mr. Kierans was talking about when he voiced his anxiety. He is concerned about his province. He is concerned that with capital coming from abroad, outside the borders, into Quebec, decisions are made that are adverse to the policy of the government of Quebec and are not in the best interests of the people of Quebec. In the final analysis I was glad to see that though Mr. Kierans suffered considerable embarrassment about his exchange of correspondence with high officials in the United States government, that in the final result it appears he was justified in that the American authorities agreed to temper their guidelines policy, and in some respects at least they notified the government of Canada, through channels, that its effect upon Canada would be very minimum indeed.

One thing about the Americans that history seems to demonstrate is that the tougher our government talks to the American government about things which they have done which we do not consider to be in our best interests, the more the American government—at least in this century, certainly not in the last but at least in this

century—has taken such a reasonable attitude toward us Canadians that they are willing to bend over backwards to see that we are not offended.

The other point I wish to make is a reiteration of things that I have said on the floor of the House before, that particularly in our mining industry, with which I am so closely connected by reason of the nature of the community I represent in this House, our history in the mining industry has been one of selling our resources for a dime and buying them back for a dollar.

The hon. Minister, when he talks about the attraction of American capital into this country, unless he qualifies what he says he means American capital coming into the mining industry in the way that it has always come, and that is to say to mine the raw material out of the earth where a munificent providence fortunately put it in such quantities in our province, and take the raw material away outside our borders, as they have done, and fabricate that raw material into finished products which they sell back to us at a very enhanced price. Indeed in the whole operation, whereas one man might be employed to do a certain unit of work in stripping the ores out of the ground, perhaps 10 are employed south of the border in fabricating those ores into finished products.

To be more illustrative, one man may mine a ton of iron ore at Steep Rock, while 10 men are employed at Pittsburgh or Cleveland in fabricating that ton of ore into steel girders and beams and steel rails, and so on.

One pleads in vain for the government of this province to do something toward the utilization of our mining resources within our province in the way of the erection of industries that render them into finished products and create a widely expanded field of employment for our people and which would, no doubt, lead to a stimulus in immigration and impel us to attempt to attract larger numbers of people from abroad to come and join us in the bare expanses of this country.

It is a crime that in 1966 we still have less than 20 million people in this country. Laurier said in the first decade, and he was completely wrong, he said that by the end of the century we would probably be 60 million to 75 million in Canada.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): He would have been right if he had won the election in 1911.

Mr. Sopha: My friend the hon. member for Brant says that he would probably have been right if he had won the election of 1911. But there it is. He looks as though he is going to be completely wrong. Indeed, in this province itself—I should not tarry here—it was reported that births are down 3 per cent. More than 3 per cent last year in this province, when the crying need we have is for people. I am angered to some extent with the hon. member for Scarborough West. We have a terrific need for people in this province, young people, and babies. He consistently and continually puts his resolutions on the order paper advocating contraceptives and birth control and all those other things to keep down the size of the family.

Mr. S. Lewis: Supported by the hon. member for Brant beside you.

Mr. Sopha: All right, that is fine.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 406, please.

Mr. Sopha: I never take the floor of the House and have the feeling that I speak with the sufferance of my friend the hon. member for York South; I do not have to feel that way. I am free and independent and just as much a member of this House as he is. In his meanness he would have me feel otherwise; I do not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I say to the hon. Minister that I have expressed my views. Mr. Gordon wrote his book and Mr. Sharp and Mr. Pearson said, in respect of it, that there ought to be a debate in this country about the proposals that Mr. Gordon laid down. This is a very anxious problem to Canadians who think about it. Canadians are people of many problems. Ever since the 1850's, if not before, Canadians have been very anxious about the presence of that monolithic neighbour to the south. Some people call us schizophrenic in that regard; I do not know that the term is warranted, but it is one of the vexing problems of our age to keep the economic control of our country, in our own hands. In that regard, there are many illustrations spring to mind. You note the frenzy we get into when there is a suggestion that our financial institutions, such as banks and trust companies, might be taken over. You would see how quickly the government of Canada moves in that sphere to prohibit by law the passing of control of those financial institutions, which form the very keystone of our financial structure, into foreign hands.

I say to the Minister, when he is talking about American capital coming into this country, why should this same thing not obtain

for the mining industry in the sense that I have expressed myself? I hope we have a debate. I hope that it is an intelligent debate in this country. Pending the debate, I suggest that we Canadians should adopt a slogan; we should have something to the effect of: American investment, ever. Divesting our resources, never. That ought to be the atmosphere, I suggest, in which we think about these things, an atmosphere which leads to the development of this country for the people who reside in it. First, for their welfare and their betterment, and secondly, an atmosphere wherein we are conscious—and we have not always been and are not, I suspect, in this country—of the great wealth that we have here, and are conscious of our moral responsibility to share it with that large part—two-thirds—of the world's population that is in a state of chronic starvation at all times.

Finally, the things I have been talking about—the erection of a steel mill at the Lakehead, the advancement toward economic maturity in the way of an integrated economy where we do not have such a great dependence on the importation of finished products that we have now. We have made remarkable strides since World War II; we had virtually no heavy industry when Great Britain declared war on Germany in 1939. All this has developed in the two decades and the approaching third decade. Since then, we have made great strides.

I look to support from the hon. Prime Minister, because he walked out of here in the recess and spoke to a very influential group—the national association of manufacturers. He, the first citizen of Canada's greatest and wealthiest province, called for a return to the national development policy. He said that if we were going to make anything out of this nation, we have to think of it in national terms. Canadians joining together and taking on the big projects in this country that are necessary for its proper and organized development. At least the hon. Prime Minister is consistent; when he says that, he goes back to the very idea propounded by Sir John A. Macdonald. The Prime Minister did not invent the words "national development policy"; those are Sir John A.'s. That was his policy after 1867 and Laurier carried on that national development policy. But the national development policy ended with the death of Laurier. We have no return to it. The closest we have gotten to it is the fact that in this country all big projects have been undertaken by government. I cannot recall one undertaken by private industry.

Ones such as the St. Lawrence seaway, the building of the pipeline across the Laurentian shield, projects of that calibre, are undertaken by government. The Prime Minister did not spell out the details in his address to the national association of manufacturers. He did not put any flesh on the bones that he, to speak metaphorically, laid before them. That is part of the problem, as I see it.

I would prefer that the Minister of Economics and Development in this province be concerned about the economic effects of the importation of capital into the province, rather than get up and make sweeping generalizations such as he made that day in response to Mr. Kierans about his welcoming attitude toward American capital. The answer is somewhere in between. The importation of capital must be orderly; it must come in here under a set of rules that we devise in respect of the economic decisions that flow from ownership of industry in this province. We will come to it. I do not know how long it will take, but some day we will reach the same system as the countries of western Europe. The Benelux countries, from what I have read, are sterling examples of control of foreign capital. We will reach that level of maturity when we, through our democratic processes and our parliamentary institutions and laws passed after reasoned debate, will lay down the conditions, the responsibilities, that flow from ownership of industry. It may take us ten or 15 years—I hope not—to get to that level of maturity. But some day we will get there.

Mr. Nixon: Before I ask my question, I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment on the thought put forward by the hon. member for Sudbury?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I would be delighted to comment. First of all, I think when Laurier was defeated, I was three years old or I was just starting my first paper route, so you cannot blame that on me. I agree with the hon. member that Mr. Kierans has a right to free speech the same as I have. I have made some speeches around and out of the country. I simply state that I disagreed with some of the things he said about foreign capital. It has since been proven that the things we talked about here this afternoon indicate that the concern that he had has not come about. If you followed the elections in Quebec, the Hon. George Marlow, the Hon. Réné Levesque, a most outspoken Quebecker, the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Lesage, Mr. Parizean of the GIC, and the hon. Mr. Filion of Sidbec, have all stated:

"Don't scare off foreign capital until you have a replacement." I simply suggest that I have the same concern, but I certainly do not believe you should get so mad at the cook that you stop eating.

Let me also suggest that in the *Globe and Mail* this morning Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the international monetary fund, voiced some of the things that we have talked about in our department, with reference to trade balances and current account balances. He, too, does not see anything to be too concerned about, providing you are doing your share of the export business. This is what we are trying to do in this province, and what the Canadian government is trying to do. My feeling is the same as, I think, some of these people like Professor Slater, who said we are too concerned about our international balance of payments problems. I do not think legislation is going to solve the problem; I think we are going to have to do a better job of selling in international markets. I would be delighted to attend the debate between the two schools of thought in the Liberal Party on Mr. Gordon's book. I read the book, but I have not had a chance to form any opinions. I simply ask myself the question, if we are going to buy 25 per cent of the $20 billion of U.S. investment or more in this country, what have we got when we spend the $5 billion to acquire 25 per cent of what we do not have today? And would we not be better off to take the $5 billion and start now to create more Canadian industry to compete in the future with Canadian international companies, such as the Moore corporation and Massey-Ferguson and some others? I think if we are accumulating those kind of dollars we would be far better off to accumulate them, not to buy out foreign interests that are here now, but to start from a fresh footing and give them some competition with our own Canadian investment.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer all the questions the hon. member poses. I agree with much of what he has said. I simply state that I listen to the pros and cons, I form my own opinions, that is a democratic right. I just disagree with some of the alarmists and I think some of these discussions which have reference to international balance of payments are somewhat alarming to those who are probably not steeped in it. Certainly, we cannot have our cake and eat it, too; we are going to have some problems. But I do not see how we are going to solve these problems by legislation. I think if we are going to have a problem, we have to sell our way out of it the same as Japan sold its way out of the balance of payments problem last year, the same way Great Britain is trying to sell its way out of a problem today, and the same way as the United States is trying to adjust its balances by selling more goods abroad. Again I come back to the fact that 57 per cent of our exports go to the United States. If we want to get so mad at the cook we stop eating and wipe out that 57 per cent, then we had better find out who else can take up the drag, because I do not see where we can get 57 per cent of our exports on other markets almost overnight. We can work towards it, but we certainly must recognize the fact that we are the biggest customer of the United States and they are our biggest customer. The closer we get to balancing the imports and the exports for the United States, the less problems we are going to have.

I think I also share the opinions of many in monetary matters in that if you show me a country that has a balance of trade and if you show me a country that has no international balance deficits, I will show you an economy that is stagnant. I think you have to have some of these things that you have to work towards eliminating them as fast as you can. You are never going to have a dollar in and a dollar out. I think everything we are doing in this government is directed to try to sell more Canadian goods to help the balance of payments problem. Nothing we are doing here, in my estimation, is adding to the problems of our balance of payments. We are trying every day in the week with everything we are doing here, both domestically and on international markets, to reduce that imbalance of payments, and to create more markets for Canadian goods.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has described the way out of the adverse balance of payments problem as getting into the country with which the adverse balance exists and selling there. I do not believe that we are doing enough here in Canada or in Ontario to capture the large share of the American market that has been so successfully captured by some of our competitors. We have obvious advantages already discussed in the House—the advantage of language, contiguity and the fact that we are familiar with the market demands and requirements of the Americans, very similar to our own. In commenting on this feeling, I wonder if the Minister would begin by comparing the number of dollars

we in Ontario spend in this department in furthering our trade with the United States as against money spent on the furtherance of our trade with Europe, where we have a favourable balance.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, let me say this, we spent last year about $100,000 in trade missions and over 50 per cent of those missions were directed to the United States markets. Plus we had nine of what we call investment opportunity missions. I went on some of these myself. So there was part of this $100,000 in trade missions that went to the United States areas.

In our advertising programme, if the member recalls, we discussed here, we are advertising today in *Business Week, New Yorker* and *Harbord Business Review.* I would say that two-thirds of our international advertising trade money is spent in the U.S. markets. And I believe I pointed out to the House here last year in the estimates that we made a motivation study in the United States, for a number of reasons, but first of all to find out why Americans were not interested in buying Canadian products. The answers in the main were, "Well, why should we, they are just the same as American." In one regard we could take that as a compliment saying that we can compete with the Americans in design and style and quality.

I think also in price in many items that we are shipping over there, but it also pointed out that we have a tougher job in trying to sell them goods that they can make just as well themselves. Now, our efforts this year, are going to be completely directed towards, at least I should say, our efforts this year in international trade, the majority of it, the main emphasis on trade, is going to be with the United States, where I think we have an opportunity of increasing the sale of Ontario-made products into American markets.

Mr. Nixon: Specifically, then, in this connection the hon. Minister mentioned the development of the Massey-Ferguson corporation and the fact that although their head office stays here in Toronto as a Canadian firm, their manufacturing development is now being lost to us since it is going to the United States. This, of course, is one of the oldest firms we have. Its name is associated with political and financial leadership from the earliest time. I think it is very regrettable that the decision was made to move so much of the manufacturing facilities of this great corporation out of Canada, and, of course, some of their modern facilities are in my own constituency, and there is a feeling there that they might well be lost as well. The threat has been made, as a matter of fact, by responsible officials of the company, that if the unions operating in the agricultural implement industry, persist in demanding the parity of wage structure between Canada and the States, that in fact they will consider moving the rest of their manufacturing facilities from Canada. I think this perhaps was an idle threat but it was made publicly and was made at a time when labour negotiations were going on in the Brantford area and elsewhere. Now, I wonder if the hon. Minister could report on what effect the move has had on the Ontario economy, and what effort he made to persuade the company to keep their manufacturing facilities here, and how he views the thing in toto. Is it a provincial catastrophe, as it may appear, if the manufacturing facilities are lost?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Commenting on the first matter, I think we discussed this in the House, about the move of Massey-Ferguson's corn-husker assembly from Woodstock to Des Moines, Iowa. At that time I pointed out that their main office, the American office, was in Detroit where I understand today, in the statement you just touched on a minute ago, Massey-Ferguson are doing 65 per cent of their total worldwide business in the United States, and the reason for that move out of Woodstock was to complete the manufacture of the corn-husker right in the corn country, to save freight and to be more competitive with the American competitors. I do not think anybody could argue with that move. I talked to the Massey-Ferguson officials. They outlined it to me at the same time they released it to the press, that they were making this move. They advised me and I think rightly so, that they felt they would sell more corn huskers out there by the fact that they would be more competitive and therefore they would be buying more parts from their Canadian plant. The parts are still going to be manufactured here and shipped to their American assembly plant. In other words, what they are doing, is not assembling the complete mechanical unit here, they are assembling the complete mechanical units in Des Moines. But they were manufacturing their parts here, and they felt that the 300 people affected that time would be given employment in their Brantford plant, plus other plants which were looking for manpower. They felt that within a year or two that the increased sale of that product in the United States, and the market they had available to them, would

mean there would be more parts manufactured, not less. So in the overall rationalization of their production facilities, it would create more jobs in the area you speak of, not less.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know if the people of Woodstock would have been willing to accept that explanation in its entirety. I would like to ask the hon. Minister further that if those reasons apply for the corn-picking machine, then surely they apply even more so for the large combines that are built here in Ontario, as comparatively few of them are sold in this province; they are all sold in the American mid-west and, to a lesser extent, the Canadian west. Would you say that it would be to our advantage then if the manufacturing plants for combines were moved out to the Des Moines area which is closer to the field of their use.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would think it is to our advantage to keep as much manufacturing here as possible. But again I say this, economics enters the picture. And also how can you create jobs. Do we care whether we complete a product in its final assembly or just manufacture parts that somebody else assembles? We have been a nation of assemblers over here for many years, this is one of the complaints; all Canadians do is use a screwdriver and an electric torch to put goods together but now we want to design them, and engineer them and manufacture them, and I agree with that a hundred per cent. I would be reluctant to see manufacturing leave the province but, on the other hand, is it going to take a job away tomorrow, and put two jobs there the next day on a different basis? This is the same situation I think we are facing in the automotive industry, where people may be making fenders today and tomorrow they are manufacturing car radios. We are going through an evolution, I believe, in manufacturing, the rationalization of industry, and we are keeping an eye on it; we talk to most of these people. I have talked to Massey-Ferguson three times since this move was made in Woodstock, and I am assured that they are going to produce more parts here. I have not heard anything to the contrary that they are going to move their operation out of here. I read the paper the same as anyone else, but I know nothing beyond what I read in the newspapers; but I would think we would discourage, if we possibly can, any move of manufacturing out of this country. It is in our interest to keep it here. On the other hand, if it is going to create more jobs by producing more parts that we can ship to somebody else who has assembly provision, there is nothing much wrong with that. I would sooner make the parts than do the assembly.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, following up the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury, and the hon. member for Brant, getting the industry here, what is more important to me is where we put them when we get them here. The hon. Minister's own report shows that four million people in Ontario are living in a state of unbalance, or two-thirds of our people are living in a state of unbalance so far as our economy is concerned. Now, the thing is, what can we do, what can this department do to check the drift of industry into this metropolis down here, the Golden Horseshoe? In our economy, the hon. Minister has many reasons why you cannot check the drift of industry, but he must know that in the old country this is done. There is a clipping from the editorial from the Moncton *Transcript* entitled:

A Check to Drift of Industry

> A major check to the drift of industry towards the crowded southeast in Britain was achieved last year.
>
> This success for a government policy on the distribution of industry is shown in the figures of approvals for industrial buildings which were issued by the Board of Trade in London. The total area of industrial building approved in the region of above average unemployment, Scotland, Wales and northern and northeastern sections of England, increased to nearly 15 per cent of all industrial buildings approved. This compares with an average of only 39 per cent over the previous five years. This change in the balance of approval has not been at the expense of growth.

The argument has always been before that if you tell industry where to locate they are going to look for other places to locate. But we do not know that yet and the experience there has been that in spite of this apportionment or allocation of industry to hungry areas, that it has increased. The total amount of industrial building approved increased in 1965 by 6.5 per cent over the previous year, so in this area government policy is not helping to correct what was once an acute geographical imbalance in the location of industry between the different regions of the country.

This is a factual allocation of industry to hungry areas, and I want to make my voice

heard for the two-thirds of the people living in unbalanced or in hungry areas to ask: What can be done? We know that in our system of free enterprise we cannot tell industry where to go and we should never change that; but there must be some way, through tax incentives, through Hydro rates and water rates, through highways and corporation taxes that we have in the control of this administration, through which we can say to industry: "We do not want to tell you where to go, but we want to discourage the growth here in the Golden Horseshoe, and if you go here or there you will have all these tax incentives that are on top of the designated area programmes in the federal field."

I know the hon. Minister has many problems in getting them to come here in the first place; but second and most important, the government should do something for the people who are not being looked after under the present plan.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is being done, or what can be done, through a programme of this nature.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps the hon. Minister would like to comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Grey North.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I will comment on them.

I think when the hon. member was away the other day we discussed the designated area programme with the federal authorities. We are already in discussion with Mr. Drury about it now to see where we can co-operate with the federal authorities in doing some of the things the hon. member mentioned.

Second, we also outlined the new Ontario development corporation which is going to provide funds for equipment and bricks and mortar to help diversify industry out of the Golden Horseshoe into areas where they cannot now get mortgage money to put up these manufacturing facilities. I think one of the moves that we have made in this new corporation that we are forming is to do just the things that the hon. member is talking about. We have had a number of people from areas such as his own coming in and saying: We have somebody in here who wants to start a plant, but we cannot get anybody to put in the bricks and mortar; or the finance companies will not finance the equipment that far away from the corner of King and Yonge.

I think we have answered that problem and I hope that there will be many others that we can contribute to in this coming year as we get a little more experience with this corporation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to a different aspect of the problem that the hon. Minister discussed briefly a few minutes ago with the hon. member for Brant. In doing so I wish to raise again the question of the Canada-United States automobile trade pacts. I realize that those pacts were referred to very briefly earlier in the discussion of this vote. However, there are further aspects that I think are worthy of some consideration; the discussion at a previous time was quite brief.

I would like to say first of all that in principle I am in favour of arrangements of that kind. I am quite satisfied that we will not continue to compete successfully in this country unless we can get into various types of continental trading arrangements. So I am not criticizing the principle of the pacts at all. And I am not necessarily criticizing the details, I am merely suggesting that we should, in a matter of this kind, take a good, close look at what is happening to us at each stage along the way.

I am not, even now, making any dogmatic statements. I just wish to call the attention of the House and of the hon. Minister to certain facts.

First of all, we now have available—and it is quite recently that they have become available—the latest trade figures from DBS; and using those trade figures, I want to compare our position in 1964 and 1965. As far as exports are concerned our position appears to have improved. It appears at first sight, shall I say, to have improved.

As between 1964 and 1965 our exports of automobile parts went up by $77.5 million; our exports of cars and trucks went up by $99.1 million. However—and this is where the squeeze comes, Mr. Chairman—our imports of parts went up by $276.7 as between 1964 and 1965, or by $199 million more than our exports of parts went up; and our imports of cars and trucks went up by $131 million, or $31.9 million more than our exports of cars and trucks.

Thus it is true that our exports went up, but let us bear in mind that there was a buoyant market in 1965. Production was expanding everywhere but the trend is obviously against us at this moment. In our

net position we were worse off by about $230 million, and as far as I can see this is largely as a result of the automobile trade pacts. If we start to run into a tighter market situation—and there are some indications already that we may indeed be approaching that situation—I think we could find ourselves rather badly squeezed.

The fact of the matter is that our parts industry is taking a trimming and it may be wiped out completely—well that is probably going a little too far, but it is certainly being very adversely affected.

The hon. Minister suggested in a previous discussion of this point that these fellows have to learn to compete and that if in this continental market they cannot meet the price of their competitors they can expect to go down the drain. I suppose that is the way it goes, but I am not so sure that we should view the situation with equanimity.

It may be that we need rationalization—in fact, I have no doubt that rationalization of our parts industry is desirable. There are probably some inefficient competitors and it would be better for the country in the long run if they either became more efficient or went into other lines of endeavour, but I do not think that we should witness what appears to be a serious threat to the entire industry without being prepared to take some active steps on the other side.

I think it is necessary for the government to take leadership in some of the rationalizations and reorganizations of industry that will become more and more common as we develop larger and larger markets.

The economic council, we were told the other day, is now making a study of some of the dislocations arising out of the automobile trade pacts. This is all to the good. It will stand us in good stead if we make other arrangements of this kind. But the rapid and major adjustments that become necessary as a result both of technological change and of reorganization and integration of markets, simply cannot be left to the good old laissez-faire method of letting those who are not strong sink—every man for himself and let the devil take the hindmost. You just cannot carry on that way. It will not benefit our country and it will certainly cause great suffering to large numbers of people. I suggest that we are faced with a situation as a result of these pacts which is far from entirely favourable from our point of view. I think that government, both at this level and at the federal level, should be giving the whole situation much closer attention than they have up till now.

I know that the hon. Minister's view is—and I respect his opinions—that in the long run it will all work out, that the United States companies are at this very moment engaged in substantial investment in Canada. They are overhauling their plants to take advantage of the opportunities that are now provided under the trade pacts. That may be true—I have no doubt that it is true to an extent—but I am wondering to what extent it is true. How much compensation are we going to get? How much benefit are we going to get out of these pacts?

As time progresses, I am wondering who is getting the benefit. Obviously the automobile companies are getting a substantial benefit and I am wondering if anybody else is getting any benefit.

Let us just take the various items.

Take the consumer. One of the arguments that was presented to us when the pacts were under negotiations and up for approval was that the Canadian consumer would benefit from these pacts because it would make possible lower prices. That is logical, that seemed reasonable and people accepted it. But in fact the Canadian consumer has not enjoyed any significant price advantage at all up until now.

Admittedly during the last federal election campaign, which was not too long ago, this matter became a political issue and the automobile companies, no doubt in order to accommodate their friends of the federal Liberal Party, made nominal decreases in prices, and I emphasize the word nominal. They were of very little consequence.

They tried to sell us the bill of goods simultaneously that the decreases in prices were much more significant than appeared on the surface because they were also including safety packages that had previously been extras. Well, I will not go into the details now, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter where there could be considerable dispute, but actually I think most of us would have to recognize that they grossly inflated their valuations of those safety packages. It is true they added some safety features which had previously been extras, but they were far from enough to explain the margin that still existed between the prices they were charging to the Canadian consumer and the prices on the U.S. market. So up until this time, I think it is fair to say that the Canadian consumer has benefited very little in terms of decreased prices; a little bit, but not very much.

Then, there is the Canadian worker. Up until now he has not received any benefit either. He is still paid, sir, at a substantial

discount in relation to his fellow worker in comparable employment in the United States. I have no doubt that the automobile workers union, which is a strong, progressive and socially minded union, will try to do something, not only to look after its own members who are employed in this industry but also to look after the consumer. In fact, the only organization I know that has shown real interest in the welfare of the Canadian consumer in this situation, is the united automobile workers union. The Canadian government has shown extremely little interest in it. Only when it became a political issue did they make some representations to the automobile companies to give some nominal concessions to the consumer, but they have taken no really effective steps to see that Canadian consumers and Canadian workers, in some combination or other, get substantial benefits out of these pacts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that our economy is not getting any benefit, either. We were talking a little while ago about balance of payments. I am not going to go into that question, but if we are thinking about balance of payments, we can say that as the result of the automobile trade pact our balance of payment situation in 1965 was $230 million worse than it was in 1964. I will agree with the hon. Minister that one does not look at individual situations in isolation, but I still say that is a rather dangerous-looking trend. I do not think it is good enough to say that this will all come out in the wash, that in the long run we will all benefit. I think that in terms of the automobile trade pacts, it is time that the Canadians were getting something other than promises. We have got a lot of promises about the benefits we are going to get, but the only performance has been for the benefit of the big three, mainly, of the automobile manufacturing fraternity.

I would like us, for once, to get some of the benefits and then to have some of the promises as to the good things of the future. I think it is time that our governments, both federal and provincial, took a look at this situation, sat down with the automobile manufacturers and really talked turkey to them about the situation in which Canada is finding itself under the agreements as they have worked out up until this point.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Charman, commenting on the hon. member for Woodbine's remarks with reference to the difference in the balance of trade, I agree with him that the figures are correct from DBS. I just point out that the pact was made in January, 1965, and it was not felt that orders for cars would be placed until some time in the 1967 run. The car parts companies right now are facing the fact of whether they are going to enlarge their facilities, and also whether they are going to meet American competition and go across the border and try to get their orders. This is the year, I think, of decision in the automobile and the parts business. Many of these things perhaps had tended to lower exports, or keep exports below the figure we had anticipated, due to the starting up of many of these plants over the year. If we are going to have continental competition, I think this is the year we are going to meet it, in order to get the orders for 1967 automobiles.

I would point out the heavy investment by GM, Goodyear, Ford, Eaton Axle and Budd; all these people are just putting their plants up right now. Their contribution to the export position will show an entirely different picture when those plants get into operation. I am quite convinced that when Ford gets its plant running in 1968, down in Talbotville, most of these cars, as I understand it, will be for export.

The deadline set by the federal government and the automobile companies is sometime in 1968. They get their automobile parts and automobile sales up to $268 million over a basic period, so that we are working towards that end right now. I think we can argue about export figures until we are blue in the face, but I do not think we are going to be able to actually say we have met competition until these plants are operating and we have gone over and sold on a continental basis.

But in the overall, I think we are doing a pretty good job of producing automobiles here. The automobile business here has not slowed down like it has in the United States. I certainly hope that it will not, but I think our workers here are working pretty consistently in the automobile industry. We have already discussed parity in wages. I simply say that, when the investments are in, this is the result we are all working towards. This is what I am sure the automobile companies are working towards in putting in their new plants and equipment. If there is going to be parity, they have to get parity in production and parity per car per hour. This, I am sure, will come about.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago there was some discussion about the fact that Massey-Ferguson had left Woodstock and gone to the United States. I wanted to ask the hon. Minister, in his discussion with the Massey-Ferguson officials

before they left to go to Des Moines or wherever it was, if there was any suggestion that the extra taxes it costs corporations to operate in the province of Ontario might be some reason why they would leave. Because where Massey-Ferguson went to, the corporation tax is only 48 per cent, whereas in the province of Ontario it is 52—a substantial difference, I am sure the Minister will agree.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we had no discussion on the corporate tax structure, but I think you will recognize that that difference of four per cent is an interim situation, if I read in the papers rightly, coming out of Washington. There is a move now to put the taxes back on again. I do not think any company would make that decision based on an interim tax adjustment.

Mr. Whicher: There was no suggestion, at the time when Massey-Ferguson left, that it was an interim situation. As a matter of fact, taxes can very well go up in the province of Ontario. They are going up every year. I would suggest that the 52 per cent corporation tax is interim, as far as the province is concerned, and that in the future it could very well be higher. The fact is that here we have a four per cent differential. The hon. Minister is a businessman himself. He knows that this is a substantial amount. This amounts to millions of dollars, when it comes to large corporations. To Massey-Ferguson, which may be doing $3 million or $4 million business a day each day of every year, this is a great amount of money.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think in relation to that, too, we have a 7.5 per cent difference on the dollar, which is in our favour. And as the hon. member for Woodbine just said, we have a much lower labour rate, so I think the advantages Massey-Ferguson were looking for were not made on the four per cent difference.

Mr. Whicher: Of course, I must agree with what the Minister says, but that is only part of the story. The other part is that it costs a lot of money to send them by freight from Woodstock down to the United States where they are sold.

But one basic cost is taxes. In the province of Ontario it is 52 per cent, and in Iowa it is 48 per cent; you cannot get away from it, whether it is American or Canadian dollars or whether it is low or high labour. The fact is it is 52 per cent here and down there it is 48 per cent. If I were a businessman, I would be thinking about it.

Mr. Sopha: If the member for York South had his way, it would be 55 per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, you are being mean, and personal!

Mr. Sopha: No, I could not possibly equate that quality in the way you—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion regarding location of industry. I think the hon. member for Bruce and the hon. member for Grey North have raised the question of this dilemma on at least two occasions during this department's estimates. As the hon. member for Grey North just mentioned, how far can the government go? How far can the government dictate where industry in the province is going? Certainly many of the industrial commissioners and business development commissioners in this Golden Horseshoe area are not going to agree; you cannot convince them that the government should subsidize an industry to locate in a certain area of the province. They are highly organized. They have probably been organized and established longer than most industrial commissions or regional development associations. They have a very efficient staff and they are very competitive.

As a matter of fact, competition exists very keenly between commissions within their own counties. I think that if, for example, the provisions of this new regional development Act and new regional development councils are effective, we will have benevolent direction given to industry that wants to locate in the province. I think if there is enough co-operation between these various associations, the information garnered by various industries will be that they will realize the advantage of locating in areas which are now considered underdeveloped. This could include Bruce and Grey North, as well as various other areas in the northern and the eastern part of the province. But we cannot avoid the recognition that transportation facilities—and by transportation facilities I mean sea, air and rail—labour, skilled, unskilled, semi-skilled, and markets play a very important role in deciding where industry should locate.

I think there is a certain amount of responsibility on the part of the various municipalities in the province to in some way sell, as the hon. Minister has said on a number of occasions, the advantages of their particular areas. It may be that a certain type of industry would be much more successful in Grey North than, for example, in Halton. Certain towns in the Golden Horseshoe area

have a high residential assessment and therefore this could mean high taxes; such communities need a certain percentage of industrial assessment and naturally they are going after it in every way possible.

So, as I say, Mr. Chairman, it is hard to convince those industrial commissioners and their business development departments, that they should not compete on a very fair basis for whatever industry may be locating in their province.

Mr. Sopha: With the permission of my friend, the hon. member for York South, I would like—he has left his seat—but I would like to address a question to the Minister.

This department, of course, has not been reticent or shy in the six or seven years of its existence about trumpeting—and I think that is a suitable word—trumpeting its successes. It spent a good deal of public moneys on purchase of time in the media of communication to proclaim its achievements. Now, we are blessed by the fact to some extent that the present Minister is not quite so phrenetic as his predecessor, who took us through the era of the hippopotamus, but we managed to survive it. However, the atmosphere created by the department has not lessened to any significant degree.

I have been impressed somewhat sorrowfully, I say sincerely, about the succession of reverses that Ontario has experienced in either failing to attract large industries that might have settled here or in losing large industries that have preferred to go elsewhere. In my time, the earliest I recall is the decision of Atlas Steel to locate in Quebec because of the differential of hydro rates; and indeed, you could not possibly find a closer connection between the Minister and the company because I think the father-in-law of the previous Minister was one of the chief directors of that company, Atlas Steel. However, it went to Quebec. Domtar: we never did get a satisfactory explanation from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests about our failure to persuade Domtar to locate their plant in an area of very low economic development, that is to say, the district of Algoma. It went to Quebec.

Studebaker has recently announced that it is going to surcease the production of cars at its Hamilton plant. My friends, the hon. member for Bruce and the hon. member for Brant have both referred this afternoon to the loss of the Massey-Ferguson plant to the state of Iowa, and so it goes. As they say, in a very apposite phrase, I hope, a succession of reverses in the economic life of our province.

Now, can the Minister, co-extensive with and consistent with the large expenditure of public moneys that he makes in his department, and consistent with the proclamations of success that we hear, can the Minister inform us of any large industry in the past decade that has been persuaded to locate in Ontario? I hold the question out as something of a sort of challenge to him.

We were provided with a list of some 170 companies that have opened branch plants in Ontario, but they are all pretty small potatoes, they do not reflect economic activity that provides employment for large numbers of people. Rather, they are more illustrative of the phrase of branch plant economy that some people use in the economic world as a term of opprobrium. But I for one, mindful of the assertions of the hon. Prime Minister and some of the other members of the government that we are creating 90,000 jobs a year, a statistic for which they could not possibly have any proof, because DBS does not provide any statistics to substantiate, and we hear from Professor Macdonald at the public accounts committee, the statistics branch of this department is in the Stone Age. If that is not accurate enough, perhaps it is in the Bronze Age. But it is a very limited development.

This department has not the statistical proof, but we suffer from the fact to some extent in political affairs that Ministers of the Crown, who are otherwise honest, upright and churchgoing people every Sunday, I imagine, they go around the province prating these statistics that have just no foundation in fact, and have the equivalent validity of the Prime Minister's "done"; and he is otherwise an honest man. Somebody called him "Honest John" this afternoon; I thought that was reserved for the Baptist from Prince Albert.

But there is my complaint. Here is the place to provide information, so that at some future time we can go to the hustings or make a speech somewhere to some group; such as I was doing when I was away from the House and offended the hon. member for York South last week when one day I was speaking to a very important group, the Ontario convention for the blind, a very well-adjusted and happy group of people in spite of their affliction—they are not all Liberals, some of them are Conservatives. But we might be able to say that we challenged the hon. Minister of Economics and Development to tell us in the Legislature—if he does not want to take up the challenge it is all right with me, but I offer it—tell us of a large industry that through

the efforts of this department has been attracted to our shores. I have mentioned three or four that have been attracted elsewhere and, indeed, have gone elsewhere.

The one that was of particular disappointment to me was the Domtar's decision to locate in Abitibi county in Quebec rather than locate in northern Ontario where employment is very much needed by large numbers of people. The time has come, I think, for this hon. Minister, if he chooses to do so—if he does not want to enter the fray I suppose that is all right, it is a free country—the time has come for him to get up and tell us about some large industry, and please do not get up and tell us about the auto parts industry, because that was attracted here, I should venture to say, solely through the offices of the federal government which entered into negotiations with the government of the United States. I think the whole thing came to realization at a certain meeting between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States held on the ranch of the President in Texas, where the final deal was sealed. And we hear that at that same meeting the President took the opportunity to give our Prime Minister the very devil about some of our attitudes in international affairs, but that was all by and by, so I am just removing that one from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I would like to hear about some other large industry that has been established here in the last ten years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I am sure the hon. member can certainly pose the questions but I know he would not have the answers, and I do not have the answer to that one. But I would be glad to get a list of them and let him have them. I would just like to suggest this. There is not a period in the last 50 years of this province's history, that there has been a greater concentration of manufacturing investment and output in this province than there has been in 1964, 1965 and 1966. All one has to do is look at DBS and break it down for the province of Ontario.

Manufacturing investment has increased by 108 per cent between 1963 and 1965; and no matter how you try to write it off you cannot, the industry is here. Now, do you want to take all of industry or do you want to take the DBS figures?

I think industries listed in DBS were something like 738 for Quebec, 875 for Ontario. But this includes dogpounds, fish and chip stores, everybody you want to name. All we have taken here are the industries that, as we say in the report, employ X number of people providing X amount of floor space. Now, I would be very happy to dig up the facts that the member asked for and let him know how many industries came in here.

We had one here, Dominion Textiles, which just went into Cornwall; Dupont in Kingston; Aluminum Company a few years ago in Kingston. Throughout this entire province there have been a number of industries brought here through our efforts.

Now, you talk about the car parts business. Our department has been working with the Budd Manufacturing Company for the past eight years and Budd would only come in here when it was economically sound for them to come in.

But talk to Budd yourself. We helped Budd get located in this area.

I would be very happy to supply you with a list of the companies that you refer to, the larger companies that came in here. We are not just putting in fish and chip stores, I can assure you. The facts and figures we published every year are authentic if you want to go back and check them out.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister if he is satisfied with the areas of locating of industry across the province. It was pointed out by one of the members of the Opposition last week that of the new establishments, some seven of the 160-odd had located in northern Ontario; and of the plant extension, an equally infinitesimal percentage, I think something like two per cent, had located in northern Ontario.

I am not making a value judgment of it. I am at this point asking the Minister what he thinks of the locating of industry and the extension of new plants of present industry and what he feels that the future will hold for location in northern Ontario and outlying areas.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the answer is obvious. Maybe I could read these figures to you.

In eastern Ontario, out of the 178 we talked about last year, 12. The breakdown runs: northwestern Ontario, four; Georgian bay, 16; Lake Ontario, five; northeastern Ontario, four; midwestern Ontario, 17; Niagara, 28; Lake Erie, eight; Lake St. Clair, 29; Metropolitan Toronto, which is 100 miles within the base of King and Yonge streets, 55.

So only 30 per cent of industry is located in the Metro area. We are achieving a diversive location of industry and industry is being decentralized. I think I read these

same figures last year, I think the percentage last year was about the same. When we come to new industries they were not all locating in the Metro area, they were spread throughout the province of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Could the Minister give the percentage in terms of the amount of capital invested rather than just the number of plants located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I would be glad to.

For instance, in eastern Ontario, the average square footage per plant was 440,380 square feet; number employed: 1,033; and investment was $18,230,000. That was in 1964.

In 1965, it was 641,600 square feet; 1,023 employed; and an investment of $17,603,000.

In northwestern Ontario, the square footage was 21,500; the investment and machinery in plant was $535,000. This year it is 79,000 square feet and the investment is $8,100,000.

In Georgian bay area, it was 145,450 square feet last year, for $1,979,000 plant machinery. This year 740,700 square feet; 1,460 employed; for an investment of $8,333,000.

The Lake Ontario development area was 64,500 square feet last year; 149 employees; $536,000 investment. This year it is 137,000 square feet; 455 employees; $4,310,000 in investment.

Northeastern Ontario development association reports 308,500 in plant square feet; 440 employees; $30,107,000 in plant investment this year. That is a mistake, $30 million is not right. This year, 23,000 square feet; 27 employees; and $1,077,000.

Northwestern Ontario development reports 455,300 square feet; 616 employees; $5,571,000 investment. In 1965 the square footage was 1,200,000; 1,735 employees; $28,708,000 in investments.

Niagara Falls region, the square footage was 1,032,204; employees were 1,778; and investment $7,433,000. The square footage this year is 686,700; employees, 756; with $18 million in investments.

Lake Erie is 78,400 square footage; 174 employees; $905,000 investment. This year it is 320,400 square feet; 501 employees; $4,850,000 investment.

St. Clair region is 477,900 in plant square feet; 568 employees; $5,011,000 in investments. This year it is 1,000,437 square feet; 3,028 employees; and $91,785,000 investment.

The final one is in Metro. There were 2,635,375 square feet in 1964; 3,595 employees; total investment of $28,418,000. This year it is 2,758,900 square feet; 7,457 employees; and $20,372,000 in investments.

I think this gives some idea of the amount of jobs created and the investment in various parts of the province. Again, as we pointed out the other day, I think these figures should be published in that industrial book which I think the hon. member for Woodbine suggested would be a good idea.

Mr. Bryden: When you publish them, would you also show percentages of the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. I have the percentages over here—

Mr. Bryden: I do not want to take the Minister through the whole table, but can he give the percentages under the three categories for Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have them under the third column here; I just did not want to take up the time of the House.

Mr. Bryden: Would the hon. Minister give them in the three categories for just Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Metropolitan Toronto. The first was the amount of square footage and this is plus five per cent over last year; and the employees were 107 per cent more; and the investment was minus 28 per cent over 1964.

Mr. Bryden: What is Toronto's percentage of the total investment for 1965?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The total for 1965 in investment and plant was 106 per cent.

Mr. Bryden: I do not think that the hon. Minister follows me; what is Toronto's proportion of the total?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have it broken down for Toronto; I will be glad to get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to comment.

I paid careful attention to the statistics read out by the hon. Minister. In respect of investment in the pulp and paper industry, the forest products industry, and particularly in northwestern Ontario, the amounts he referred to—$8 million or $10 million in respect of some of them—they are peanuts, to descend to the vernacular.

Now, that remark of mine may have some

aspects of unfairness about it, to downgrade what has been done in stimulus toward investment in the forest products industry, were it not for the fact that a senior official of his own department, last year, took to the banquet circuit. I sometimes wonder about civil servants making remarks on the banquet circuit. I forget the individual's name, but I could easily get it. He made a speech in which he referred to investment in the forest products industry in other provinces of Canada. He said that these other provinces, where there is tremendous investment in the forest products industry, I say to my good friend, the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs, they were at a point of danger of overproducing themselves in the market, leading to a slip in prices and the consequent disaster that would be correlated with that. A very patronizing remark when one remembers that in the province of British Columbia, the investment in the past few years in the forest products industry, has been $2 billion.

The hon. Minister gets up and talks about $8 or $10 million, and the expansion of plants in the forest industry of northwestern Ontario. There has not—and until corrected, I will stand my ground—been the establishment of a new pulp and paper mill in this province in the past 15 years. We have not had a new one established, and yet Noranda Mines, which is a home-grown company incorporated under an Ontario charter with the head office in the city of Toronto, and with a large accumulation of cash, goes out to British Columbia, bought a pulp mill and got into the pulp and paper industry, an attractive avenue of investment. Be it noted, Noranda Mines does not establish a pulp and paper mill in Ontario; they go out beyond the mountains for reasons of economic attraction which apparently we do not have in Ontario.

The hon. member for Bruce suggests different taxes. I am not one of those who are against taxes, because we get a lot for them in this province. But when one considers $2 billion of investment in the forest products industry – the industry, I think it is safe to say, that employs more Canadians than any other single industry—we have $2 billion in British Columbia and this hon. Minister gets up and talks in terms of peanuts!

What is the sequel to it all? The sequel to it all, having observed it all my life, is that we have groups up in northern and northwestern Ontario that are forever holding meetings about the lack of industrial development in their areas, the chronic, eternal, continuous plague to their development. They form regional industrial development associations at the stimulus of this government; they hold meetings and they present briefs to the government, but all their efforts and all their talk never achieved any fruition or crystallization in the establishment of any significant industries.

I say to the hon. Minister: What is wrong with this province and its forest industry? We have—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): I cannot see anything wrong with it at all.

Mr. Sopha: That is his outlook. He is a very buoyant, optimistic, sanguine individual, self-satisfied, smug and complacent. Overfed, I might also say.

As I was saying, what is wrong with Ontario? We have immense resources of forests in the northern regions of our province. We have all the raw material we could hope to use, even with the most pronounced and vigorous development of our forest industry. Why can we not therefore attract some of this investment in it? Why is it that Ontario alone, of the provinces with great natural resources in forest, has been unable to attract a new pulp mill to this province in the past decade and a half?

You know, Mr. Chairman, when a pulp mill is located and established, it means employment for something above 1,000 men; perhaps 2,000 or 2,500 men. I do not downgrade for one moment the expansion of such companies as KVP. That is not the exact name because it was changed last week, but hon. members will know the company that I refer to. It was announced that they were going to engage in a $20 million expansion of their industry. But notwithstanding that, we have not been able to locate a new one; we have not developed a new community. When a pulp mill locates, that means that a new community will be established, a new municipal unit. That would have been the case had Domtar selected the district of Algoma instead of Abitibi county—that would have meant the development of a new community. It is the type of thing that we need in northern Ontario, the type of thing that has significance. We produce pulp, paper and paper products as they do at Espanola, as they do with newsprint at Kapuskasing and Smooth Rock Falls, for shipment abroad. We are producing the finished product. It goes into the market with the labour content that we have put into it reflected in the employment of our people. Quite unlike the mining

industry, where the raw materials are sent outside our borders for fabrication, it is entirely different. That is what gives one enthusiasm about development of our forest products.

So the House deserves an addendum, the hon. Minister having gotten up and talked about $8 million that was spent in northwestern Ontario. I caught one of those statistics—somebody is expanding $8 million and perhaps the House is entitled to an explanation as to why it is that British Columbia can attract $2 billion. That amount is to be invested in the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Is that in one year?

Mr. Sopha: No, that is not in one year. That is spread over a number of years; I think it was five. I have not got the clipping, but it is in *Hansard*; I think that over five years, $2 billion was to be spent in British Columbia. Some of this is Japanese money, interestingly enough; Japanese capital coming in from Japan into the pulp and paper industry. They have that. We have the hollow words of the senior civil servant of the banquet circuit, the left-lettuce circuit, who makes the after-dinner speech. He says: They are going to price themselves out of the market if they keep up this expansion. His quotations are in *Hansard* last year, and can be found. They were read into the record at that time.

It is pretty hard to digest, I would say to the hon. Minister. It is small solace, instead of having $2 billion of investment in the province, to have the cries of alarm of a senior civil servant in this hon. Minister's department. Perhaps while the hon. Minister is at it, if he cares to say anything, he will tell us about Noranda Mines, the home-grown company. Why did they choose British Columbia for the investment of their capital?

You know, it is quite remarkable. Quite remarkable to see how the mining companies are going out of the mining business in the province. I forget what it was Noranda Mines bought last week. They bought another company somewhere; I think it was an American company they bought, entirely unrelated to mining. The money does not go into exploration, or the finding of new mines in this province.

Consolidated Denison bought a bread company, and then they bought a cement company. One hoped they did not mix the bread with the cement.

Rio Algom bought Atlas Steel. Gunnar bought McNamara Construction Company. One has to have considerable dismay about the future of the mining industry in this province, to see these companies taking their large accumulations of profit and using them in other industries, entirely unrelated to the one in which they made their money.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes, Mr. Chairman. We commend the Minister for wooing American concerns to settle in the province of Ontario, but we also have to look upon the concerns that are in Ontario, and I think that we should do everything possible to see that they stay in business, and not transfer operations across the border.

I bring this up with the tool and die industry and the mould-making industry. Most of the employment in this industry is centred on U.S. products. Now unless there is some better arrangement between industry and The Department of Labour itself you may find that some of the tool, die and mould makers may be forced to transfer their operations across the border. They find it most difficult at times to get sufficient hours of work for their employees. They are limited by the 100-hour per year statute, or regulation, of The Department of Labour.

I know I have had representations by the tool and die industry, as the hon. Minister knows, in my own community. They are quite concerned and several of them have told me that they would be better off to transfer operations over to Detroit or some part of the U.S. After all, 95 per cent of their business is across the border. So I certainly hope that the hon. Minister does everything he possibly can to see that we not only bring in industry, but that we keep the industry that we have at present in Ontario, working on U.S. business.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I should like just to clarify two figures the hon. Minister gave—I am sorry to be pressing him on this—if for Metropolitan Toronto, the total investment in 1964, and the total investment in 1965, if he could just take a moment.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is more than the city. I did not say city of Toronto, I said the Metro region.

Mr. S. Lewis: Metropolitan—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The Metro region, which is about a 100-mile region, the total investment in plant and equipment in 1964 was $28,418,000, and provided employment for 3,595 people. The total investment in 1965, was $20,732,000 and provided employment for 7,457 people.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister. In looking through his reports, I had noted that his department reports something like 500 trade missions around the world. It struck me with some significance.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sorry. Not 500 trade missions. Five hundred Canadians have been on trade missions since 1963.

Mr. Thompson: Five hundred Canadians. Thank you. It struck me that there were two areas that it did not seem you had been to; had trade missions. Now I know you have been into China. Am I correct on that? But I have wondered if you have also been into any of the eastern European countries; I am thinking of Iron Curtain countries.

May I just add that behind my question is a further question, whether because of the number of American subsidiaries here, and knowing some of their country's policy about trading, with certain other countries, whether you may feel that Ontario therefore should perhaps not try too hard in this particular field?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, as a matter of fact, we have a trade mission leaving on September 7, which should be in Switzerland at a nuclear affair until the 15th and then it goes into eastern Europe. I think that the countries are Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and over to Norway and Denmark and back again.

I am hoping, sir, that before the end of the year again, we will have another one into other areas in eastern Europe, which we wanted to get into last year, but in view of the lateness of the sitting of the House, we could not set it up.

There is no reason why we should not go into these areas and promote trade. The Americans are in most of them. There are only two areas in the world that I know of where the Americans are not promoting trade, and one is Communist China and the other is in Cuba. As far as we are concerned, we are doing business in both of those countries, in nonstrategic materials, which is what I think we should be doing.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, assuming that one of the American subsidiaries was in Canada, that you had developed a market for that subsidiary in Red China, and the subsidiary decided because the parent company policy was that it should not trade with China, that it could not, what action would you take?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I would have to face it when we came to it. We have not had that situation yet.

Mr. Thompson: A second question. Does the hon. Minister think that large private subsidiaries in Canada, such as General Motors, should make public annual reports?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think in the Attorney General's new legislation that he is putting forward, much of that will be answered. I think it would be good public relations for all companies to be able to make a statement on their Canadian operations, including General Motors, and I believe in the legislation that is going through the House right now, much of that will be called for.

Mr. Thompson: It will include subsidiaries, will it? As I understand it, that has been left off.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think this is one of the things that the hon. Attorney General is considering right now.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 406 carried?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take much time on this, but I do not want the vote to go through without making a couple of observations about the hon. Minister's famous speech to the Empire club, because I would feel conscience-stricken if I did, and morally remiss, and I am sure he expected me to say something, however.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member for Scarborough West feel that the speech to the Empire club has anything to do with vote 406?

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, yes, it is directly on the vote.

Mr. Chairman: It really does not come under this vote. I know the Minister answered a question in connection with it, but it really has no relevance with this. I make no attempt to curtail discussion on it, but I think the member should realize that we are dealing now with vote 406, on trade and industry, and really the Empire club speech has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, and I put it to you frankly, sir, this was the first major policy statement by this government on the question of foreign aid and it was classed as such by the hon. Minister when he gave it, and there is no conceivable place in these estimates more appropriate than the trade and

industry branch, and the foreign missions, and the effort to sponsor foreign trade and investment, to discuss this matter. And I would remind you, Mr. Chairman, just while you are thinking about it, that one of the quotes the Minister gave in his famous rebuttal to his critic, was this sentence—I think it is a very exemplary sentence—but I want to read it to the House:

> With our stake in foreign aid, Ontario, I am sure, like other provinces, must never become so parochial that we consider foreign aid as the prerogative of the federal government only, it is a responsibility that all provinces and their governments must recognize and share the same concern for its success or failure with the federal authorities.

Now, it seems to me that the Minister himself has dropped the issue foursquare within the provincial responsibility. He made a speech to the Empire club, it was a policy statement, I can understand him making it there. Indeed, it was an Easter message, Mr. Chairman. It was time, as he said, to reflect on life's overall purpose and mankind's goals. I cannot think that any other topic could be more worthy of discussion in this House than life's overall purpose, mankind's goals and a theme in which our fellow man is dominant, to quote him. So I have frankly held off, Mr. Chairman, and—

Mr. Chairman: Well, I am sure the member for Scarborough West will agree that every time a Minister of the House makes a speech outside the House, it does not automatically come for discussion under an estimate. I suggest to the member that it really does not come under 406 and I am going to ask him, if he will, to make his point and make it briefly, if he will, in connection with the vote. It really does not come under 406.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I will make the point, I will not challenge the chair; one small remark, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, I believe, did go to China, to Ghana, to Nigeria, to several of the Latin American countries and he himself travelled as a Minister to promote foreign trade. I do believe, Mr. Chairman, it bears therefore directly on this vote; I cannot imagine that it would be otherwise.

Mr. Sopha: Did he have permission from the hon. member for York South to be away?

An hon. member: I doubt it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I wanted to say if I could that I really have very great respect for this Minister, Mr. Chairman, that is why I am prompted to make these remarks, and indeed for the way he conducts his department and the way he has conducted these estimates. It is in many respects a pleasure, and the opportunity to develop an exchange across the House that has characterized the last few days is to some of us a very great pleasure indeed. I therefore want to make a special point of suggesting to him that his venture into the field of international trade, international foreign trade, was perhaps somewhat of a calamity in the context of the other rather more, I think, intelligent and thoughtful statements he has made.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, because it bears directly on Ontario's future with these countries, that it showed an essentially superficial knowledge of the problems of international relations and the needs of these foreign countries and that in the long run it could be deleterious to Canadian interests and Ontario interests which seem to me to be one of the prime motivations of this Minister in the process of making his speech. Now, I have only three or four comments, Mr. Chairman, that I want to make but I think they are important in this province's development of trade with underdeveloped nations.

First, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's speech was preoccupied with self-interest and I cannot imagine a more unfortunate premise from which to begin a discussion of foreign aid. It reflected all the while, patronizing condescensions which have characterized the western world in particular comments on this kind of field for the last several decades. And that is very worrisome in the middle of the 20th century. The hon. Minister constantly talked—I am quoting from his speech—about "people who tomorrow will become consumers" and cast what was supposed to be a foreign aid exercise in the cloak of an effort to enhance Canadian manufacturing and to enhance Canadian industry and to try to invoke some benefit for ourselves or a primary benefit for ourselves and very much what would be a secondary benefit for the country to whom the aid was extended. And the speech was full of tantalizing contradictions which demonstrated that.

One of them I want to draw to the Minister's attention, was in his windup, he said:

> We can visit and work in these countries without their citizens having any suspicion of ulterior motives, they know we are not there for anything but business.

Well, that is a regrettable thing, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I appreciate that the hon.

Minister might not himself interpret that as an ulterior motive but earlier in his speech he made a point of saying—and again I will quote it—"Of course, there is an ulterior motive behind my proposition, call it enlightened self-interest if you will."

Now, when he began he had an ulterior motive, when he ended he did not have an ulterior motive, but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the ulterior motive was there for everyone to see and to hear and nothing could be more damaging to concepts of foreign trade at this stage of the 1960's than that kind of blatant self-interest, because that is precisely the pattern of neocolonial mentality in economic affairs which all the underdeveloped nations are rejecting and for which they have no use whatsoever. And it cannot, I suggest to you, have other than harm over the long run.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, which I wanted to reflect on in terms of the Minister's speech, because again it affects our trade pattern, was that a great many easy and facile statements were made about the nature of these other societies and their governments. The hon. Minister says:

> Their political philosophy most of the time is based on expediency. We should serve the people rather than create police states. Separate the political despots from patriotic men who want to pay their way.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that kind of unsupported value judgment about governments in other societies simply does not bear repetition by the Minister on future occasions, I suggest, because it is an affront, it is a serious affront to all kinds of underdeveloped countries, to be characterized in that facile manner. I suggest to you that while a case can be made about one party states in emergent countries, to characterize them with a sweeping wave of the hand as police states and political despots and building monuments with colossal stupidity and running off with millions of pounds or millions of dollars, to do it in a sweeping and undocumented way, is, I suggest to you, sir, a very great mistake in the present context of foreign aid. I simply hope that none of the emergent countries of Asia or Africa or, for that matter, Latin America, find the Minister's speech in their hands because they would be most affected by it.

In his reply to the critic, Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentions some of the people he was talking about. He mentions Farouk, Peron, Jiminez, Nkrumah and Batista. Well, leaving Nkrumah out for a moment, Mr. Chairman, because I think that is a separate area, I want to say that I could not agree more with the Minister that the other men he mentioned are political despots or were political despots before they were deposed, but I want to quietly point out to him in this House that their regimes were underpinned by precisely the kind of foreign policy which he is advocating this government now adopt. Their regimes were not underpinned by government to government aid or aid through the world bank, or through the technical assistance programme, or through the international monetary fund; their regimes were underpinned by private corporations exploiting and destroying the entire society in the process of extracting raw materials. And that is precisely the policy the hon. Minister then went on to advocate.

I suggest to you, sir, that the Minister might also have included Liberia, the Minister might also have included Venezuela. The Minister in his pattern of despots, which is incidentally not always those of other members of the House, but in his delineating of despots in this world, chose the people who were dependent not on foreign aid as Canada has given it, but on foreign aid as private corporations have given it, particularly American corporations, for the process of devastating entire societies. And it was very sad, therefore, to find that he then goes on to advocate precisely that kind of policy for this province and for this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to go on to that policy just for a moment. What the Minister said, in short, was that 50 per cent of the money we are presently investing should go to Canadian businessmen for the purpose of their investing in other society, setting up manufacturing industry, for a profit, it should be pointed out. The hon. Minister was very, very high on profit when he enumerated the benefits, he enumerated a profit on our goods, services or labour or a management fee as the prime contractor, or other things. So that the hon. Minister was full of self-interest, he was interested in a profit, and what he wants to do is to give 50 per cent of the present money to the Canadian businessman for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that that would be a catastrophe, an absolute and total catastrophe. First, because the money that we are now giving is so picayune in total world needs that it should not in any sense be halved in that way, and secondly because aid on that basis in the long run might well do harm. I say might, I am not prepared to be categorical about it, because there may be some cases of enlightenment where there

would be benefit through the receiving economy, but all the experience of the past with very few exceptions suggest that the private business mercantilism, the freebooters of the modern 20th-century economy, have very very little interest in genuine contribution to emergent countries. They have a very great interest in extracting every possible dollar of profit and every possible ration of ore.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister was exceedingly harsh on what he would do to these countries if they dared to default, and it shows a mentality so perverse, so perverse in aspects in foreign trade that I want to put it on the record of this House. The hon. Minister said, "Should the country," that is the receiving country, "default any one year owing to political or economic change, then the foreign aid dollars originally designated are utilized to meet the defaulting country's obligation" and he went on to say, again:

> Should a country default this immediately serves notice on all suppliers and creditors that adverse political or economic change is taking place, and until the delinquent country has corrected its position—

Just listen to the wording, Mr. Chairman:

> until the delinquent country has corrected its position, few countries, if any, would extend further credit. Today, many developing countries jump from one foreign aid programme to another by running up whichever flag will lure the prize. The end result is a financial sinkhole with no bottom.

Mr. Chairman, that is just too crude.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say you are pretty naive. I would just suggest to you, my friend, that I have never sold a nickel's worth of merchandise that I did not figure I was giving a benefit to the buyer, and I say the same thing in these foreign countries. When Mr. Nkrumah can walk out with $127 million of generated funds from that economy, somebody else has to put it back in again. I am simply suggesting, as I did the other day, I will send you the rebuttal to the—

Mr. S. Lewis: I have the rebuttal.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would like to give you the complete thing and I would like to sit down with you sometime and explain the difference between your philosophy and mine. Certainly as far as I am concerned my philosophy means that we are going to do something for these people, not lead them down the garden path.

Mr. S. Lewis: Good, I am glad the hon. Minister jumped in. I am glad we are engaged, because I think this is the place, since he is entering the field for foreign aid, this is the place to discuss it.

That really is not the Minister's philosophy, that is the Minister's pretext. The Minister's philosophy is much more arbitrary than that.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, this being a special day of the week, and there being a function planned and arranged, I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, before we rise: Vote 406 has not carried?

Mr. Chairman: No, it is before us.

Mr. Sopha: That is on the record.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development and possibly The Department of Transport.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the House leader if there will be a night sitting tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, there will not.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.35 o'clock, p.m.

No. 118

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 25, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 25, 1966

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3809

Municipal Franchises Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3809

Local Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3809

Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3809

Confederation Centennial Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3810

Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 3810

Questions of Mr. Davis re central bargaining agency for school boards, Mr. Thompson 3810

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 3810

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3848

Erratum 3848

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, members of the women's Progressive-Conservative association, Elgin county; and in the east gallery, students from the following schools: Ridgeway and Crystal Beach high school, Ridgeway; the Rockford Road public school, Willowdale; and St. Joseph's separate school, Oshawa.

We have some other groups, which I will ask members to introduce to the House.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention some distinguished guests from abroad who are with us today.

I refer to the gentlemen in the Speaker's gallery, representing two teams travelling in Canada and the United States, participating in international water polo competition.

They comprise the Sutton and Cheam swimming club of Surrey, England, and the Spartak Motorlet club, Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce two of the fairer sex to you. We have in the west gallery the Dairy Princess of Simcoe county, Margaret Hambly. With Margaret is Mary McNeill, a junior farmer from Northern Ireland, who is visiting the province of Ontario. Mary is one of a group of nine on a three-month tour of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to clarify that the grants made under this Act with respect to hospitalization of indigents, which may be paid in any year following the year in which the municipality becomes eligible for such grants.

THE MUNICIPAL FRANCHISES ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the period for which the Ontario municipal board may approve a franchise from one year to three years.

THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to make it possible that schools which serve more than one municipality liable for local improvement assessment so that the cost of these local improvements will be fairly distributed over all the municipalities in which the school board has jurisdiction.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, in some cases, such as annexation matters, the board's determination of the matter is in the form of a decision. A subsection of this amendment is, therefore, an amendment to refer to a decision as well as to an order.

The second part of this amendment is to permit a municipality to obtain an approval for a lump sum for a particular class of

work, and then when the specific location of the particular work has been determined, to allocate out of such lump sum an appropriate amount for the particular work.

THE CONFEDERATION CENTENNIAL ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Confederation Centennial Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will extend participation in centennial grants to all councils of Indian bands, whether or not they operate under section 68 of The Indian Act of Canada.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides that where notice of the registration of a tax certificate is sent to a corporation, a copy of the notice shall be sent to the public trustee. This is to ensure that the tax sale does not purport to convey any interest in land that has been forfeited to the Crown.

The second part of this bill provides that if an improvement district is erected into a town, village or township the tax arrears procedure will continue to apply.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education.

Would the Minister advise if his department is giving consideration to the suggestion of Judge Walter Little of Parry Sound that Ontario school boards set up a central bargaining agency to negotiate similar schedules for teacher salaries and fringe benefits in different parts of the province?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, The Department of Education is not at the present time giving consideration to this suggestion.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask as a supplementary question whether the Minister thinks it enhances the prestige of the profession of teaching or makes it easier for the boards to be able to discern the qualities of teachers when you have something like a mass supermarket in the approach of hiring teachers?

Hon. Mr. Davies: Mr. Speaker, I would think that this question might more appropriately be discussed during the debates on The Department of Education estimates. To get into long discussions today whether it is appropriate or inappropriate, I do not think is the appropriate time to do it.

Mr. Thompson: Well, to be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, I would like to ask the question which I sent in. This is to the hon. Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: I have two questions here of a similar nature, yours and that of the member for Riverdale. I was wondering whether it would be more appropriate if you wait until the Minister is in his seat before they are asked. There has been some discussion of the point that Ministers would like to be present whenever a question is being asked of them. So with your agreement we will have both these questions asked whenever the Attorney General is in his seat.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question of the hon. Prime Minister several days ago with respect to the shortage of social workers. There are various authorities who have said that they need at least 200 a year and I wonder whether the government was considering giving a grant to Waterloo Lutheran college which had asked for a school of social work.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I believe that this question came up when I was not here. Frankly, I have not the full details of it, but I will try to have it by tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 19th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*continued*)

On vote 406:

Mr. Chairman: When we adjourned I believe that the member for Scarborough West was on his feet.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I did not even sit down in the interval.

When we were concluding yesterday, in the latter few minutes of the afternoon, I was making some observations on the trade and industry branch relative to foreign aid to emergent countries as indicated in the hon. Minister's speech to the Empire club and on departmental and government policy generally. The basic premise was that I thought this to be somewhat of an aberration in the Minister's general approach. Seldom does he make a statement which is, I think, as potentially calamitous in its implications.

His intervention during the course of the discussion yesterday, Mr. Chairman, reminded me somewhat of a latter-day Cecil Rhodes. I might say that it would not surprise me if, during the course of the afternoon, the hon. Minister quotes "Gunga Din" across the floor of the House to bring fully into focus the basic "white man's burden" philosophy which has been characteristic of the utterances of this department.

What worried me about the foreign aid programme as advocated by the hon. Minister—the Ontario aid programme—is that initially it is based on self-interest on our part. It is prompted by motivations of exploitation and by ulterior motives which are not really worthy in terms of exploiting emergent economies for our own profiteering interests.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize what seems to be his dominant theme, and that is to create consumers in underdeveloped countries for manufactured goods, rather than the far more important theme of closing the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations in order to create some kind of viable international economic framework.

The other things that worried me greatly, which I mentioned to the hon. Minister, was the sweeping and facile judgments on the nature of these political and economic societies; the suggestion that there were despots or that there were political tyrants sucking the soul from their own society for their own use, and all of this without, in any sense, discriminating intelligently between individuals and countries and some of the very real problems that exist.

The Minister jumped to his feet to say that the statements made on this side of the House were naive. Well, I want to suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, that they are not naive.

The result of his proposals would be damaging indeed, very, very damaging, to foreign trade and international relations.

I would challenge him on the floor of this House to show where Canadian aid—and which kind of Canadian aid—has gone to the purposes he described so extravagantly in his speeches. Where, in the government loans which we have given, has Canada subsidized dictatorships of the kind he described? Mr. Chairman, if he argues that American foreign policy and American economic aid-giving has verged on absurdity in this regard and the shoring up of dictatorial regimes, then I cannot quarrel with him. I think very few members of this House would quarrel with him because all too often—with the exception of the Marshall Plan—that has been true since the end of World War II.

But surely for Canada, the Colombo Plan aid; the aid to the federation of the West Indies; the aid to underdeveloped countries generally; and the contributions to the world bank and to the United Nations technical assistance programme have been salutary indeed for the projects for which they were designed. The only way in which they can be faulted is in the measure of the money given rather than in the nature and direction of the giving.

Mr. Chairman: I hesitate to interrupt the member, but I would remind him that we are not into the scope of foreign aid and international trade. I would ask him, if he will, to please stay with 406.

Mr. Lewis: I am—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): On a point of order, why is this not appropriate under this vote? This Minister of the Crown, who is now under review and answerable to this Legislature, made a very significant speech to the Empire club which caused a lot of comment in this country, and particularly editorial comment. This is now our opportunity to question him on the floor of the House about his remarks, and to ask the Minister to give us justification for making them as a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. Chairman: As the member for Sudbury knows, what we are dealing with now in the committee of supply is the question of estimates, and I would suggest that under the circumstances we should stay with the vote before us.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, may I just note the fact that in his speech referred to, the hon. Minister also announced or appeared to have announced a new departure in government policy in this field. Now, our interpretation is that that government policy is best discussed under this particular vote.

But it was more than just a speech; he definitely announced the government policy. I have forgotten the precise terminology that he used, but it was something to the effect that an Ontario development plan would be established in this area.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member for Scarborough West to continue and, if he will, to restrict his remarks to the vote, please.

Mr. S. Lewis: I shall try to remain within your limits, Mr. Chairman. I respect them, but I think the interventions made by the hon. members for Sudbury and Woodbine are relevant as, indeed, you might expect me to think.

I would say, again, that the proposal of the hon. Minister to turn over something like 50 per cent, or whatever, to private business for purposes of entrepreneural activity in the emergent countries, is both a mistake in the terms of the history of that kind of attitude which has tended to result in gross exploitation and profiteering in lives and in resources, and also in terms of what the hon. Minister himself would like to achieve.

As an example, Mr. Chairman, he stated in his speech and he then repeated it in his so-called reply to his critics, that what he would like to do in the case of Nigeria, for instance, is to convert a steel rod manufacturing plant which was operating inefficiently into an efficient operation with 50 people and put it on a competitive footing in that society. I want to suggest to him respectfully, through you, Mr. Chairman, that that does not begin to get to the basic problem of these underdeveloped countries.

The basic problem, I suggest, is to achieve a sustained growth, a sustained economic growth, which is based on an accelerated rate of savings reaching the breakthrough point in these emergent societies; an accelerated rate of savings which would amount to 12 per cent or 15 per cent of the national income being devoted to capital formation. Until that is the case in these emergent societies, the kind of contribution that the hon. Minister is advocating makes no sense whatsoever. In fact, it is positively harmful.

There has to be an overall effect in these societies, a contagion of development right across the board, rather than bits and pieces of modernization which, in the final analysis, have an inhibiting influence.

I was looking back through that remarkable little series of lectures by Barbara Ward on the rich nations and the poor nations and noticed a comment of hers which I would like to put on the record and suggest to the hon. Minister for his interest. She says:

> There will come about, taking a look at his kind of policy, what one can only call a kind of dual society, in which the scattered growing points of a modern way of life are restrained almost to the pitch of immobility by enormous forces of inertia inherent in the old framework of society.

Now, that is basically the problem with the bits-and-pieces manufacturing modernization advocated by the hon. Minister. It is simply not any kind of solution for this new society, and I suggest, therefore, that it should frankly be abandoned.

The Minister revealed his essential toughness towards the new society, his underlying motive, the condescension of the western world—if I can put it that way—when he described what he would do to the emergent nations if they dared to default on payment. I want to read it into the record again to remind the House. He said, and I quote:

> Should a country default, this immediately serves notice on all suppliers and creditors that adverse political or economic change is taking place, and until the delinquent country has corrected its position few countries, if any, would extend further credit.

That kind of statement, Mr. Chairman, would simply confirm the suspicions in the minds of the recipient country that our business is there to plunder rather than to co-operate. And what kind of language is that from a responsible Minister of Economics and Development, to talk of delinquent countries correcting their position, as though they were some adolescent—which they may be on the international market, but which position should not be used as a bludgeoning tool by sophisticated western society. It is that attitude which is inherent in everything in this speech given to the Empire club.

The Minister talks of benefits to these foreign countries, but I would point out that they are benefits on his terms, and on his terms exclusively. And this is another aspect which would be so repugnant to them, and which is frankly so repugnant to us in this party. The Minister said: "Read my reply to the critics." Well, let me quote two statements from that reply which I think are pretty shocking in their implications:

> When these nations learn the value of a dollar earned by the sweat of their brow, the sooner they will realize the true meaning of democracy and begin to develop

political statesmen to serve the people not despots to enslave them.

Later on the hon. Minister said:

> It is obvious to me that money or handout equivalents do not create the society we would like to see—

I emphasize that:

> —we would like to see, in these countries who need our help.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one thanks the Minister for his gratuitous comments on people in underdeveloped countries working by the sweat of their brow and recognizing the value of the dollar. But let me assure him that in societies where 90 per cent of the people live on rural subsistence economies with average annual incomes of somewhere between $25 and $65 a year, sweat of the brow is not an uncommon denominator and they need no such advice from the Minister. They need no such bowing and scraping and humbling themselves before the almighty dollar, which is used rather less effectively than the Minister would suggest.

What does the Minister mean about democracy? What demands is he making on these countries? What is his definition of democracy? Is he suggesting, for instance, to take the African continent, that there is one country that could be validly described as a democratic nation in our concept? I challenge him to name on the floor of this Legislature a single country which could be so characterized. And does that mean one writes off entire societies because they have not yet accepted the perfection of the Westminster model?

Again, Mr. Chairman, the problem of this speech is the imposing of western value judgments on the nature of the societies that are evolving. I suggest to you, sir, that it may very well be true that all of these emergent societies have to go through a certain one-party phase before any kind of democratic framework evolves. Indeed, it may never evolve as the Minister would like to see it.

It may be desirable that it does never evolve as the Minister would like to see it—because societies which have no history of democratic practice; which have no developed civil service; which have had minimal educational opportunities and are impoverished societies with one-crop economies, this kind of society may not, in terms of its culture and its tradition and its legacy, wish to be burdened with what the Minister would like to see as the fulfilment of democratic practice.

One might also ask him what he means by "the society we would like to see." I am using his words. I say this not in an argumentative way, but what kind of arrogance does that suggest to him? "Societies we would like to see." The fact is that some of them are developing the most remarkably sophisticated societies. Indeed, in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries, until they were destroyed by the western colonialism, some had very sophisticated societies—sufficiently sophisticated that we wanted to pattern our models on them.

So, Mr. Chairman, what worries me about the whole tone of the Minister's speech is its essential lack of sympathy and lack of interest in the problems of emerging countries, and the suggestion that business interests, financed by government in large measure, would enhance the economies of those countries. All experience, particularly in the countries which he quoted—Cuba and Venezuela and Argentina—demonstrates that private capital of that kind served only to exploit in the most frighteningly acquisitive way.

I ask myself, Mr. Chairman, why is it the hon. Minister took this stand? What prompted him to make this kind of speech at Easter—a more inappropriate time I cannot imagine? I suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, it is because as a free enterpriser, as the most stalwart private enterpriser in this Legislature, he still believes that such is basically the way you solve that kind of economic and social problem. I suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, that it is simply no longer valid for underdeveloped countries in the middle of the 20th century. It may have been valid in the early days of North America and in western society generally. There may have been some value, despite all the massive and attendant social injustices, to the use of private competition and free enterprise in the development of western society. But that private competition and free enterprise is not relevant to modern society in the emerging world, and it is an attitude which the hon. Minister should largely discard from his mind.

It may be that occasional manufacturing industries are of value in these new countries, but only after massive injections of foreign capital from the have nations on a truly major scale to bring them up to that 12 to 15 per cent of capital formation, in order that they reach the economic breakthrough.

Otherwise, sir, we are simply perpetuating a subsistence economy and deriving some small profit in the process.

Now, if the Minister had stood up at Easter and said he thinks Canada should be devoting two or three per cent of its gross national product to economic aid, and that Ontario would encourage the federal government to do so; if he had suggested that Ontario would directly contribute to the technical assistance programme of the United Nations; if he had suggested he would promote a federal-provincial conference somehow to begin to overcome these incredible world problems on a government-to-government basis, then he would have been widely applauded. But to inject the entrepreneural mentality into this desperately difficult situation at this point, I suggest, was unfortunate indeed.

I have one final observation, Mr. Chairman, and then I will take my seat. It is this:

I urge the Minister not to be so precipitate in his judgment of other countries and other rulers. It is fashionable to demean Kwame Nkrumah because, fortunately, he has been deposed. But I suggest to the hon. Minister it is unwise to make so many sweeping judgments about the nature of these other economies.

When he jumped to his feet in this House yesterday, Mr. Chairman, he said that Nkrumah had run off with $126 million or $127 million to foreign lands. Well, of course, only the most irresponsible press printed that kind of stuff. I suggest to the Minister, it was never actually corroborated. I got in my office just today, a copy of *Africa Report,* which is certainly regarded as one of the most responsible of American journals. In their summary of events in Ghana, under the question of Nkrumah's resources, they point out that at a press conference his economic consultant, Ayeh Kuma, in detention, told the conference that the former President's personal fortune amounted to approximately $7 million, all but $22,400 of it in Ghana.

Now, $7 million is not the kind of sum which a leader should amass, he is guilty of that, one does not deny it. But let us not become so extravagant in our interpretation of others to impute to them ideologies for which they have no use. I can think of one incident after another, equally distressing in that regard, which the hon. Minister seems to accept uncritically. I suggest to him that it has very damaging effects indeed, and I urge upon him that he re-evaluate his entire foreign aid programme. Trade with these underdeveloped countries and see if he cannot, in fact, encourage the Canadian government to do the job that it should be doing.

Mr. Sopha: For my own part, Mr. Chairman, I was saddened on reading the report of the speech made to an organization which I had hoped that before many years would become completely obsolescent and disappear. However that may be, my quarrel with the hon. Minister is on slightly different grounds from my hon. friend from Scarborough West, though there was not much in his remarks with which I could disagree.

If I understand the foreign policy of our nation and its attitude to foreign aid and assistance to underdeveloped countries since the end of World War II, we Canadians have not, in the international councils, bothered ourselves much about the form of government that obtains in any particular country. I can recall no incident where Canadians, as a people or a nation, have been accused of gross interference in international affairs and the style of government of other countries. Our American neighbours have, indeed, been the most generous people that the world has ever seen, their charity knows no bounds in what they have given away since World War II, to needy peoples elsewhere. They often have had to suffer abuse, much of it undeserved, because of their support of various elements, various persons who have governed these countries.

The only interference in the affairs of another nation that I can recall we ever made, was the stand that we took, and a just and right one it was, about the government of South Africa and its policy of apartheid. But no other example can I make my mind conjure. That was the first thing wrong with the hon. Minister's speech.

The Minister, of course, spoke as a businessman. He typifies the businessman in this Legislature; he was a very successful businessman before he entered the field of politics. He talks and thinks like a businessman, indeed like a director of a company and a high executive officer in the corporate world, which he was.

In that regard, I think it not unfair or unduly critical to say to him that as so often obtains when one does not keep up to date with world affairs but is absorbed in the business world, many of his ideas were more typical of the nineteenth century than they were of the twentieth. And particularly when he refers to the necessity of encouraging these people to import private capital to develop their own industry.

It is true such countries as Liberia are attempting to do that, but Liberia has for a long time had a very stable government, the growth of some sound financial institu-

tions, and has been marked by an era of peace.

I think my hon. friend from Scarborough West rather overdoes it when he talks about the form of government that obtains in Africa. He defies the hon. Minister to name a country that has parliamentary institutions that equate our standards of democracy. It may be difficult to draw exact parallels and similarities, but I remind my hon. friend from Scarborough West that in many of the countries of Africa that were formerly administered as colonies by the British and have now achieved independence, the British record is fairly good, especially in respect of the numbers of trained people that the British left there who were qualified to take over administrative duties in government.

I mention Kenya and Tanzania as two that are perhaps good examples of that. Maybe they are not democracies. I understand in Tanzania—hon. members might be interested—which is a one-party state, they tried to found a second party; they tried to create one, and the attempt was not successful. Nobody wants a second party. They apparently do not want parliamentary debate between Opposition and government in the way we know it. Who are we to criticize them? And if we do criticize them as the hon. Minister appears to do in that speech, then I suggest that he talks in the way of arrogance, the worst feature of the white man.

He is really looking down on the black man and comparing his deficiencies with the superiority of the white man, and is saying to him, "We are better, copy us, you will have peace, happiness and eternal salvation. That is all you need to do." But of course that means the importation of the coca-cola machine, the frug and the watusi, and all the other wonderful incidents of North American culture. They all go along with it in this copying process.

The next point I want to make today, and I would not expect to be challenged when I say that the records of our country in the realm of foreign aid is not to indulge in metaphor, is that we might go out and run up the flag outside, and all stand back and salute it, and sing loud hosannas of praise to ourselves. Compared to what other nations have given to needy nations, what Canada and Canadians have given is not very exemplary or deserving of much commendation.

Nick Cavall told us that a couple of years ago when he got back from the administration of the Colombo Plan. He told Canadians what he felt, being close to the situation, about our decision in giving away some of our affluence, which indeed we have. I think Canadians are perhaps deserving of a little criticism that their first interest in life is that they are dedicated somewhat to the proposition that what we have got we are going to keep. We are going to keep it first of all for ourselves, and maybe if we have a little bit to spare then that little we will give away, maybe. The contribution to the Colombo Plan, if I remember correctly at its genesis, was something of the small order of $25 million a year. Our neighbour to the south, with ten times the population, gives away in the order of billions of dollars a year.

I am one of those who feel and I say this to the hon. Minister who, and I say it is fair criticism, I do not think really understands the world picture and what is going on in this changing world with its massive currents of nationalism and desire for self-determination that has captured the imagination of the black, brown and yellow men.

It is not inconceivable that we, occupying the north half of this North American continent with its manifold riches in the way that we do, white men all of us, or almost all of us—perhaps some day in the not-too-distant future, the yellow man, the black man, the brown man, is going to say, "We are tired of you Canadians having all that affluence and all those resources, and we will come and take it away from you; we will just move in on you." Nothing is impossible in the nuclear age and when one tries to assess the feelings of these people for a place in the sun—I just got finished reading a book about Africa, compiled by the *New York Times*, which tells us that the average per capita income of the inhabitant of that great and dark continent is $178 a year, in terms of what it will purchase in North America.

The average per capita income in Canada and the United States approaches something like $1,100 to $1,300 a year; that is man, woman and baby in the cradle. Almost 10 times the African amount. Somebody said here—I said it yesterday and apparently I am correct—that two-thirds of the world's population is at any particular moment in a state of chronic starvation. Millions and hundred of millions of people will go to bed tonight with empty stomachs.

I tried to put that in graphic terms when I said some years ago that people in Indonesia, I read, eat grass in the absence of something else to put in their stomachs. And we can turn on our television set any time and look at a commercial, a very high-priced commercial, about the proper diet for

our dog and give him all the calories and all the vitamins that he needs to get a shiny coat and be man's best friend, as he is expected to be. It ends up that my dog is better fed than a good many people in Malaysia or India or Upper Volta or Tchad or Gabon or any one of 25 or 30 other countries that I can reel off the tip of my tongue.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member really think that this comes under trade and industry?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, sir; yes, indeed. We are reviewing a speech made by the Minister at the Empire club.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member, if he will, please, to stay with vote 406.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I have made my point. For that I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just recommend this; I said that I had read the *New York Times* book on Africa, which has just been published. They have one on southeast Asia and others on Latin America, South America, and one or two other countries—the names do not come to mind. The books are written by experts, people who have lived in these areas, alert news reporters who know how to gather information, and I recommend to the Minister that he get all of them—they are $1.65 apiece—and read them all; then he will come away a little better acquainted with what is going on in the world.

Now, I want it recorded for *Hansard* that when I raised my point of order before, I said that the hon. Minister's speech had caused serious editorial comments. I was glad that it did. And he said, "All to the good." I attempted to send for some of the editorials that were printed and a long clipping comes back to me. It was simply not so; the editorial comment was not favourable.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): *Maclean's* magazine!

Mr. Sopha: Yes; my friend, the hon. member for Grey South mentions *Maclean's* magazine—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): I will send them the message from coast to coast.

Mr. Sopha: —and what they had to say. So my parting words to my hon. friend are that he might do as R. B. Bennett did one time, I believe: Take speeches of that nature and if he gets a joy out of writing them and looking at the grammar and the syntax and the words that are used, well, let him write them and then he can read them to himself perhaps before the mirror and then take them and throw them in the wastebasket and never deliver them. Because to deliver them out of the mouth of a responsible Minister of the Crown in the type of world in which we live does nothing but lessen our image. We are people who are looked upon in most parts of the globe with trust and confidence, and indeed a people to whom other nations look as wanting nothing from them; we have no imperialist designs, we have enough territory, we do not want to run anybody else's government, we do not want to superimpose our culture upon anybody else, we are a reticent and shy, friendly nation. That is what we try to be to other peoples.

We want other peoples to come and seek our counsel and our assistance and our advice, we want them to come to us and ask us to interpret them to the great powers, to try to provide a nexus, a rapport, between the great nations and the small. We are middlemen, honest brokers; that is our proper role.

That role is not advanced by speeches of this nature where we start to give advice to others on how they should run their government and their economy. That is the central point I want to make. I want to say to the Minister who sits here—one of 78—who dictates the policy that governs this province, that if he makes speeches like that, he does not make them for me, he makes them for what I suspect is a very small minority of people in this country and he would be wanting if he tried to accumulate a large group of public opinion that would support him in remarks of that nature. Look at the headline: "400 million buys poverty—Randall." $400 million buys poverty.

Mr. Chairman, $400 million will buy a lot of wheat, it will buy a lot of tractors, it will buy a lot of other capital goods that these people so desperately need.

Mr. Bryden: And we give much less than $400 million.

Mr. Sopha: Yes; we give much less, the hon. member for Woodbine says. And the solution of their problem is a very simple one. In order to accumulate capital, to build industries and works of their own, they have to be able to save from current production, they have to save from it in order to support the workers who are building and are not producing consumer goods, a simple economic proposition. They cannot, because they do not produce enough; they do not produce enough to feed the producers and to be able to feed a large group of their workers who

are engaged in building capital projects. How do they get off the treadmill, out of the maze, the rat's maze, how do they get out? There is only one solution by which they can get out and that solution involves our giving of what we have by way of surplus to them, to provide that capital and consumer goods to them so that they can work their way out.

I just want to say by way of postscript that I find it difficult to agree with the hon. member for Scarborough West about Kwame Nkrumah; he has been closer to him than I have, for part of his life he has been down that way. I had the pleasure of being associated some years ago with Dr. Azikiwe, the President of Nigeria, when he was a student in this city, who studied at the University of Toronto, and with a man who was at one time a high government official, Dr. Okejani, who also took his medical degree at our university. I know the calibre of these people and the desire they have to lift their countries from the depths of poverty in which they find themselves. I think the member for Scarborough West is a bit too kind to Nkrumah, if I understand from my reading about him, that he imposed upon his people in Ghana one of the most vicious police states that a nation has ever known. Indeed, he had to walk around—he might be a wonderful fellow—but he always had to walk around with 10 or 15 bodyguards to make sure that one of his not-so-loyal subjects would not drill him in an idle moment. But my views are subject to change on appropriate evidence.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let these two statements go unchallenged and I am sure my hon. friends would not expect me to.

I simply suggest that it is a matter of opinion. I have mine and I stand by them and I stand on my opinions not only on the experience I have had before coming into government in these countries but on the experience as a manufacturer licensing people to manufacture products in these countries, and being associated with visitors from many of these developing countries over the last 15 or 20 years; and I do not agree with what my hon. friends say. They are entitled to their opinions. I simply suggest to you, sir, that I had long talks with Mr. Paul Hoffman of the United Nations; with "Soapy" Williams who is, I believe, the ambassador-at-large for the African countries; and I had a meeting only last year with the new Prime Minister of Greece; I had meetings with the acting Prime Minister of Jamaica; had talks with the Prime Minister of Trinidad and with the governor of Formosa. This was all in the last few years. And I also met with the Minister of Industry for Nigeria, who was one of those slaughtered not too long after the big Commonwealth conference.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I can talk from actual experience and I might also agree with the hon. member for Sudbury. I had one hour and 15 minutes with Mr. Nkrumah and the first thing he asked me was what was wrong with the economy of Ghana. I suggested, after visiting him for a week, that he had it backwards. He asked, "How do we correct it?" I made a suggestion and he asked, "When can this happen?" I said I would have to go back and talk to my friends in Ottawa as they controlled international funds, but certainly I would like to see if I could do something for him.

I might say that we have had visitors not only from Ghana, but from the Ghanaian consul general in Ottawa; the ambassador from the United Nations; the Nigerian Prime Minister's ambassador has been in my office two or three times since I came back, wanting to know if we could put this programme into effect.

I assure my hon. friends that I do not have an "ulterior" motive as I am supposed to have here today. I simply suggest that it is a play on words. I am delighted that I, in this session of the Legislature, am able to let my hon. friends take my speeches and keep me on the griddle since last Tuesday, and it looks as though we are going on until next Tuesday. I am enjoying every minute of it and I will be delighted to send them copies of all my speeches from here on in. It will save them a lot of research.

Mr. Chairman, one of the weaknesses of this Legislature is the fact that the hon. members in the Opposition parties can take things out of context and make them sound as they are not. I would like to take this opportunity to read into the record, exactly the reply I made to those who criticized the speech at the Empire club. I stand by these comments and I would also suggest to hon. members that I would be glad to send them all the other press clippings that were printed outside of Toronto.

The letter I have here was written to the editor of the *Globe and Mail* and it reads:

> Dear Sir:
>
> It was with particular interest that I read the editorial criticisms occurring in newspapers and magazines recently on my address to the Empire club on foreign aid. Also the letter addressed to the Toronto

newspapers by Mr. Harry J. Waisglass, research director, united steelworkers of America. Mr. Waisglass states that his experience on the subject was limited to a six-month period when he was acting as a labour expert in Singapore over two years ago.

Things happen very quickly in two years.

I pointed out in my remarks that 11 governments had collapsed or had been overthrown in these emerging nations and many of them in the past two years.

In view of these events, I expressed my views from recent experience, having visited many of these countries during 1964 and 1965 and discussed the plight of other countries with very knowledgeable people engaged in international trade.

My comments were based on a comprehensive analysis of these personal experiences, covering countries such as Communist China, Manila, Formosa, Nigeria, Ghana, Greece, Turkey and Lebanon, plus several visits to the West Indies where a great deal of Canadian aid has been directed, but where unemployment and poverty is still very great.

During these visits I had discussions with the heads of state, civil service employees, businessmen and Canadian trade and foreign service employees in all the areas mentioned. I therefore suggest that my comments are not without foundation and were not intended to retard Canada's contribution to foreign aid, but rather to confirm what my critics themselves have suggested, that Canada should give more, not less.

However, I feel that this should be done on a more direct and controlled basis to make our foreign-aid dollars go further in an endeavour to achieve more practical results than those we have been getting up to the present time.

It was made quite clear in my analysis of foreign aid programmes not only from Canada but from other western nations that too often the aid in cash, materials or food, is not always achieving what the giving nations desire or what the people of the receiving nations anticipate. If any confirmation of this doubt is needed, the collapse of eleven governments in the developing nations over the last few years, with Haiti to follow if the reports in recent press statements are correct, should make all of us aware that something more than foreign aid is badly needed. This is so, if we sincerely want the people of these nations to find their place in the sun, with a standard of living that fellow human beings deserve regardless of politics, class, colour or creed.

The abuse of foreign aid is exemplified by the great numbers of despots who wind up in Europe next to their well-heeled bank accounts with money filched out of their country's economy while the masses continue to suffer great hardships. Those who claim that this illegal wealth is not derived from foreign-aid moneys are simply burying their heads in the sand, for food, materials and equipment supplied through foreign aid, even if purchased in the countries of the donors, have made it possible for the despots to acquire the internal generated wealth of their countries to be deposited abroad so that they and their followers can live luxuriously when a new regime takes over. The new regime endeavours, once again, with additional foreign aid and crash programmes to develop order out of chaos.

The list of those who have destroyed their people is long and I would draw your attention to just a few: Farouk of Egypt; Peron of Argentina; Jiminez of Venezuela; Nkrumah of Ghana; Batista of Cuba, and from all reports there is soon to follow Duvalier of Haiti.

Surely, if we of the western world sincerely believe in giving more then, for the sake of humanity, let us do so with our eyes wide open and on a more intelligent basis so that we can help the masses and not imprison them with foreign aid that too often, directly or indirectly, provides for the creation of a police state. The late President Kennedy, in his inaugural address said: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." It would seem that the despots I have referred to have established their governments on the following principle, and I quote a television comedian: "Ask not what your country can do for you; get one that will."

Ex-President Nkrumah, like many of the others referred to, apparently had his plans well laid out for retirement. Recent reports emanating from the new government in Ghana, indicate that he has stashed away $7 million to $126 million to take care of his future. This apparently is "par for the course" for a dictator to abdicate under similar circumstances.

It is obvious that this is the golden rule that many foreign aid recipients have followed. Too often this was made possible

because the western nations are too politically polite and not as mercenary as they should be in foreign aid assistance. It is time we put some teeth into foreign aid. If we are pouring it in, we should be sure that those guiding the administration of these emerging nations are not ladling it out for the day they will be deposed. By permitting them to do so, under the obsolete and antiquated diplomatic gobbledegook excuses that we cannot interfere with the sovereignty of these nations because it would not be politically expedient to do so, I suggest that it is simply to continue to encourage through any form of foreign aid the results we see before us, continued political chaos, revolution, poverty and unemployment.

Canada—as stated by Mr. George Stevens in the magazine section of the *Globe and Mail* on April 23—

> —is being asked to make greater amounts of agricultural produce available and less capital goods, namely, manufactured products. Though this food is desperately needed and we cannot supply the insatiable demands of a hungry world of deserving people in sufficient quantities to solve their hunger problems on a continuing basis, Canada also, in its own self-interest should be producing manufactured products; products requiring many man-hours of labour should be included in the contribution of the western nations' foreign aid. National revenues raised through taxes on wages and corporate profits can come only from full employment within our own nation if current foreign aid programmes have established themselves in these vast new markets, while Canada would be looked upon as a food and raw material supplier only and our manufactured goods nonexistent in these developing markets.
>
> Even vast amounts of increased food supplies cannot stave off the ever-increasing hunger of more and more millions of people, who produce some food for themselves, if their future productive effort is based, as it seems to be at the present, on the generosity of the have nations from year to year, subject always to the political behaviour of the recipient. This is borne out by the recent press statements that foreign aid to Haiti was cut off in 1963; it similarly was slowed down very noticeably in Ghana in the last few years. When the western world does not like the political climate, this comes about, a slowdown in foreign aid, and the masses who are unable to rid themselves of the despots ruling their countries are the real sufferers.
>
> This was true in Ghana prior to the elimination of President Nkrumah. At the same time, however, in Ghana a nation of 7,500,000 people, approximately 53 embassies were established. This was their biggest business, foreign embassies. I believe this is even more than we have in Canada. This, as I say, was their biggest industry, and yet the political behaviour of their government meant the elimination or reduction of foreign aid to the people.
>
> When Ghana attained independence approximately nine years ago, the nation had several hundred millions of dollars in the Treasury. In December 1965, on my last visit to Ghana, the deficit was £66 million, and as I said earlier, a statement has now been released by the new government indicating that Mr. Nhrumah has $126 million deposited in foreign banks for his own use. In fact, he just took over another country.
>
> We in Canada, not too many years ago, first developed our secondary industries and from the revenue through taxes, built schools, our universities, technical institutes and hospitals, and other social necessities. Today, while all these social needs are essential, they earn not one penny of income to carry out operating expenses, and as a consequence most of these emerging countries have to depend on foreign aid generosity to keep their institutions operating.
>
> Surely a more sustained effort to provide industry to produce for the domestic needs of these nations would not only give their people immediate job training in industry, but create instant domestic consumers. This would generate taxable revenue, as in Canada, to provide for these social needs and develop stability of government, not dependent on political expediency. When these nations learn the value of a dollar, earned by the sweat of their brow—

and I repeat this for my hon. friend from Scarborough West:

> —the sooner they will realize the true meaning of democracy and begin to develop political statesmen to serve the people, not despots to enslave them.
>
> The plan I suggested to channel foreign aid dollars through private enterprise is not wishful thinking on my part, but a programme I have discussed at great length with the various people referred to earlier. Some of my critics have suggested these

budding nations cannot adapt to efficient labour-saving automatic equipment which would be too sophisticated for their use. They also point out that the creation of jobs for the masses at any cost must be the prime requisite.

Let me illustrate this point. In Nigeria, 450 employees were turning out steel rods for the construction industry with Italian equipment in a plant which I visited which was 30 years old, and so obsolete that cost of the product was prohibitive. I was informed by the manager they could not compete costwise in their own domestic market and were importing steel rods, despite the fact that they were jeopardizing 450 jobs, and unless the government would subsidize domestic production, or ban imports, they were closing the doors at the end of the year. It would have been far better to have the most modern equipment and employ 50 people; produce steel rods they could use for their own economy at a cost that would make them competitive; allow them to ship into the export market to earn the much-needed foreign exchange; to build up their manufacturing volume and employment by increasing sales through efficiency and not subsidies.

Canada would not be the highly automated, competitive nation she is today if we had accepted in our early stages in the development of secondary industry the concept of job creation at any cost, regardless of the economics. With approximately 20 million people, we duplicate the efforts of the world's mightiest nation, the United States of America, and enjoy a standard of living as great as, or better than, any other highly industrialized nation in the world. For those who say this is not possible in the developing countries, I suggest it is being done by many companies in these areas now, but not by enough.

One such company that comes to my mind is the Bata Shoe Company whose headquarters are in Toronto. I visited their plant in Lagos, Nigeria, where they produce millions of pairs of shoes annually with employees that have the patience and the intestinal fortitude to train themselves. I maintain this can be duplicated in other developing areas with hundreds of other industries, but certainly not under our present operating concepts of foreign aid.

I believe we can do much more, with better results for the recipient nations and for Canada, if our aim is to help the developing countries and show them how to emulate our democratic system and create a private enterprise economy.

Mr. Sopha: Why should they?

Hon. Mr. Randall: To continue:

Self-help is a must if we are to achieve a better way of life for those we want to assist. It cannot be obtained by giving grants of money, or food, or the building of schools and hospitals only. We at the same time must expedite the creation of jobs through well planned and efficient control of labour and manufacturing costs to build up a greatly expanded secondary industry, the most important part of the overall programme.

Obviously the people of all the countries are grateful for the aid they are receiving from year to year. I maintain, however, we cannot operate our foreign aid programme like a winter works campaign. We must find and try a more self-help and practical approach, or go from year to year salving our consciences with bigger handouts, righteously assuming we have done our part, while poverty and hunger keep pace with the ever-growing population of the world.

The urge, the skills, and the enthusiasm are there, but they need new thought, new programmes and a realistic approach on the part of all have nations, to create a more meaningful life for millions of people in a shrinking world, who can be our customers of tomorrow and we can be theirs. The faster the world shrinks in this jet age, the more conscious we must become of those have-not nations, and the more aware they will become of the vast difference in our living standards, compared to theirs.

Canada's image, as I stated in my address, was never brighter, and my critics admit this is so. It seems logical, therefore, to take advantage of this good image created by our past performances—whether we consider them adequate or inadequate in the area of foreign aid—and see where we can promote it in the interests of those who want to help themselves.

It has been stated that the United States has given over $70 billion in foreign aid since World War II in every part of the globe, for almost every conceivable cause. Today, those who were privileged to receive this help when it was so badly needed have, in many areas, made the United States a target for abuse and unjustified criticism, particularly in some of the countries that I have visited. It is obvious to me that money or handout equivalents do not create the society we would like to see in these countries who need our help.

But money with industrial development and labour in-plant training through private enterprise that would provide employment and develop skills could, I suggest, make a more comprehensive attack on poverty, hunger and disease.

It was recently announced in the press that the federal government in Ottawa is looking for a businessman to direct our foreign aid programme. I respectfully suggest this move is most timely as foreign aid to any country is not charity. It is big business, and still expanding at an ever-increasing rate, particularly as the affluent nations become more affluent, and the gap between the haves and the have-nots widens still further.

In closing, may I say I appreciate the comments of those who have taken time to criticize my remarks to the Empire club. I have the sincerest respect for those who are engaged in the supervision and distribution of foreign aid. I am cognizant of the tremendous responsibilities they must assume in carrying out their plans and projects. Their task is much like the story of the loaves and the fishes in their endeavour to feed, clothe and shelter the multitudes of hungry and poverty-stricken people around the world.

We, in Ontario, contribute almost half of the national income, produce almost 52 per cent of the manufactured goods, and through our trade and industry programmes have increased the sale of Canada's manufactured goods in almost every corner of the world, so that for the first time in our history, in 1965, we exported from Canada $1,300 million worth of manufactured goods. With our stake in foreign aid, Ontario I am sure, like other provinces, must never become so parochial that we consider foreign aid the prerogative of the federal government only. It is a responsibility that all provinces and their governments must recognize and must share the same concern for its success or failure with the federal authorities.

I hope these comments and suggestions will be accepted as a sincere desire to be constructive on a matter that is, I am sure, of great concern to many Canadians.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my comments on foreign aid. I stand and fall on this statement.

Mr. Sopha: After the disaster of that speech, would the Minister consider reducing the salary of the speech writer and perhaps he will quit?

Hon. Mr. Randall I should double it. I wrote it myself.

Mr. Bryden: The unfortunate part, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. Minister apparently does not recognize the disaster. The letters that he—

Mr. Chairman: Before the member starts, may I once again appeal to the members of the House on the basis of fairness and on the basis that the leader of the Opposition and the members of your party have asked me to direct the activities of the House under the proper sequence of votes? As has been pointed out earlier, the matter of foreign aid, international trade and the Empire club speech really does not come under vote 406. We are dealing with sales missions, international trade fairs, buyers, and a number of other items that properly come under the vote. Now, there have been speeches from the member for Sudbury and one by the member for Scarborough West, and the Minister has answered them. May I appeal to the House to stay with vote 406?

Mr. Bryden: We realize, Mr. Chairman, that there has been, shall we say, a continuing tension between the chair and the Opposition as to the interpretation of what comes under vote 406. I may say that I have no intention of dealing with this at any length, I dealt with it in my introductory remarks. But we feel quite satisfied that this does come under vote 406. In fact, in his speech at the Empire club, the Minister was reported in the press to have unveiled what he called the "Ontario plan." I think I referred to it earlier as the "Ontario development plan," but I have now checked it and the term he used was the Ontario plan. Our interpretation is that this Ontario plan comes under this vote.

Furthermore, although we appreciate your difficulties in defining the limits of any vote, I do not really think that you can deal with the matters covered by this vote insofar as they have to do with the promotion of Ontario products and the Ontario trade overseas, except within the context of the philosophy that the hon. Minister has so fully expressed. I have taken rather a long time to explain it, but that is our only justification for trying to raise this matter, Mr. Chairman. I will certainly accept your ruling, and if you rule that this is the end of it, then that is it. But I would like to make one or two comments, and I will try to make them brief.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: The unfortunate part is that the hon. Minister apparently has not even yet recognized the catastrophe his speech represented. The letter he read to us in full, and it was quite a lengthy letter was, indeed, in reply to an editorial that appeared in the *Globe and Mail*, taking very much the same position that we have taken on his original speech. The *Globe and Mail* did not—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do I have to accept your opinion and the *Globe and Mail's* as being correct? I have an opinion of my own.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am not—

Hon. Mr. Randall: We just differ in how we are going to handle foreign aid; you have one method and I have another.

Mr. Bryden: I do not for one moment want to suggest that the hon. Minister is not entitled to disagree with the *Globe and Mail*. I do not regard the *Globe and Mail* as the final authority, or anybody else, for that matter. I just was pointing out that the *Globe and Mail* has put forward a criticism with which we agree. The Minister wrote his letter. We tried to put forward our criticism in fuller terms, in three different speeches at different times during these estimates. The Minister's reply is simply to read again the letter he wrote to the *Globe and Mail*.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You took it out of context.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You did not explain the entire letter to the House. You just took out of context what—

Mr. Bryden: I did not myself deal with the letter. My hon. friend from Scarborough West dealt with it at some length and, I submit, not out of context at all. I think he pointed precisely to the desperate weaknesses in the whole thinking in the letter, to the totally false assumption on which it is based. I would not say that there is no merit at all in the letter. If one starts shooting in all directions with a shotgun one is bound to hit the mark sometime. But the basic philosophy shown there is exactly what is wrong and it is exactly what the *Globe and Mail* put its finger on. I will quote one sentence. It is said of the Minister's proposal:

> It is a programme that smacks of the nineteenth-century colonialism which emerging countries have rightly rejected.

And this is the point that apparently the hon. Minister cannot comprehend at all. His comments on this matter show the limitations of the Cook's tour expert, the fellow who goes to a country for a week and becomes an expert on it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: How often have you been there?

Mr. Bryden: I have not been in most of these countries at all, but I—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Get yours out of a book.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest that books are useful instruments. As a matter of fact, they will give you a lot more information than a one-week visit to a country. I am not decrying the value of a visit; it is always useful to be there. But it is essential that you should understand something of the background and history of these areas which, it is quite clear, the Minister does not understand at all. He has reflected throughout, and stands by it—the smug arrogance of the white man, the assumption that if only other people were as smart, as intelligent, as virtuous as we are, they would not have any problems.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have done more for the coloured man than you have, and more than anybody in that group sitting over there. I have made more contribution to the standard of living of the coloured people in this world than all eight of you sitting in the NDP seats.

Mr. Bryden: This is a childish support of—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not childish.

Mr. Bryden: It is based on nothing.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the members that the member for Woodbine has the floor and that he should proceed without interruption, please.

Mr. Bryden: All right, I will refrain from comment on the interjection then, Mr. Chairman. The Minister actually makes a great point on the dictators who feathered their own nests. But as my hon. friend from Scarborough West pointed out, with the exception of Nkrumah, he was talking about Farouk of Egypt who has long since departed the scene, and certain Latin American dictators who have also, in most cases, departed from the scene.

But the point that I think the hon. Minister simply refuses to understand is that in all of those cases, I am now excepting Nkrumah, they were products of the very

type of system that the Minister is advocating; of private enterprise, the big international corporation moving in, establishing, promoting and supporting this type of regime in order that it might have a free hand to carry out its economic exploitation of the country concerned.

This is what the people in the emerging nations strenuously object to. They have gone through imperial exploitation over varying lengths of time, ranging up to 300 years, and they are not going to take any more of it. The Minister is quite right when he says there is a significant role for private business investing its funds, such as the Bata Shoe Company, in these countries. And these things could be worked out, I am sure, between those entrepreneurs and the countries concerned.

Those are matters that the countries concerned should work out with the various entrepreneurs who are willing to risk their money there, just as our province and our country worked out arrangements with people from other countries. This is a matter for them to work out. We should not lay it down by saying, "This is the way it is going to be done, we are going to finance certain of our capitalists to go over and make a dollar in your country."

The hon. Minister's suggestion is just incredible, the suggestion that the government money that is spent on building up the infrastructure of these countries is a waste or is premature, is beyond comprehension.

There is no use comparing an African country of 1960 with Canada as it was, shall we say, in 1800. We are living in a totally different world. It is equally incomprehensible how the hon. Minister can suggest, as he has suggested in his letter, that there is a connection between foreign aid programmes as they have been carried on and, to quote his words, "continued political chaos, revolution, poverty and unemployment." Just how one can make that connection is completely beyond my comprehension. Anybody who has even a limited knowledge of the history of these countries will understand that instability is bound to be a characteristic of many of them for a long period of time.

To speak only of the present situation, they are in a situation where expectations are far beyond the capacity to fulfill them, and that sort of situation is bound to create extreme political stress. But we can go further than that. They have had very little experience in the last 100, 200 or 300 years in government. And why? Because our forefathers, the predatory white men, went in and destroyed their societies and gave them practically nothing in return, nothing but heartache, trouble and poverty.

Now they are faced with trying to pull themselves out of this situation. They are having great difficulty in developing the type of consensus that leads to political stability and which it took us and our forefathers centuries to develop. We criticize them because they have not done in a decade what it took us hundreds of years to do. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we, as I tried to suggest in my introductory remarks on these estimates, should develop, to begin with, an attitude of humility. We should recognize that the difficulties of these countries to an important extent arise out of the sins of our own forefathers.

I am not saying we should now go around in sackcloth and ashes, but we should recognize that these countries have grave problems to which there is no simple solution and that for us to take a superior, self-righteous attitude is the worst thing in the world. We should try to develop an understanding of their problems. When we have understanding, then I think we will be of genuine help to them.

One thing I would say for sure is that we will not be of very much help to them if we continue to assume that all they are entitled to and all we can afford to give them are the crumbs from our table, that we have to have our second television sets, our second cars, our power boats and so on, and if we have anything left over after all that, then we might be able to give a few handouts in a spirit of noblesse oblige to these people.

We are not going to be able for very much longer to continue to live in a rich suburb on the edge of a vast world slum. I am suggesting that our days are numbered if that is our attitude.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is what I keep telling the member.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister agrees with that, but we still take the attitude of the rich suburbanite towards the slum dweller—that we are the superior people because we live in the rich suburb and they have to learn to emulate us rather than develop their own ways and their own particular genius for self-government.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would not the hon. member admit we have to give them the tools before they can develop their skills?

All I am suggesting is, we give them the tools so they can develop their skills. You would not take your own family and hand it money and let it run down the street every day in the week. You would want to know where the money was going and what they were going to do. You want to make them productive. All I suggest is we make these people productive. This is what they want. They ask for it.

Mr. Bryden: Again I would suggest to the Minister that this is a simplification that is just impossible. You cannot separate these things. You are now dealing with total societies and these societies have to develop on all fronts. They need education, they need technical education—the Minister suggests this is something that can be deferred. But they need that if we are going to develop manufacturing industries on our style there, they certainly need that. They need the industries, they also need the infrastructure—the roads, the dams and so on. You are going to get things out of balance and that happens in our own country, too, where development is out of balance.

But to suggest that there is one priority —you must give such-and-such a thing first and leave everything else until later—makes no sense in my opinion. I think this is a process that has to develop as a process. All of these things are involved and they are all important.

As I tried to suggest, there is not any particular point in the Minister's statement with which I disagree—there are some points in his lengthy letter with which I could agree—but it is the basic attitude behind it that is wrong. It will bring us to grief, it will destroy our good image which the Minister says exists in these countries.

I am aware that some parochial editors in provincial newspapers accepted the Minister's statement as making sense. He appealed to all their most petty prejudices and they responded nobly, but the response to the Minister's statement was very unfavourable in those journals that have a sophisticated understanding of the nature of the problem. I would say that when it comes to reporting and commenting on foreign affairs, the *Globe and Mail* is perhaps the most sophisticated paper in Canada. It certainly is right up there among the leaders.

Their editorial—I read one paragraph from it—their editorial I think hit the nail right on the head. Yet this is a Conservative newspaper, it is not an NDP or a socialist newspaper, it is a Conservative newspaper. The heading of the editorial was: "How not to give foreign aid." I would suggest to the Minister that he should read the editorial again, it is a short one, read it and really try to absorb it, and then perhaps he would not be so proud of the lengthy letter that he wrote in reply to it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on this item and in the area of trade with foreign countries—but not in the Minister's Empire speech or his reply to the critics, you will be happy to know—I want to ask the Minister what specific outlay of funds, if any, does the Ontario government make with relation to trade with the Republic of South Africa and is there anything at all in a concrete way? I have in my possession a paper prepared by the trade and industry branch on South Africa, prepared in the middle of 1965, analyzing Ontario's import and export trade with that country. I am curious to know whether there are any specific financial outlays at all for trade missions, for clinics, for literature, for anything of that kind.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we do not have any figures on what we do in South Africa. The last connection we had, or association we had, we brought in three buyers from South Africa, the buyers group that came here two or three weeks ago.

Mr. S. Lewis: You brought them here?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We brought them here to have a look at Canadian merchandise, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Did we pay the expenses?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We paid their travelling expenses and they paid their hotel expenses. We do that for such visitors from all countries in the world. We had 95 at the Inn-on-the-Park last night.

Mr. S. Lewis: I appreciate that. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to do that in the future?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is our intention to do business with any country, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, is it the intention to bring buyers from the Republic of South Africa?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would think so, yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: What was the outlay on that trip?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Whatever the air expenses were, I do not have them here, I will be glad to get them for the hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the Minister, through the Canadian offices —I guess they are in Pretoria—does he have literature from the Ontario trade and industry branch, does he send personnel at any time to discuss trade relations? I am trying to ascertain the expenses involved.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have had no personnel in South Africa. We do supply our literature to all the Canadian government offices and I presume they would have it in South Africa.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the businessmen and the supplying of literature, I want to move an amendment to this vote in the estimate. Before I do, I want very quickly and briefly to put this case to the Minister: the greatest single contribution he might make in this society at this point in the field of foreign trade is to boycott the Republic of South Africa. I want to suggest to him that in so doing, he would find himself in consort with every single civilized nation in the western world, because there is not a single nation at the United Nations—with the exception of Portugal and South Africa itself—which has not, in fact, declared vigorously against the system of apartheid. There is not a nation which did not contribute to the discussion of the value of an economic boycott of South Africa. Indeed Mr. Chairman, I would go further and say that most of the eastern and western world were involved in a discussion of the validity of economic blockade where the Republic of South Africa was concerned.

It is very interesting indeed that, now that the Rhodesia economic embargo appears to be working, despite many of its critics, that argument now loses its impact—the argument that economic embargoes could not, in fact, operate. They have been tried; they have been recognized by international authority; they have been applied; and, if we are to believe the words of the British government, they will be successful. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that within the next two months the international court at the Hague will rule on the question of Southwest Africa and remove that part of South Africa from that country's jurisdiction and bring it back into the community of nations.

What I am trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is that on this issue, on the issue of apartheid in South Africa, the world is virtually united, and some countries and some organizations have begun to conduct the boycott. It is a difficult business, indeed, and I make no bones about it—everyone recognizes it—but there has to be the moral force demonstrated in certain areas of international society for it to be effective. I can think of no better moral force than the province of Ontario in this country which has now consistently voted against apartheid in the United Nations for two or three years. Indeed, with the accession of Howard Green, a Conservative, to the post of the Minister of External Affairs the policy began to shift.

What would it mean for Ontario, using the Minister's own figures? Exports from the province of Ontario to the Republic of South Africa during the year 1963, the most recent year for which figures are available, were $8,340,000; imports into the province of Ontario from South Africa were $2,200,000. So we are talking about $10,500,000, a very small price to pay, I suggest, for demonstrating that we, as part of the international community, can no longer bear the kind of policies that are pursued in that country.

I have one or two small references before moving the amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I will make them in this way. The Minister may say that one of the things that worries him the most is that it would harm the indigenous Africans. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that it is the cry of all the indigenous African groups in South Africa—the African National Congress, the Pan-African Congress, all the related groups—that an international embargo be undertaken; that conditions could not possibly be worse and they wish that the international community could resolve itself on this issue. There has never been any question on that from Chief Lethuli down; that has been the course.

The second thing is that if the hon. Minister says—as he may be inclined to say —that there are other totalitarian regimes in the world, then I say this to him: There are other totalitarian regimes in the world, but South Africa is the only totalitarian regime whose totalitarianism is based on race, and that distinguishes it from every other authoritarian country, and it puts it in a category which is completely repugnant, I suggest, to the rest of mankind, the hon. Minister included. There is no question in my mind, Mr. Chairman.

The policies in South Africa today cannot be described, I remind the hon. Minister. The policies of torture, which are akin to the days of the Gestapo, cannot possibly be conveyed in words; the sexual assaults on political prisoners, reports of which are now coming through to the western press, stagger the imagination; the extent of brutality and the coercive apparatus of the state cannot be countenanced by a civilized community. The

complete eradication of all political opposition on the basis of race is something that makes any other authoritarian country seem modest in comparison. The use of the pass laws, the erection of the Bantustan areas to segregate entirely the country, the uprooting of humanity—unknown since Stalin moved the Volga Germans—Mr. Chairman, all the policies of the Republic of South Africa make it imperative, I suggest, that people everywhere take some kind of stand on this issue and that governments take some kind of stand on this issue.

The hon. Minister himself moved into the field of foreign aid and foreign trade. I have, on occasion, in this House in past years had a resolution on the order paper which was never brought for debate and that is why I am raising it at this time in this estimate. But I appeal to the hon. Minister to take this step just as the present leader of the Conservative party led the effort in the Commonwealth to expel South Africa, so this province should now take the first step.

The motion I am about to move, I admit, is symbolic in its content rather than effective in its content, but it is important that the symbol be maintained because behind it the hon. Minister has in his power to exercise the policies we advocate and, keeping in mind those categories which he has described, I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Renwick:

That, item 6 of vote 406 be reduced by the sum of $2,000.

I repeat that that is an effort on our part to convey to the government the feeling on this issue and if that amendment carries it would demonstrate by this government that they are prepared to take action in this area.

Mr. Chairman: It is moved by the member for Scarborough West:

That item 6 of vote 406 be reduced by the sum of $2,000.

All those in favour, will please say "aye."

Those opposed, will please say "nay."

It appears that the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour, will please stand.

Those opposed, will please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" 48.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and vote 406 carried.

May I suggest to members of the House that vote 405, Ontario House, has been thoroughly discussed under vote 406? They are closely allied and interrelated. Shall we deal with that vote now?

Vote 405 agreed to.

On vote 403:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of areas in which I should like to ask the hon. Minister a number of questions with regard to vote 403. During our earlier discussions on the whole new role of regional development councils, the hon. Minister stated that he wanted to avoid as much as possible a duplication of research and to assist these regional development councils in their research programmes so that they could get a greater assessment of the bare facts of the situation, upon which they might map out their programmes. I think of two of the regional development associations which have been moving toward some kind of detailed study and research: the eastern Ontario development council to which the hon. Minister spoke a few weeks ago, where they have entered into a contract with Spartan Airways for a survey as part of research there; and I understand that the St. Clair regional development association has also come up with some sort of a programme.

Would the Minister indicate what the government is willing to do for councils which move to the stage in their thinking that they want to tackle some of the basics so that they can map out a programme?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I would be delighted to. First, may I say that the eastern Ontario development association has not made a contract with Spartan Airlines. Spartan Airlines made a proposition to them. Many consulting companies, once the announcement was made on regional development, approached many development associations—now known as councils—and suggested that they were in a position to make a survey of their particular area. We have been getting from the press, and also from some of the meetings that the consultants have had with the developing associations, suggestions that they would be offering a programme.

However, I talked to the eastern Ontario development council about this $730,000 aerial survey of eastern Ontario, and we do not think it is essential, but there are other surveys that will be undertaken in that area. The one from Lake St. Clair—yes, we have had some discussions with them and we have asked that all the councils submit any proposal they have for review by the research

department of our chief economist, to decide which will have priorities and how we can best assist the various regions in getting these studies under way.

I had a meeting, I might mention, with some people in northwestern Ontario this morning, in my office, about the same programme—a very comprehensive study of northern Ontario—and again we decided that, with all the things they would like to have discussed, we should first of all sit down and establish some priorities as to what should be undertaken.

Mr. MacDonald: A related question that I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman: I understand that earlier this month there was a meeting of representatives from various universities either in conjunction with, or in anticipation of working in conjunction with, the regional development councils. What exactly does the hon. Minister envisage is happening here? Are you going to try to develop a closer working liaison between, for example, the eastern Ontario development council and, say, the Ottawa University, or Queen's University, or the northwestern development association with the Lakehead University, or Western University with the Lake Erie regional development council, for purposes of using the disciplines and the skills and the research personnel that they have?

I have heard rumours of this kind of development. I wonder if the hon. Minister could enlighten us on what exactly he has in mind there.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are correct in your assumptions. We do intend to use the universities in the various areas and the consulting services and research services they have available, if we cannot do it in our own department. As you know, we are building up an economic department of our own, and have quite a number of people coming into the staff and have employed a number of people recently. More are being employed in the coming year, but much of this work, a lot of this work, will have to be contracted out on a consulting basis. We intend to make every use of the universities around the province. The hon. Minister of Education has the funds available for this university research, as indicated by our department, when we decide to undertake a study for any of the development councils.

I think I mentioned earlier that we have one going on now at Queen's University, for the city of Kingston. This is just an example of some of the studies that we will be giving to the universities.

Mr. MacDonald: I take it, then, that the financing for any such studies will be handled from the government office through subcontracts, so to speak?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my other area in which I wanted to ask questions is with regard to item 5. Are you taking them in succession?

Mr. Chairman: I think as it is a small vote here, we could deal with all items under this vote at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, in item 5, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Minister a question with regard to the costs of administering the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation. Without any extended repeat on some of the earlier comments that have been made with regard to this committee, I am wondering if the time has not come for purposes of building public confidence in this committee, and the expenditure of money that the government has put into it, if the government could not at least make available to members of this Legislature and such other people in the public, the study papers and the reports that have been prepared. You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the amount that is being spent this year on this advisory committee is $50,000. Now, $50,000, if you will forgive me, is not peanuts, and I suggest that $50,000 is too much money to be spent on a group that until now appears to have done nothing except advise the Prime Minister. The results of their work are presumably reflected in the rather regular speeches on this issue that the Prime Minister is making across the province. My only complaint is that he does not take a lead within this Legislature to provide an opportunity for members of this House to engage in what should be the great Canadian debate.

But could the Minister inform us, is there anything positive, specific, tangible, so to speak, that has emerged from the work of this committee and which might be made available so that we conceivably could benefit from the background studies and advice that is emerging here as well as from the hon. Prime Minister and other representatives of the government?

Hon. Mr. Randall: All I can say to the hon. member's question is, no, there has been no report published by this committee

for the public. It is my understanding that the advisory committee agreed to serve on the basis that they were advising the Prime Minister and their thoughts would not be published until they had been discussed with him in detail. I think the hon. Prime Minister, himself, could, if he were here this afternoon, give you more detail on that. As you appreciate, we operate this department to assist the Prime Minister in these discussions, but to the best of my knowledge these reports are not made public and there is no intention at the present time to make them public.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to voice a vigorous protest on it. I think that if $50,000 of public funds is being spent on an advisory committee, this House is entitled to know the areas in which this committee is now engaging in research. As I recall, the hon. Prime Minister on some occasion did list the number of topics in which various members of the committee, or other persons whom they were seconding, presumably in their universities from which they come, and so on, were preparing material, and I submit that we in the House are entitled to get some benefit from this too.

Maybe this gets into the actual work of the committee, rather than the mechanics of it, and the hon. Minister has not got the information right here at hand, but I reiterate, either to him or to the hon. Prime Minister, that so far this committee is an abortion of the democratic process. It is all very well to be setting up committees that are advising the hon. Prime Minister, but when you get a committee that is expending $50,000 of public funds, I submit that the public in general and the members of this Legislature are entitled to share in some of the benefits, if there are benefits; and indeed the committee has now been in existence, if I recall correctly, for two years. Surely something should be available at this point.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I will take note of the hon. member's suggestions. I am advised by the chief economist that most of these studies undertaken since February, 1965, when the committee was formed, are still under way, and we will take the hon. member's suggestions under consideration. I am quite sure that in discussion with the hon. Prime Minister we can meet you on a happier ground.

Mr. MacDonald: These studies seem to remind me of the government's centennial project. I wonder which centennial they are working towards.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 403 carried?

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on this I would also like to lodge as severe a criticism as I can. I think the chief economist is a bit like the Scarlet Pimpernel, you seek him here, you seek him there. Why the Minister of Economics and Development is having to answer for Confederation, and all the arrangements between the federal and provincial governments, I do not know, unless it is, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister feels he is not capable of answering.

We brought up the question of this Confederation committee before. We asked the hon. Prime Minister: Are these people just coming for a kind of scholastic tea party, or are they actually producing something? Knowing the calibre of some of the people, I can feel just how strongly they resent this blanket of conservatism that is covering them and suffocating them. Half of them are not Conservatives at all and they have been sucked into an approach where they are having to advise a government which cannot think up ideas for itself, and they resent it. What is more, what they resent is the secrecy with which they have to shroud themselves.

They are men with very able ideas. They want to speak out and get a dialogue right across Canada, and not have their ideas muzzled within the confines of some chambers here. And as well as that, the poor Minister of Economics and Development is asked to pilot an estimate, and take the brunt of criticism, when he is asked that we pass $50,000 for this committee. Why did not the hon. Prime Minister do it himself, under his estimates? We understand that he is meant to be the man who looks after Dominion-provincial relations. He is the fellow that goes up to Ottawa, but when it comes to the kind of hard look at what is taking place, he passes the buck over to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, so that he can answer for this.

We have not heard one iota of evidence that the Confederation committee is working on problems for the benefit of a dialogue between the federal government and Ontario, and knowing, as I say, some of the people who are on that committee, I am fully aware of the stature that they have, not only in the academic world, but across Canada, and I say again that they have resented the kind of approach, where they have been drawn in, and the suggestion has been made that they are meant to whisper ideas to the Prime Minister.

I will say something else again, that some of them feel he is not catching on to some of their ideas, and that this thing is just going to disintegrate unless he does catch on soon. They came in thinking that this was going to help, in the whole of this dialogue as we move towards the centennial, that we would have a Premier who would go up with all kinds of approaches towards Confederation. Many of them had come in because they had felt that the Premier in Quebec was the man who would be taking the limelight, who was shaping them and fashioning our approach to Confederation, Mr. Chairman, and the Premier of this province seemed to be struck dumb or unable to come forward with ideas. Because of this, I feel, in view of the fact that we have had to have some of the reports tabled and we have seen nothing, and because of this—and it seems to me there is still a shrouding of secrecy—and because all of us want to feel a pride in Confederation, a pride in ideas, and because of the kind of men who are on the committee, who want to be spreading their ideas across Canada, as I say, and not hidden within the Legislature somewhere, because of this, I move that:

The $50,000 in item 5 of vote 403, should be changed to $1.00.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Not on this item, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic to the motive at the back of this, and if this is the only way in which we can get some reply from this government, we will certainly go along with it. May I ask a number of questions in speaking to the amendment? Will the hon. Minister indicate, first, how many meetings of this committee were held in the last fiscal year, the fiscal year concluding March 31, and secondly, how does the government propose to spend this $50,000; what is the breakdown, how did you arrive at a budget of $50,000?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, on that point, there have been eight meetings held by the committee referred to, and I would also, before answering your latter question, like to suggest that, as individuals, these members can speak on their own behalf. But as a committee they themselves have asked the Prime Minister not to publish their works until they have agreed amongst themselves that it should be published. Now, some of the things that they are doing, some of the short papers they are preparing—here is one by Professor Bora Laskin on *The Province and International Agreements*—this is not a subject on which I think you can come up with a paper in a matter of a few weeks or even few months.

The other, *Supreme Court in a Bi-cultural Society*, by Professor Edward McWhinnie, again is one that takes a great deal of time. *Cultural Exchanges between Ontario and Quebec*, by Professor G. H. B. Symons, and the following short papers are *The Constitutional Monarchy and the Provinces* by Dr. Eugene Forsey, who I am sure the hon. member is familiar with, and *A Catalogue of Exchanges between English and French Canada* by Father Matte.

Now, all of these, I think we will have to agree, are lengthy subjects, ones that require a great deal of study. If the committee is going to put in any recommendation to this government that means anything, I am sure that we are not asking them for an off-the-cuff expression of opinion. I am sure that if the Prime Minister was here he would say the same, that this advisory body is not going to come up with a decision every day in the week such as I know the hon. members would like to see, but there has to be some study on these subjects. It is an entirely new field, I think it is broadening as we recognize the exchanges that take place between the provinces and the federal government.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is about 100 years old.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, perhaps it is, but more advice is going to be required, and the subjects that are being discussed here now—I am sure there are many more—would indicate that we are making progress. I am quite sure when the hon. Prime Minister is in the House you can discuss it, it does not have to be discussed in the vote. I am quite sure the Prime Minister will be glad to enlarge on what I have said here.

Answering your second question, honorariums amount to $20,000; research project $20,000; administration $5,000; and supervision of the research $5,000—that is the $50,000 that we are asking for.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale stood in his place. Was there something in advance of item 5 under vote 403?

Mr. Renwick: It was a general question about the office.

Mr. Chairman: Well, it could follow this amendment.

Mr. Thompson: Speaking on my amendment, I would like to say that I recognize

that the report will take some time, but my concern is that when we first suggested having a committee on Confederation, we thought it would be a committee that would embrace the Legislature. After all, we are just as much interested in Confederation as the Premier of the province. We had hoped that this committee would be a select committee to which there would be these advisors, very able men. They have this in Quebec and we see no reason why they should not have it in Ontario. We have asked the Premier of the province to make this a select committee which these advisors would help, but we have had no reply.

It is used simply for the ear of the Premier. The selection of the topics which are discussed and which the very able men research, is completely unknown to the rest of the Legislature, indeed to the province. One of the great tragedies, I think, in the whole area of Confederation has been the lack of confidence which the government has in the people. That is one of the reasons why your centennial project has become a farce and a joke around the province, apart from your inability to plan with respect to it.

But really, the whole situation of drawing people in to participate has never been recognized by the government. There are many people who would like to express their points of view, they would like to know some of the problems concerning Confederation; they would like to know what Ontario's position is. These people are throughout the public of Ontario, and we resent very much the lack of confidence that this government has in letting the people be informed. The democratic principle is that the people should be informed and participate.

My friend from Sudbury has talked of the enthusiasm and the zest with which 100 years ago we had political figures going across the provinces explaining what the problems were and the issues. This government today has to recognize that it has to open the doors, open the windows so that the public and the representatives other than government, the representatives of Opposition parties, have a right to express their points of view and get direction in the problems of Confederation.

I said that the reports will take some time, but what I believe is fundamental, that all sides of the Legislature should be participating in discussing the responsibilities and the problems of Confederation, and it is for that reason that I have moved my amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Before voting on the amendment, may I suggest to the member for Riverdale that he ask his question under the data processing section from 6 to 9, because the amendment before us comes under section 5.

The hon. leader of the Opposition has moved that:

> The $50,000 in item 5 under vote 403 be reduced to $1.00.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion that item No. 5 under vote 403 be reduced to $1.00, will please rise.

All those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" 46.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Now, under items 6, 7 and 8 of 403, we agreed that the member for Riverdale would ask his question there.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has stated that he has accepted and adopted for the province the goals of the economic council of Canada as reasonable targets for the whole of the province. I ask, is the office of the chief economist engaged in breaking down those goals on the basis of the ten economic regions in the province of Ontario, so that each region in the province will know what its goals and targets are in an overall Ontario plan to meet the objectives of the economic council of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the hon. member; no, we are not, we have not got around to breaking it into regions, we break it down for the province. We take the economic goals that the economic council of Canada put up and take our share in the province of Ontario. It is not unlikely, and certainly when our statistical centre is set up, undoubtedly we will be breaking much of it down into regions. I think it will be necessary.

Mr. Renwick: May I assume then, Mr. Chairman, that it is envisaged that the breakdown would take place, and that there would, in fact, be a statement of the goals for each of the ten economic regions in the province in due course?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It would not necessarily be goals. I think what it would be used for is to give us some indication of the problems in the area and the statistics as they apply to a certain portion in the area. From that, of course, I presume we will establish within our own framework in the province the potential that we think exists in each area; what we can do with it; what it needs in the way of priorities on financial assistance or research such as we discussed here this afternoon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, having to do with the vote on data processing, I am sure all the hon. members would agree that the computer systems and the data processing associated with it is becoming more and more important in every facet of our life, not only in the economic areas but in every other as well. We have heard announcements by a number of Ministers of the government referring to the fact that certain of their ministerial responsibilities were going to have data processing facilities for their assistance. Now, it is true of universities, school boards across Ontario, and it is equally true of this department here, it may well be that a good many of these services could be centralized by the government. I wonder if the Minister could give us a report as to the progress of centralizing the data processing throughout the government in his department.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I share the hon. member's concern on data processing. Having used some of the IBM equipment in my own business I know if you feed garbage in, you get garbage out. It is very essential in using this data processing equipment, being as expensive as it is, the most value you can get out of it is to make sure that what you put in brings out the answers you are looking for. Within the next 60 days, our economics department and the chief economist will be moving down to the Treasury building where some of the equipment is now available and where any added equipment required will be put into that same source.

There are some departments large enough, such as Highways and, I believe, The Department of Education, where there is sufficient work to require them to have their own data processing equipment. But what we will be doing in our department is the statistical work for the province. There may be some time on it available for other departments if they have some work they want us to do, but most of the work we will do there will be servicing other departments that do not have data processing equipment, plus looking after our own needs.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would say that there is no other single field of government acquisition as far as this type of machinery is concerned that is going to grow more rapidly in the years that lie immediately ahead. I would suggest that this Minister should have a comprehensive plan for providing data processing facilities for every department of government that might use it. The Minister of Education has announced several times that his facilities are going to be available to school boards across the province, and even in that area we find among individual school boards, that many of them are presently considering themselves large enough to buy this machinery and facilities themselves. I am not at all sure that we could not have this to a far greater extent centralized.

In this connection, it has been proposed in the House previously that this department might take on the responsibility for centralized purchasing for the other governmental departments. The Minister of Public Works suggested, when it was brought up during his estimates, that this department might be the proper home for such a plan. It has been proposed by competent authorities that money could be saved in the administration of Ontario in this way.

I would ask the Minister if this has been considered by his advisors in the office of the chief economist, and if, in fact, this might be carried out.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, first let me say that I think in my opening remarks in my speech I pointed out that we are going to put in coded classifications for a lot of the statistical work done for the government. Certainly I think most of it would be done by our department under the chief economist. So we can be of service to the other departments.

The Treasury department, of course, decide insofar as data processing equipment is concerned, where and who should use it, this is really under The Department of Treasury to decide what kind of equipment shall be purchased and where best it can be used. I am sure that the hon. Provincial Treasurer can give the hon. members more information on that when his estimates go through.

Insofar as the purchasing policy of the government is concerned, I might say that our department some time ago took a look at the purchasing policies of most of the

provinces with reference to the problem of preferential tariffs that seem to be creeping up periodically, and I might say that since that investigation a number of them have been dropped. Not all provinces, but a majority of provinces recognize that this is a detriment to their own economy.

The question of centralized purchasing is one that I think we will certainly have to take a look at. I am not too sure if it would fit this province just because it fits New Brunswick. I have heard lots of reasons why we should have centralized purchasing, but I have not heard any reasons yet given by anybody as to why we should have decentralized purchasing, or whether this is less costly than having centralized purchasing. It is one of those things I think has to be studied. Yes, I think we will be looking at centralized purchasing along with many other costs to the government and government services.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask through you to the Minister, who does the chief economist advise concerning Dominion-provincial conferences?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not hear.

Mr. Thompson: Does he advise the Prime Minister concerning Dominion-provincial conferences?

Mr. Chairman: Might I remind the leader of the Opposition that we are now dealing with data processing?

Mr. Thompson: It is under the data estimate.

Hon. Mr. Randall: When I am asked for information on matters pertaining to my particular department, yes, I advise the Prime Minister, but most of the information the Prime Minister requires he gets through the federal-provincial committee that we have, and that is what he goes to the conferences with, the information supplied through the office of the chief economist. We get the request from the Prime Minister's office for information that he requires, the chief economist in his branch with his staff prepare it, check it, and it goes to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Thompson: Could the Minister give me some idea of how much time, what proportion of the time, of the chief economist is spent on advising the Prime Minister; is it three-quarters, or what?

Mr. Chairman: I think the leader of the Opposition realizes that this question does not relate to data processing.

Mr. Thompson: No, this is very important, sir. As I say, this man to me represents the elusive Scarlet Pimpernel, I want to know just where he should be located.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is one of those $64 questions—I do not have the complete answer. I asked the man who knows; he said he spent some 20 to 25 per cent of his time on federal-provincial conference work and his staff spend the same amount of time preparing the reports for the Prime Minister.

Mr. Thompson: In view of the fact he is responsible to the Minister, does the Minister believe that there should be a federal-provincial office set up by this government over which the chief economist would be the superintendent or the director? I raise my question through you, sir,—

Mr. Chairman: Stay with the data processing, please.

Mr. Thompson: Through data processing—it is certainly a very important fact that one of the things that concerns all of us is the number of Dominion-provincial conferences that are taking place, and the fact that there needs to be a co-ordination on the part of both the provinces and the federal government today.

I have actually a list here of the number of conferences coming up in the next six months, and it seems to me that to have a co-ordinated approach on the part of the government there needs to be a centralized office. You could have a situation of the Minister of Health going up to Ottawa and taking one point of view which could be in disagreement with the Minister of Public Welfare, with reference to the Indians; there should be a central office.

In view of the fact that the chief economist, I might say, if I could, Mr. Chairman, when I refer to him as a Scarlet Pimpernel I do so with a great deal of respect for him. I happen to have the privilege of knowing some of his colleagues and some of his acquaintances, of both sexes, and they have a great deal of respect for him and for his ability.

I think that this man could co-ordinate this approach, if the Minister believes that there should be a Dominion-provincial bureau in this government.

Mr. Chairman: I know the leader of the Opposition has told the House the importance of observing certain rules of the House, and I know he would not want to break them in-

tentionally. I will ask him then, if he will, to stay with the data processing.

Mr. Thompson: May I just reassure you, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that you get data, you have to collect it in some sort of office, and my argument is that it should be collected within a Dominion-provincial office.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am sorry, I would like to get the hon. Minister's reaction to this.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be glad to answer the question. I think what we have now is exactly what you are asking for. We have a department called federal-provincial affairs secretariat, in which the chief economist is a director of that department, with five people. One of the tasks is administration of the economic planning branch; a co-ordinator is to be appointed. There is research on federal-provincial affairs co-ordinating provincial activities for federal-provincial conferences and staff work for the Ontario advisory committee on Confederation.

This staff, under the direction of the chief economist himself, is already doing something; I think it is just a matter of changing the name, to meet the request you have suggested.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate the hon. Minister explaining this. Just for my own mind, to clarify it: If the Minister of Reform Institutions was going to Ottawa to meet with the Minister of Justice, if there was a Dominion-provincial conference on reforms, would this be co-ordinated through the chief economist's office?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If he required information from the chief economist to hold this meeting in Ottawa and be prepared to discuss with the federal authorities the matters before him, yes, he could co-ordinate with the chief economist on all these matters. Many of the programmes that have been put forward, the legislation that has been put forward this year, has been as a result of some of the discussions held and the work done by the department and then given to the various departments in government.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. Minister, in view of the fact that obviously the whole structure of Dominion-provincial conferences, as far as Ontario's participation is concerned, comes through the office of the chief economist, who is responsible to the Minister? Could the Minister give me his point of view concerning open conferences, Dominion-provincial open conferences? Does he believe they should be open to the public?

Mr. Chairman: Is this still under data processing?

Mr. Thompson: Very much so, because we do not find any data that takes place.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a question that only the hon. Prime Minister would be able to answer. I am not in a position to say whether we should or should not. I think the Prime Minister has already made a statement with reference to having the press available at the conferences and I think that it is his prerogative to make a decision, in his jurisdiction, whether or not he could have an open public meeting when the conference is on. I think the Prime Minister has already indicated that he is in favour of that.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the Minister, when we start discussing the chief economist and the man who co-ordinates Ontario's role in Dominion-provincial conferences, the chief economist comes under the Minister of Economics and Development, and yet when we ask about a policy statement concerning Dominion-provincial conferences, the Minister tells us we should ask the Prime Minister. Now, why should not the office of the chief economist be under the Prime Minister? Could you express to me why it is under your department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the question is a simple one as far as I am concerned. The chief economist is a civil servant. A Minister has to answer for him in the House, as I am doing this afternoon. As we said a few minutes ago, he spends 25 per cent of his time working in the interests of the federal-provincial conferences, which are gathered by the Prime Minister. The other 75 per cent he is working with other departments, and I think as far as the working department is concerned this is where the chief economist should be. If he was not here, I presume he would be under Treasury.

Mr. Thompson: I just raised the point, Mr. Chairman. This may be completely unfair, but the hon. Minister is a man who is used to administration. I would suggest there are some who have felt that perhaps the chief economist, a person of very rare and able ability, seems to have been lost in the shuffle, because I would think that with the ideas he has somewhere we would see rays of light coming through on the part

of the government, and somehow they are not.

Perhaps one of the reasons has been that it is a house divided, as far as this province is concerned.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure the leader of the Opposition wants to get back to the vote under discussion.

Mr. Thompson: —that he has 25 per cent of his time with one department and 75 per cent with the other, and I think that administratively this is tough on the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I think it is also tough on the chief economist.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me tell you, sir, that the chief economist is a man of strong opinions. But I have also found him a man who can have his opinion changed if you can do a good job of selling. I am sure that we have a very happy combination in our department, working in the interests of the hon. Prime Minister in this department.

Vote 403 agreed to.

On vote 404:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister introduced the bill setting up the Ontario development corporation, he gave a very full statement of what his intentions were with respect to that corporation. I would like to ask him whether in future years he could assure us that the Ontario development corporation would be a matter which would be dealt with under his estimates, because my understanding is that as that corporation will be a share capital corporation, in which the shares will be owned by the province, there will not likely be appropriations in future years to be included in his estimates. Therefore, unless we have that assurance we will not know at what time we will have an opportunity in this assembly to discuss affairs related to that corporation.

Mr. Chairman: I suppose there is no reason why the Minister could not answer this question. I would remind the member for Riverdale that there is not any corporation money in this vote.

Mr. Renwick: The reason I asked the question was that in his statement he clearly stated that the affairs of the Ontario development agency, that portion of its business affairs, will now be taken over by the Ontario development corporation, and it will be the continuing body in the future. I was concerned that either the Ontario development agency will disappear, or certain of its functions will no longer be a matter for debate in his estimates.

I would like that assurance, if he would give it to us.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I can give the hon. member assurance that the Ontario development agency's activities of the past and its obligations and its assets, if any, will be transferred to the corporation and will be answered for by this department. As far as I know, and I have talked to the hon. Prime Minister, there is no intention of taking the corporation out of The Department of Economics and Development, because first of all, it supplements many of the other departments we are operating, such as our trade and industry branch. And there would not be much use of taking it out of here and putting it in some other department, because we make perhaps more use of it than anybody else. We are in contact with the industrial commissioners, the municipalities who require the services the corporation can give, and I would think it would be unlikely that it would ever be taken out of this department.

Mr. Renwick: That was not quite my point. The point I wanted to be certain of is not that it would go to another department, but since there will not be appropriations, it would not appear in the estimates, and it would fall, as I understand it, somewhat in the category, say, of the liquor licence board, or the workmen's compensation board. It would have to be dealt with by agreement with the hon. Minister that it will be dealt with at all under his estimates.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Everybody in the department, the people operating the department, are civil servants and the government own all the shares in the corporation. I can assure you that it is going to operate as a department of this government and will be answered for by us, regardless of what happens in the future. We have no intention, whatsoever, of changing it to a separate corporation or a commission. It will be operated by civil servants and we have also pointed out earlier, when we introduced the legislation, that the superannuation funds are involved and paid for through the corporation.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions about the Ontario development agency. I wonder if, with your permission and that of the hon. Minister, I could just read off these questions and if he could answer them all at one time rather than asking just one and waiting for an answer to it.

My first question is: What were ODA's loss rates last year? I raise this because it ranged in former years, as I understand it, around three per cent or four per cent, which is high.

Ottawa's industrial development bank has a lower loss rate and it is generally thought to be too cautious. It is felt that Ontario should strive for a little higher loss rate than the private banks and I agree that it cannot be too generous because, after all, it is investing the public money.

The second question is: What research has ODA done in troublesome financing areas? Little work has been done in Canada on this subject and many experts feel that there is a financing gap. A very small company, on the whole, does not have too much trouble getting money, nor does a large one. I have talked to the Minister about a couple of companies which he has been good enough to look into for me, but I am referring really to medium sized firms who do have trouble getting financial help and ODA is in a good position to get some good facts on dislocations in Canada's capital market. I think it should report yearly on this matter to the public.

My next question is: Why does ODA not have more regional offices? I have raised this before. The north, for example, has real difficulty in getting some kinds of loans.

My next question is: What has ODA done to help tourist operators and why does it not help farmers?

My next question is: It has been argued that many family-owned firms in Canada sell out to Americans because they have trouble paying estate tax. What research has been done in this field and what answers, if any, do we have?

I think we have discussed this in a previous vote, but I wonder if ODA has done an investigation of American and foreign takeovers of firms in Ontario; I wonder whether it has ever considered making a yearly report to the public on these takeovers. There is a lot of talk about it. I was interested when I raised the question with the hon. Minister about whether he felt that subsidiaries should have to make a public annual statement. He said the hon. Attorney General is now getting in legislation to do this, but we really do not have too many facts concerning subsidiaries and American takeovers.

The next thing I am interested in—and I have done this myself and I am sure that the Minister has—I have had people come to me needing financial help and I know of a number of public-spirited businessmen who are now retired but interested in helping anyone who they feel has real drive and a good idea, and the energy to develop it. I am sure there are a number of these people—I do not want to mention anyone in particular, but I am sure that the Minister knows, as well as I know, a number of prominent Canadians who are still keen to see our economy growing and are keen to help someone who has ideas, and I wonder why ODA does not keep a list of Canadians who are willing to gamble on young firms. It gets to be a very useful function.

One young manufacturer said to me that —I will put it this way—we need a list of Canadian crap shooters, fellows who are willing to take a chance and there are a lot of them in Canada. But no one has taken the trouble to put their name on it so far.

My next question is: How many firms has ODA brought along? I would like to compare this with the number of American subsidiaries the province encouraged to come to Canada last year.

The other point we raised last year is that a good many of the experts on ODA's board are retired bankers. From my own experience, and perhaps they do it with great wisdom, I have always found bankers to be somewhat cautious, and I wonder if we should not have some younger business analysts and accountants on the board. Has this already been done?

The other point is that it has been estimated privately by people working at ODA, who have worked and gone to ODA with requests, that the $7 million proposed for the corporation is good for about 100 loans, and it will last about three months. What kind of development corporation is this? The Minister has argued that the $7 million will be a kind of vaulting account—money is paid back and it will be loaned out again. I question this. One of the purposes of the corporation is to give long-term financing and this cannot be turned over quickly.

I wonder about the business advice—and this is my next question to the Minister. I have heard that the business advice given amounts to three-hour chats and a few books,

and I would like to know how often ODA put a man in a plant and for how long?

My next question is, Would the Minister be good enough to tell us, on a region-by-region basis, what loans he made last year? This is another point raised with me. It has been argued that ODA should be keeping track of big development projects. For example, it might go north to examine a small food processing plant. The plant itself might not be a paying proposition, but it might operate if the land nearby was drained so that they could use it for agriculture. And ODA should make a public report and pass this information on to the appropriate department. In other words, ODA's investigators should try, in some cases, to go beyond a single project.

My last question to the Minister is: When the Canadian development corporation comes into operation what role will ODA assume?

Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I think I listed most of the questions the hon. leader of the Opposition asked. He first of all asked about the loss rate this year. There were no losses this year.

He talked about research in financing. In almost every case when people make an application for money we have to ask them for an audited balance sheet so that we can assess for ourselves the condition of the applicant's finances before we can decide what kind of money he requires. And I might say, again using the IDB as an example, that if a man wanted $5,000 or $10,000 he would probably make an application for $5,000 in order to take care of his immediate creditors and they would lock up all his security. Then he would find that he had no operating capital. He would come to the agency and we, in many instances, have had to put up the $5,000 without any collateral because IDB would not move off their position.

Otherwise, we would have to pay off IDB to give the man the working capital he requires. So there is quite a lot of research into almost every application for the money that is advanced, and this is absolutely essential if we want to make sure the money does what we would like it to do and there is at least a 40-60 chance of making a success of the operation and getting payment.

The hon leader of the Opposition asked about regional offices.

We do not have any regional offices, sir, but we have been holding symposiums for the Ontario development associations in many parts of Ontario over the last year. I believe, if I am correct, that there have been nine or ten meetings in various parts of Ontario explaining the services and the consulting services and the financing arranged by the Ontario development agency.

As far as the tourist operators are concerned, I think I mentioned in my report to the House that we had consulted with more than 300 tourist operators. We were not set up primarily, as I think my friend will recall, to finance tourist operators. Again, I might suggest to him that this is one of the difficult areas to finance because many of the small tourist operators are in trouble because they took on two or three mortgages. They have no capital of their own to start, and they are in difficulty getting their business organized because it is a family operated affair as a rule. They do not pay themselves any wages, they have not got a proper bookkeeping system, and as you know, last year we developed a set of books for the tourist operators which have been widely accepted.

I think it has done a better job than the tourist association to acquaint them with the fact that you just do not walk in, take on the mortgage and hope that you are going to have good weather and have paying guests. Under this new development corporation, with funds available on a different basis, yes, I think there are going to be opportunities for the tourist operators. Also, I think that ARDA funds are being used in some provinces to assist tourists in some areas, and we are looking at that. We have just had discussions with the Minister of Agriculture as well for our ODA department here with reference to ARDA funds that would available to assist in tourist recreational areas.

Mr. Thompson: Would you handle those for ARDA?

Hon. Mr. Randall: At the moment I do not know. We are looking to see where ARDA funds will go. The first we heard about the ARDA funds being used for this purpose was down in Quebec and when that came to my attention we started investigating to see how far ARDA funds could be used to assist small operators.

Next, we have no report through the Ontario development corporation on firms being taken over by Americans or bought out. I am sure those figures could be made available. We do not keep track of them here, and insofar as family companies selling out, we recently made, for our information, a survey as to what reasons families have for selling out. Most of them, of course, sell out not entirely because of succession duties, but

if they are running a successful business, somebody comes along and offers them the right price and they take it, whether it be Canadian or foreign.

The hon. leader made a comment on the type of consultants we have. We shall have in the development corporation, 25 consultants, which is an increase of seven over last year, to help with this new work of the Ontario development corporation now that it is going to take on the work of the agencies plus the new programme for the corporation.

We have two legal men attached to the corporation, we have four financial analyists, and thirteen clerical people for a total of 44.

If we were to undertake some of the work that my friend suggested we would have to have a lot more staff. I do not think this is required because much of the information you have asked for this afternoon, I think we could get from other departments. It is also fed to the Ontario development corporation.

The matter of the bankers on the staff: No, we have only two bankers. Out of 25 there are only two bankers and I am informed by the director that these two bankers have arranged most of the outside financing for people who come to us assuming that they could not borrow money on private sources. But after we have had a chance to look at their balance sheets, and set up contacts for outside private financing, we have been able to get financing for them.

Then your comment on the $7 million being used up in three months: I think this is rather an exaggeration. We do not believe from the experience we have had, plus the number of loans that have been applied for under the development agency and checking with the loans system of other provinces, that the $7 million would be used up in the first three months. I would think perhaps it would be more like the first year, or the first two years. We are looking at it on the basis that $7 million will be available to get the corporation organized. If we need more money, there are two places we can go. If we have sufficient assets we can borrow on the open market, guaranteed by the Treasury on bonds or debentures. We also have available to us the guaranteed portion that now exists with the Ontario development agency, so if it is a matter of guaranteeing we can still guarantee as well as use the cash that the corporation has available.

I think one of the other questions was about the time that we consult with the client. It depends on how quickly the client will come up with the information requested for us, on which we can make a decision. I think the hon. leader knows we have had some people apply who then got lost for some reason or other. Then they came back and said, "Well, I went to the agency and I did not get any money." We asked them why they did not present a balance sheet, and they said they did not have the money to pay an auditor, or the auditor said: "You have to wait until the end of next month."

These are some of the reasons why it may take some time for people to get their loans through, or their guarantees through, but the length of time we spend with any one applicant can vary anywhere from perhaps a week to three months. At the present time we are running a pilot project up in the Soo. We have taken two or three companies into the fold; consultants go up there every month and are watching the progress of these small companies and we have been doing this since January.

Again, we are using that as a pilot project to see what else we can do for smaller industries in any part of the province. One of the most successful programmes we have comprises the on-the-job symposia we have with people like Hayes Wheel and Foundry over here in Welland. We went over there the other day; we took in 24 or 25 small businessmen around there and Hayes Wheel executive management sat down with our people for the whole day and explained what happened to their balance sheet.

A few years ago, I think, they were losing something like $1.2 million a year. I knew them when I was in business as being quite a heavy loser in the casting business. Today, I think, if you look at their recent statements, they are one of the most successful companies in the automobile parts business. They were good enough to open their doors and talk to the small businessmen we took in there, about their problems, and how they overcame them. We are doing more of this than we have done in the past, and perhaps this is a programme where we can be of greater service, and more practical service to the small businessman. We believe there are a certain number of small businessmen who are not academic.

They can read and write and count to ten and give change for a dollar, but it is awfully hard for them to go to a classroom and listen to a professor tell them how to run their business. However, if they sit down with a competent businessman who points out the liabilities and the assets and the things they have to do, sir, he can relate it to his own

business; this has been a very successful programme. Now, if I have not covered all the questions I will be glad to get up again.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate very much, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's thoroughness in covering a number of the questions. I did ask him, whether he could tell us, region by region, the basis for the loans that he made last year.

I had also made the point that when ODA might move into a certain area—and I gave the example of a small food processing plant —they may have a look at an area and say, "Well, I do not think this is such a hot field because there is agricultural land around," and yet if they took a broader approach they might feel the region could get a new spark in its economy if there was a broad frontal attack such as clearing a swamp area, and then setting up a processing plant.

In other words, ODA investigators should try to go beyond a single project, and I asked if they do this. My third question was about the Canadian development corporation. When it comes into operation, what role will ODA assume?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have the breakdown available.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister—perhaps it would make it easier. What I am really after is: Are there any regions, any economic regions, where there has not been a loan made?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Where there have not been loans made?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I think in practically all regions since the development agency was formed, provincial guarantees have been approved. For instance, in eastern Ontario we have approved over $350,000; in northwestern Ontario, $320,000; Georgian bay, $280,000; Lake Ontario, $140,000; northeastern, $50,000; midwestern, $55,000; Niagara, $550,000; Lake Erie, $320,000; Lake St. Clair, $600,000; and Metropolitan Toronto—that would be in that 50-mile radius there, $2,180,000—for a total of $4,845,000 since the agency was formed. There is a pretty wide geographic representation and we do not know where the applicants are going to come from, but I think you will find from this that there is a pretty wide geographic application for funds. I would like to point out right now that perhaps one of the most effective things we have done in setting up the agency is that we have had people come to us and tell us what their problems are before they go down the drain, and this I think is where the agency can do more for small industry than just hanging up a pawnshop sign saying, "Come and get money." That is one reason in the last few years, the last year particularly, why we have been giving more advisory service and less funds have been required, because I think we have headed off some of the difficulties that the small businesses were getting into in 1963 in the tight-money period.

Vote 404 agreed to.

On vote 407:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I had a number of remarks to make under housing and may I at the start say that we are all aware of the tough problem for many people concerning housing. I just take a clipping which was dated February 16, 1966, from the Toronto *Daily Star.* It says "Welfare families in unfit homes."

> A survey shows 682 of the 1,834 Toronto families on welfare live in buildings that violate health or safety regulations.

It goes on to describe the fact that 177 have unsatisfactory toilet facilities; 377 have unsatisfactory washing facilities; some having no tub, some having no sink.

Recognizing this, sir, I would like to dwell a little bit on the Ontario housing corporation. Mr. Chairman, the Ontario housing corporation has done good work in some fields and it has also been involved in some muddles, but in fairness it has not always been of its own making. The legislation setting up the housing corporation was proclaimed in August of 1964 and I would like to go back on this a bit just so that we can clarify this situation to the people of Ontario.

It was set up in 1964, but the corporation did not really start work until November of that year. At this time, Mr. Chairman, some misconception started which, I think, has plagued the corporation to this day. For one thing, it was called "Ontario housing czar," which it is not, and for another, it appeared as though the corporation had taken over a Metro Toronto organization, the Metro Toronto housing authority.

Metro Toronto housing authority was largely a provincial body to begin with; it was one of the management authorities set up by the province to manage public housing projects. The authority's board has federal, provincial and Metro representatives on it and it has to submit its budget to the prov-

ince's housing branch. But the authority has the power to hire and fire employees. Windsor's housing authority is very similar to the old Metro Toronto housing authority.

I have gone into this in some detail because a good deal of confusion exists concerning public housing in the Metro area. At present, there are three main organizations working in the area; the OHC, the city of Toronto housing authority and the city of Toronto Limited Dividends Housing Company. The city of Toronto housing authority is responsible for Regent Park North, the Limited Dividends Company looks after Moss Park, Greenwood, the Donald Somerville project, and others; and the Toronto housing authority and Limited Dividends Company have the same board and the same staff. At the moment, the city does not have any projects under construction in the public housing field.

And the question has arisen, should the Ontario housing corporation step in and take over Toronto housing authority and Limited Dividends Company? In my opinion, it should seriously consider such a step. There are some arguments against such a takeover. For one thing, it has not been done before. And here I reiterate that the Metro housing authority was largely a provincial body at the outset as well as the housing corporation. It would have to purchase Toronto's equity in the housing authority and the Limited Dividends Company, to be using up funds that might be used to add to the total stock of public housing in the area.

But there are strong arguments for a takeover. I am personally in favour of a takeover. It will eliminate what some consider to be a redundant executive setup and streamline procedures. It would add to the flexibility of the housing corporation because it would have a wider range of housing in which to place families. It would make public housing easier for the man on the street to understand.

As far as I am concerned, there is a great deal of confusion concerning these three agencies. It would simplify the rates charged for public housing. At present Regent Park North charges rents geared to income but its schedule is different from that of the Ontario housing corporation. All the rest of the city's housing is full recovery, which means another set of rates. It would simplify qualification procedures. At present, the Ontario housing corporation does not have any resident qualifications, but to get into a city house you must have been a resident of the city for a certain length of time. It would cut red tape in urban redevelopment.

And I would like to expand a bit on the last reason, particularly since Napier Place has been so much in the news lately. Some of the hon. members know, and the hon. Minister knows because I have discussed it with him, that redevelopment projects still have to go through a fairly complicated process before the bulldozers get into the ground. And I would like to summarize the procedure. First, a municipality must draw up an urban renewal report, a word picture that defines the area and says something about the people and the housing already there. If there is no report, then there is no action. Second, this report goes to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the federal Minister responsible for central mortgage and housing. It is easy to point out that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is the man responsible for renewal projects in this province and that the Ontario housing corporation has not been involved to this point.

The third point is the project meets federal and provincial requirements, the Minister of Municipal Affairs designates it as an area for redevelopment and the municipality usually at this stage goes to the Ontario municipal board to ratify its expropriation bylaw. The scheme itself is drawn up and it should be noted that section 23 of The National Housing Act requires that persons displaced by renewal projects must be given decent, safe, sanitary accommodation at a fair and reasonable price. And you would think this would be one of the concerns of the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs, which works with the municipalities in outlining the public housing scheme.

Once this scheme has been approved all around it goes to The Department of Economics and Development, which looks after the public housing contents—and I would like to come back to Napier Place. Napier Place is partly a renewal project and to a lesser extent a rehabilitation project. About 140 units of public housing are involved. In the Toronto city planning board's redevelopment scheme, which is being done in The Department of Municipal Affairs, in the early stages of the project, is this observation, and I quote:

> Expert information has not been collected on the total number of persons and the size of the families to be rehoused. This information will have to be collected by a door-to-door survey.

And at another point the report says:

> Precise information of family composition, income, place of work, is not available.

This information, Mr. Chairman, was not available in the early stages of the project, when the city was seeking the approval of the province and the federal government. What is more important? The urban renewal section of the community planning branch apparently made very little effort to see that the information was collected after the scheme was approved by Ottawa and Queen's Park. By comparison, Ottawa has now put forward a scheme for the redevelopment of a section of Lower Town and it contains very precise information about the people in the area. I believe that much of the trouble in Napier Place could have been avoided if a decent survey had been taken.

There is another problem. Many of the people of Napier Place first learned about the redevelopment project when they got an expropriation notice in the mail. They apparently learned nothing from the experiences in James Town. There a large number of families were suddenly told in June last year, that they would have to get out by the end of December. A series of public meetings should be held before people suddenly get expropriation notices in the mail.

Then there is the problem of expropriation in Napier Place. This, it should be pointed out, is not really the problem of the Ontario housing corporation. I want to be fair on this. But I think it is the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, under The Expropriation Procedures Act. Briefly it should be pointed out that Ontario has too many expropriation authorities. There are about 2,000, and the rights of the individual are not always protected. We should have one authority for expropriation and there should be provisions for adequate hearings, independent assessments should be available to persons threatened with expropriation, as well as expert legal advice. You can do no more. The people are being paid due compensation in Napier Place, according to The Expropriation Procedures Act. But there is however, a very real problem. Napier Place has some good homes, but their value is depressed by the poorer houses around them. A house, for example, in Etobicoke, will often cost more than the same kind of house in Napier Place, because the surroundings are better in Etobicoke.

A special kind of person has been hurt by the Napier Place expropriations. I am not so concerned about roomers, or people who have been in homes for only a few months, and have hardly an equity in them, or land speculators who may have bought homes in the area. The person who is really getting hurt is the older person, who owns his home. These people are past the age when they can start life all over again. It has been argued that the government should give these people more for their homes, and I quote one lawyer. He states that the courts have interpreted the words "due compensation" in the Ontario Act, to mean value to the owner.

> Therefore it can be argued that the owner of a house should be paid for his home at least as much as it would cost him to purchase another house elsewhere in the city. Market value is not the test.
>
> In my opinion the true test is the value to the owner and this test requires the expropriator to pay an owner as much as he would pay, as a prudent man, rather than lose his house.

In other words, what the lawyer is arguing is that the amount given should represent the true value to the owner of the house, not the value to the expropriator. At the very least the government should immediately make available low-cost conditional loans to the older citizens who own their houses in Napier Place. If a person dies before the loan is paid, the government might consider some kind of forgiveness clause to cover this. I would like to stress this, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister.

I would like now to turn to urban renewal generally in the province. At present, in the whole of Ontario, only two urban renewal projects are under construction. In Alexandra Park in Toronto, a princely 47 houses will be ready by the end of this year. In Ottawa, there are 104 units in the present urban renewal project which are going to be ready the end of October.

I cannot say that this is really a shattering record. In the whole of Ontario, there is only one urban renewal project that has gained approval and is actively being designed, and that is Napier Place. But in Ontario there are two urban renewal projects that have just gained approval, and they are both in Toronto. There is Trefan Court with 250 units and Sackville Place with about 130 units.

I would like to suggest a number of things to speed up the whole urban renewal process.

First, the urban renewal section of the community planning branch should be brought into the Ontario housing corporation, and I think we have suggested this earlier in

the estimates. At one time this section was a part of the housing branch. There seems to be no reason why the same agency should not check the feasibility of development projects, as well as finance and build them.

Second, there is an urgent need for a complete survey of housing in many urban areas, particularly in Metro Toronto. The housing corporation says in a report on Toronto housing, and I quote:

> It is apparent that the time has come for a sophisticated appraisal of current need and demand involving detailed market research into the general area of housing for modest income families and single persons. No housing agency, commission, or group, existing in Metro Toronto today can provide this information or has even made a serious attempt to estimate the quantity of housing required, to say nothing of the kind or the location, the density and the staging thereof.

That is the end of the quote from the housing corporation report.

This survey should be done by the Metro Toronto planning board, but failing that, it should be done by the Ontario housing corporation itself. Without proper surveys we are operating in a vacuum. We can get no ideas or priorities and we cannot stage our projects properly.

Third, the Ontario housing corporation should initiate urban renewal projects and not in all cases wait for the municipality to act. Under The Housing Development Act, the housing corporation has the power to do urban renewal. So far as I know, it has never exercised this power, to initiate projects and to get them rolling, and I may say that this summer, in looking at The Housing Development Act, I was very impressed with it.

I think it gives all the opportunity for really getting on with the job.

My fourth point is that there is going to have to be closer co-operation and co-ordination in urban renewal. Let me give an example here.

In Victoria, Australia, the state housing corporation has complete control of urban development, and does all the urban renewal projects for the municipalities.

In Ontario it is still possible for a municipality to get federal financing under The National Housing Act without going to Ontario housing corporation. It is unlikely to do so because it will have to pick up the province's share of the cost of such projects. But it is still possible.

You also have limited dividend building and private contractors in the urban renewal field. If all these people start going off on a tangent, then we are in trouble. There will be tremendous problems in the reallocation area alone. Obviously the community planning branch and the Ontario housing corporation are going to have to co-ordinate urban renewal efforts.

I would like to take a look at another aspect of the corporation's work, Mr. Chairman, and that is the purchase of existing housing. From January 1, 1965 until the present, the corporation has bought 1,388 homes in Metro, most of them in suburbs such as Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough, and the reason for the concentrated buying in the suburbs is simply that housing is easier to purchase in these locations.

Developers have built a great many maisonettes and town houses in these suburbs. In Metro, in the past year, the corporation has purchased about 200 single homes. In other words, they specialized in buying town houses or housing developments. The average price of the single homes has been $15,000, with about $500 an average for repairs, and this is under the corporation's authority to pay $18,000 for an existing house.

I have some words of caution about the corporation's purchasing policies. I think it should keep in mind its original policy of scattering public housing through existing developments. We do not want any more public housing ghettos. While I realize that it is difficult to buy existing housing in Toronto, I think it should make an effort to do so because many people prefer to live in the city, rather than in the suburbs, with all due respect to the hon. members who represent the suburbs.

Another reason to purchase as much housing in the city as possible is that the homes in the city are often larger than those in the suburbs and consequently are better for families with many children. The corporation seems to make a lot of use of what are called builder's proposals. In this technique, the corporation buys the land, puts the project out for tender and finances the acceptable proposal. A difference in two main ways from OHC-built housing. The builder does his own design work under a builder proposal and he has to negotiate himself with the municipality involved. In Metro, builder proposals account for a large amount of the housing the corporation hopes to see eventually finished.

In various stages, there are 350 units in Etobicoke; 306 in North York; 924 in Toronto; 340 in Scarborough, and 211 in York township. In the city of Toronto builder proposals account for, as I have said, 924 units. On its own, the corporation is building 47 units at Alexandra Place, designing 623 others at Alexandra and Napier Place, with 380 units at Trefan and Sackville still up in the air. The corporation has to be careful that the standard of design of builder proposals is as high as it is in their own projects. By that I mean it should not leave them to the mercies of some local council. The builders in question may hit some road blocks at the local level. It is not enough for the corporation, in my view, to say, we have approved the project; the municipality is responsible for holding it up.

The hon. Minister and the OHC should get behind these projects and give them all the moral support they can. Outside Metro Toronto the OHC has purchased 392 existing units as of March 31, 928 with others being built or just completed, and this I do not think anyone is going to argue. I do not think this has made a tremendous dent in the poor housing accommodation in some of our cities or in the rural slums.

In Hamilton in the past year the OHC has completed 46 family units; 40 units for senior citizens and has a 146-unit senior citizens' apartment tower under way. Windsor has fared better with 205 units under construction, and 141 are under way and designs are being completed for 216 large land assembly schemes in the works.

From the figures I have, to an extent Windsor is ahead of other areas. But across the province, including Metro Toronto, the OHC total programme is 11,130 units and that includes all those that are bought, built or under construction and being designed and it remains to be seen how many of the 11,130 will actually be up by this time next year.

Much more has to be done for areas outside Metro Toronto. The OHC apparently does not have the jurisdiction to do anything about housing on Indian reserves, and it should.

Urban renewal, apart from a small project in Ottawa, has hardly got off the ground outside Metro and this is a shame. Metro Toronto is not the only place in Ontario with slum clearance problems. I realize that OHC is not entirely to blame for this situation, but the hon. Minister cannot sit back and blame the system. If the system is wrong, press for changes. The Ontario housing corporation has done very little about the rehabilitation of housing, a crucial problem, because it is often easier and less expensive to catch a neighbourhood before it becomes run down completely and has to be bulldozed to the ground.

A little rehabilitation is being done in Alexandra Park—about 20 houses so far—and some are planned, I understand, for Napier Place. But the total in Toronto amounts to just about nothing, and outside Toronto it amounts to less than nothing.

About the only project that I can find is one in the north end of Hamilton and the Minister will correct me on this, if I am not right. The only project that I can find is in the north end of Hamilton and there the OHC arranged for the painting of four houses. I would like to make these proposals for urban rehabilitation.

First, the province must offer more encouragement for owners to spruce up their houses. The federal government offers home improvement loans and technically these loans can be paid back over 10 years. In actual fact, they must be secured by a mortgage after five years. So far as most persons are concerned, they amount to a short-term personal loan. Additional low-cost financing from the province is required.

Second, the province must see that persons who improve their houses are not penalized with heavy additional assessment.

Third, OHC must take a more active role in tearing down the odd rotten house to put in a park or a playground.

Fourth, the city and the province together must do something to control blockbusting, the technique of speculators who buy a few houses in an area, then let them run down in an effort to change zoning regulations and then be able to buy other houses in the area at cheap prices.

And I wanted to speak about housing for middle-income groups. I think particularly today with the problem of getting mortgages, this is a group that has been hit pretty hard as far as housing is concerned. First, the OHC is geared to income rates and this is not completely satisfactory. The gearing they have on these income rates, it has a minimum rate of $50 a month, which in some cases might be too high for a family. I think this end of the scale should be more flexible.

At the high end of the scale, the rates increase very quickly. For example, a person with an income of $4,800 pays 30 per cent of his income in rent and a person with $5,748 pays 31.3 per cent. I understand that

the Minister has made representation to Ottawa to modify this scale and I hope it is substantially modified. Middle-income families in this respect have a very real problem. In many cases, they simply cannot afford to buy a house. Actually, at a meeting I was at last night two people came up to me, one a school teacher, who cannot afford to buy a house because of the problem of financing.

In Metro, figures show that it costs on an average about $24,000 to $26,000 to buy a new home and about $18,000 to get a resale house. Decent mortgages in some cases are almost impossible to get today. I realize this is partially a result of the federal government's anti-inflation policy.

Central mortgage and housing money is difficult to get for private homes, but I understand the federal government has given the green light to OHC for as much public housing as it can produce—and the Minister may correct me if I am wrong on this. As quickly as possible, Mr. Chairman, the province should urge the federal government for easier mortgages on new and resale houses. If the present dislocation in the housing market exists for long, it is going to jeopardize the whole future of public housing. If a person with a middle income cannot buy his own house, he may start to question such things as the four or five housing projects in Metro with swimming pools. I think he would be narrow-minded if he did that but I can still see him doing it. It is obvious that the building trades in Metro have a certain capacity, a capacity which at the present time is practically fully utilized. In this circumstance, every time OHC buys an existing house, it means one less house for a private buyer. It is apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the province and the federal government cannot wait long before taking steps to ease the cost of mortgages and make more available in order to increase the total housing stock available in this area. Middle income people in centres outside Toronto are in a particular bind, Mr. Chairman. In many centres in the north a salary of $4,800 a year is not uncommon, but housing in these centres is often very expensive. Many of the families have a large number of children. Extending the subsidized rates would greatly help these people.

Just a word, Mr. Chairman, on rent certificates: In 1965-66 the OHC budgeted $75,000 for this plan but in 1966-67, this has been cut to $4,000. Under this much-sponsored plan—and the Minister was not in the House when we saw this being produced by his predecessor, and believe me, there were editorials about it. I think he did this for a couple of years, and there were editorials each time to say that it was a new, dynamic approach. The editors had not looked to see that he had just gone through the same parade the year before. But anyway, under this vaunted plan, the OHC leased property from private owners and rented it out to persons on a geared-to-income basis. One could only conclude from the estimates that the programme was a failure, a failure because the OHC was being gouged by private owners. I would like to get an answer to that from the hon. Minister.

A word also on grants for housing research: In 1965-66 there was $120,000 budgeted for this. In 1966-67 it is only $40,000. And one reason for the drop may be that the department has dropped its research into termites. I think research was being done on termites in the east end of Toronto, and I would like to know what the final result of that particular research was. In any event, $40,000 is a puny amount for housing research in this province. The OHC should, and it must, be making studies of industrial building or systems building, the techniques of building more houses for less cost.

Mr. Chairman, I have a number of other questions which I would like to ask as the estimate is developed, but I think I will leave it at that.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I just wondered whether the hon. Minister would prefer to reply to my hon. leader first before I go into this problem.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the hon. member would like me to I would be glad to. I appreciate the comments made by the hon. leader of the Opposition with reference to the housing corporation. I think he has been most patient with us under some very trying circumstances. We have not reached Utopia yet and I think it will be a long time before we do.

I notice that in trying to answer the questions as they come about, the hon. leader mentioned the difference between the Metro housing authority and the Ontario housing corporation and that which is controlled by the city of Toronto. As you know, the Metro housing authority was appointed by order-in-council. When we formed the Ontario housing corporation we felt two things. We felt first of all that the houses under its jurisdiction could be added to that of the

Ontario housing corporation, plus the fact that we could use their very efficient and knowledgeable staff in the development of our own staff at the Ontario housing corporation and reduce very much the cost of operating a separate unit. We were not able to convince the city of Toronto that they should follow suit for perhaps a number of reasons.

We have since made an offer to the city of Toronto that we would take over their housing projects. They could retain ownership, we would take on management, and we would make provision for the subsidies required. But the city of Toronto still seem to feel they want to run their own Toronto housing corporation and under the circumstances, until they accept our offer, that is the way the matter stands. I believe it would be in the interest of this province and the city of Toronto if they did accept our offer because, in the first place, the people of the city of Toronto are now standing the full brunt of any subsidies or any losses that are suffered on their properties, whereas if they come into our scheme, their losses would be handled as they are with other schemes, where the federal government pays 50 per cent, we pay the balance, and the municipality does not have anything to pay except, I should say, the 7.5 per cent. So that the city of Toronto losses would be reduced very considerably if they only had to withstand 7.5 per cent on any subsidies.

One of the things that perhaps should be pointed out in the units that are directed by the city of Toronto, in terms of percentages, bachelor, one- and two-bedroom units constitute over 70 per cent of the total portfolio of the housing authority. This has been one of the major problems in the city, the bedroom count is not big enough to take care of the family. There again we were faced with the anomaly the other day of the Blue Heron project here on Sherbourne street where the city of Toronto wanted to take over that project and get it under way, but it was only one- and two-bedroom suites again, which would not add very much to the housing required in the city of Toronto. We believe there could be considerable money saved if the city of Toronto were to join forces with the Ontario housing corporation and put their properties in the same portfolio. I think we could reduce operating expenses for them as we have reduced operating expenses in the Metro Toronto housing authority and use perhaps some of their very valuable staff:

I think that the next question that you posed—the number of homes in the redevelopment areas that were being rehabilitated—we have only 19 under way at the present time; in Alexandra Park, that is all we have been asked for. Until we have been asked in Napier Place to move in and participate in that area, we do not know what homes yet are to be rehabilitated or knocked down. The lack of communication in urban development, I think, was certainly pointed out and the hon. member for Riverdale was certainly present at a city of Toronto meeting that we attended a few weeks ago. I read a statement to the assembled citizens from Napier Place on what had happened in Ottawa; what had happened in Hamilton, where the city authorities had communicated to the people that were going to be affected, and there was very little, if any, difficulty in the urban renewal schemes in these two areas. But in Napier Place I cannot help but agree with the hon. leader, also my hon. friend from Riverdale, that the communication was not good and as a consequence there has been a lot of misrepresentation, misunderstanding and maybe fear on the part of the people that they have not been given the consideration that they should have been given in view of the fact that they are going to lose their homes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Have communications improved?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have talked to the mayor, and as I have mentioned—I left the statement with him. I have talked to the mayor since and I do not know what the city has done in the meantime; I would think they should have acted on the information that was given to them. It is their prerogative to inform the people what they intend to do. As you know the city have the authority to decide where the urban renewal is going to take place and we in effect become bankers, as the hon. leader of the Opposition said here a few minutes ago. Perhaps things could change; I think in time perhaps they will, but in the meantime this is the situation that exists.

The expropriation matters that he spoke of are under the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I would prefer that he discuss that in his estimates. If they come up at that time and I think perhaps they will, it is not the Ontario housing corporation's responsibility to talk about expropriation. As all the hon. members know, we can build houses only when they knock the old ones down. That is our responsibility, to move in as we have done in Alexandra Park, and start to build as soon as the land is clear, and we are doing that.

Mr. Singer: Don't you fellows talk to each other?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure we talk to each other. However, I cannot put houses on sky hooks. I will put them on property as soon as it is cleared; that is my responsibility, to build houses.

The word "ghetto" was used this afternoon, and I think this is rather an unfortunate connotation of a situation with people who are deserving of perhaps a little more consideration. That may have been true a few years ago, but we are not creating ghettos by buying homes in Metro Toronto and any other areas, because in my estimation these people who move in—the only difference between them and the people that are living there is perhaps a few hundred dollars a year in income, and this has been proved. They have moved into these areas and have been accepted. Once they find out that we are not moving people in there who will upset a neighbourhood, they recognize that the only difference perhaps is that the family wage-earner earns a thousand dollars less than the man he moves next door to. Any of the problems that have existed I think were well aired, not only by radio, newspapers and television but by public meetings. Certainly that, to my way of thinking, answers the description of these purchases of block housing in these areas as ghettos. They are certainly not by any manner of means ghettos, and if they were ghettos under private ownership, as soon as the Ontario housing corporation moves in we have a responsibility to the neighbourhood and we take better care of our homes, which has been proved, than an absentee landlord. There is not any need to feel that when the Ontario housing corporation purchases homes in any municipality we are going to let them become a detriment to the area in which they are purchased.

The rental scale was touched on by the hon. leader. This is under review right now by Mr. Nicholson, the Minister of Housing in the federal government. It has been discussed at great length with the central mortgage and housing corporation president and his people, and we have every reason to believe that there is very shortly going to be an adjustment in the scale of rents in view of the cost of living. The same is happening to the people in the one-third of the low-income groups.

I might also add that the central mortgage and housing corporation has not reduced the amount of funds that has been available to the Ontario housing corporation. As fast as we can accumulate the purchases of housing or let contracts to build houses on the requests from municipalities, the funds are available and I might say the co-operation in this regard is excellent. We have it not only from our own Treasury department, but from central mortgage and housing. They have been behind us 100 per cent. We have the money just as soon as we can implement a programme.

My hon. friend touched on the rent certificate scheme, and again I cannot answer for my predecessor, I simply say he solved the problems of that time. We rented something like 278 homes. It was obvious when the landlord found that the Ontario housing agency was the tenant in taking care of the subsidy, it did not take him long to increase the scale, and most of the homes that were rented on this basis, on the rent scheme have either been purchased or the people have been moved into homes that are owned by the Ontario housing corporation where we have control of the rents. We did not really abandon the rent certificate scheme; we found a better method when we formed the Ontario housing corporation. I might say that the $4,000 was not in the budget to provide a rental scheme programme. The $4,000 was there to take care of the leases that were still on the hook. As soon as those leases run out we will be out of the $4,000 that you have watched on our budget. Last year, I think it was $130,000. It used to be something like $150,000. It is reduced now to $4,000 and this will take care of the leases that will run out in this fiscal year, so that Ontario housing corporation will move these people if they have not bettered themselves under their own power. We will move them into homes that are operated by the Ontario housing corporation. So the $4,000 is just to take care of obligations which we have assumed.

The mention of the termite programme was brought to me by the hon. member for Woodbine a few years ago. We have appropriated $150,000 for this purpose. We offered to share the costs with the city of Toronto. It took some time for the city of Toronto—I think it was after a local election had got by—to say they were going to enter into a project of trying to eliminate termites in certain parts of the city. To the best of my knowledge, nothing was ever done after this. Money was available, but the city did not go to work on the termite programme. They never called for the money and we left $40,000 in this year. If the city decides they want to continue we will have the money available and more money can be

available on the original basis. But there was very little done to the best of our knowledge, on the elimination of termites in Toronto.

Mr. Singer: Can the hon. Minister tell us if the infestation is spreading or is it limited?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think that it is any better than what the hon. member outlined when he came to me two years ago, but again there are certain people who do not want a sign on their lawn that they are termite-infested. The residents themselves were not too interested in the termite project and this is one of the things that the city ran into, that people did not want to be classified as having a home that was infected in this way.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister did not answer my question. Does he know if the infestation is spreading or has it been checked?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be inclined to suggest to you, my kind sir, that it is spreading. If it was spreading two years ago and nothing has been done, I fail to see where it could be any less.

Mr. Singer: So the hon Minister is just marking time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is not in my jurisdiction. The money is here, it is up to the city and if the city wants to use the money, it is available.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, to be fair to the hon. Minister, I think that he has done about as much as he can. I am not going into the difficulties that have been encountered. I spent years trying to get action. I finally found a Minister who was receptive to the idea and I thought I had persuaded city hall also that this was a problem that required action. It required a Minister with a sympathetic attitude to get any action out of city hall. The Minister has offered the money and still very little has been done and it is not entirely the fault of city hall. There are difficulties also as far as the individual homeowner is concerned, but there is absolutely no question that termite infestation is spreading. It has been spreading for a generation and it will continue to spread unless action is taken to stop it. Some householders have tried to control the problem but a great many do not seem to be too concerned about it, as far as I can see. Just how one stimulates public awareness of the problem is rather difficult to say, but I do not really think it is fair to suggest that the hon. Minister is passing the buck. I would say that the buck was being passed all over the lot until the Minister stepped in and provided at least the basis on which action could have been taken, and still can be taken.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think that we have any idea how much the private homeowner has done for himself and does not want to talk about. Perhaps he has taken action on his own; we have no record of that.

One other question the hon. leader posed was to do with private construction in Metropolitan Toronto, and he suggested that the information he had indicated that mortgage money was down and that the housing starts were down. I have some statistics here which I think would be of interest.

The starts from January 1 to April 30, 1965, were 3,993, and in the same period this year, 4,078—they are up. The completions were 4,871 in 1965 and they are 6,212 this year. Under construction, as of April 30, there were 21,943 and 30,270 this year. Approved loans, NHA insured, January 1 to April 30, were 2,798; this year they are 3,140, and the approved loans directed by NHA from January 1 to April 30 were 256 and this year they are 737. So I think that some of the fears that the money is not available and that homes are not being started is not quite correct; these figures indicate that they are.

Another question asked was concerning the purchase of existing houses. Of the 1,347 houses purchased to date—this was in Metro, I presume—950 are occupied by families from the public housing waiting list, so we have been taking on the responsibility of housing these people off the housing registry as fast as they are listed. So out of the 1,347 houses we have housed 950 families in the Metro area. The housing survey in Metro was proposed by us and we reported to Metro in January. We have now agreed between ourselves to go ahead and make this housing study and the federal government have also agreed to share the cost with us on this project. So that is something the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned that is already under way.

I might comment too that in reply to the question raised by my hon. friend as to whether there was a programme for Indians. I have under date of Friday, May 20—"Ottawa signs deal on provincial help for Ontario Indians." This is in the department of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare who is head of the Cabinet committee on Indian affairs, and our department

through the Ontario housing corporation will provide the homes required in these areas under this agreement that has just been signed, on April 20.

I tried to catch all the questions that the hon. leader of the Opposition asked, I believe I have answered as many as I can. As he said when he left, he would probably have some more later on. I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In 1963 a survey had been completed on the need and demand for federal-provincial rental housing back in the city of Windsor and at that time one of the results or conclusions drawn was that the real deficiency is not in the number of housing units available at fairly reasonable rents, but in their physical condition and location.

Since the completion of that report and the introduction of the auto trade agreement, the picture has completely reversed itself, and from a period of surplus housing we are now suffering probably the most acute problem the city has ever suffered since the days of substantial unemployment, and that is the shortage of housing.

The Department of Economics and Development surely must have known that certain types of industries were going to move into the community well in advance before they actually did come into the community. Could they not have forewarned the community that there would be a shortage of housing in a foreseeable future so that the community could have planned for housing?

One of the reasons for the shortage of housing is the fact that the city had been landlocked as a result of the delay on the part of The Department of Municipal Affairs in the annexation of the surrounding areas. The surrounding areas did not seem to want government housing at the one time, and because the city had a shortage of area land on which homes could be built, it found itself in a most embarrassing position when it came to providing housing. So some of the blame can be placed on this government for not coming down with the annexation decision much sooner.

The shortage is so acute in the city—and mind you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the department of the hon. Minister for the action it has taken, because one year ago when this was brought to their attention the department came down and certainly explained the situation extremely well. Mr. Soble and Mr. Suters were down and I think the city did get good action from them. The two gentlemen deserve to be commended for the attitude they took and for their presentation concerning housing and housing needs in the community.

One year ago an advertisement appeared in the newspaper and shows how acute housing was then:

> West side near Assumption University, clean, three-bedroom, brick, fireplace, basement, two-car garage, clean, residential neighbourhood, $175 monthly, payable two months in advance. $500 deposit required.

That was one year ago. Here it is just recently—May 12 this year:

> Responsible family wants to rent three-bedroom home. Will pay year's rent in advance.

People are willing to pay rent for the full year in advance—and this illustrates how acute the housing problem is in the community.

The department is doing considerable work to alleviate the housing shortage and we will have to commend them for what they are doing. However, it does not seem to be sufficient, as yet. The shortage, instead of being stationary at the present time, seems to be accelerating with the increased number of jobs that are available in the community.

Because of the shortage of homes we find that the rents are skyrocketing, and they are skyrocketing to the point that not only was the council concerned but the various unions in town were concerned and they set up a public meeting at which they discussed a rental appeal board. This was presented to the hon. Minister and to the hon. Prime Minister. In fact, I understand that a hearing was to have been held with members of council, and the Prime Minister and, I would assume, the Minister were in on the hearing concerning the establishing of a rental appeal board.

This appeal suggests the following:

> That a rental appeal board be established which would consider the following suggestions as to the kinds of provisions that may be required.
>
> 1. Provide tenants the right of appeal when landlords raise rents disproportionately.
>
> 2. Request landlords to show evidence that dwelling improvements justify rent increases.

3. Set a fixed permissible percentage rental increase.

4. Establish a time limit whereby no rent increases over the original rent rate are permissible for a specific period of, say, one year.

5. Ensure that rents are established at a figure having some relationship to the accommodation available, age of dwelling, condition of same, location, number of rooms, and so forth.

6. Compel landlords to show due cause for eviction of tenants and bar such evictions when it is evident that the landlord's motivation is to charge exorbitant rent.

In personal discussion with some of the members of the fair rents committee when the meeting was held on May 11, they had mentioned to me that there is already a precedent set for a board similar to this. That is in the motel and hotel industry, where you have posted on the back of the door the maximum rentals that are permissible for the use of the room. So the individuals that I have talked to thought this might be an answer.

I would like at this time the hon Minister's comments concerning this rental appeal board. Is such a scheme practical? Does it have drawbacks? Is it the type of scheme that could be implemented in an isolated community, such as my own, that is suffering at this time from the exorbitant rental charges by some landlords? Mind you, there are a lot of good landlords who would not take advantage of the new economic climate by raising their rents. They charge a decent and a justifiable rent for their properties, but you always get the few who seem to take advantage of the unfortunate.

In fact, to show you the types of rentals charged, here is an individual making $95 a week, with three children, and paying $163 a month rent. Here is another one with an income of $146 a week, six children, paying $176 a month rent. Surely these rentals are beyond the capability of an individual to pay and maintain a decent standard of living.

I would like the hon. Minister first to comment on this rental appeal board. It was presented to him, and I know the citizens back home would be interested.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of this department and after that the estimates of The Department of Transport. From 5 to 6, I believe, the private members' hour will be resumed.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

(May 18, 1966)

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
3635	1	51	Change to read:

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): But they reformed him.

No. 119

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 26, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 26, 1966

Sixth report, standing committee on legal bills and labour, Mr. Bales 3851

Statement re Welland canal road crossings, Mr. MacNaughton 3851

Questions of Mr. Wishart re experimental bail project, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Renwick .. 3852

Question of Mr. Wishart re Tilco Plastics strike, Mr. Renwick 3853

Question of Mr. Davis re CNIB, Mr. Thompson 3854

Questions of Mr. Robarts re programme for medical centres, Mr. Thompson 3854

Statement by Mr. Robarts re liquor licensing 3854

Legal aid, bill respecting, Mr. Wishart, first reading 3858

Rule against perpetuities, bill to modify, Mr. Wishart, first reading 3858

Accumulations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 3859

Trustee Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 3859

Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading .. 3859

Tabling report, Mr. Wishart 3859

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 3859

On notice of motion No. 27, Mr. Cowling, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Apps, Mr. W. E. Johnston, Mr. Sopha 3882

Recess, 6 o'clock 3892

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today students from the following schools: In the Speaker's gallery, Centreville public school, Centreville; in the east gallery, Watford district high school, Watford; Murray township school section, Trenton; and, in the west gallery, Oro township school area, Orillia.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills), from the standing committee on legal bills and labour, presented the committee's sixth report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill 86, An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill 97, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter that I believe is of considerable interest.

With the announcement last Friday by the Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister of Transport, that approval has been given to the diversion of that section of the Welland canal between Welland and Port Colborne, our position regarding canal crossings is clear, at least to the extent that we must proceed without delay with our studies to establish road crossings of the canal on the new alignment.

Since, in all probability, most if not all of the crossings of the canal will be by tunnel, large economies can be effected by constructing the facilities before or at the same time as the canal itself is being excavated. The department will be working very closely with the St. Lawrence seaway authority and the municipalities affected to ensure that the crossings chosen will not only fulfill their requirements at present, but will provide satisfactory service in the future.

The latest proposal put forward by the seaway authority and affecting the canal between Thorold and Lake Ontario was the announcement that land was being expropriated to provide for a new location of this section of the canal. If this proposal is finally approved, it will affect a number of existing facilities. The Garden City skyway will be required and will remain in operation for a number of years, at least until the new canal is built and a tunnel facility under it to carry the Queen Elizabeth Way and Highway No. 8 has been constructed.

All work on the recently-designed tunnel crossing at Carlton street in St. Catharines will be held up until a final decision has been made in respect to the rerouting of the canal.

The contract for the actual construction of the tunnel at this location, recently advertised, will be cancelled and studies will have to be undertaken to establish crossing of the new canal alignment if a decision to proceed with it is made.

We have been advised by the seaway authority that as a temporary measure, and to provide for service until a decision has been made and the new alignment constructed, a temporary bridge will be constructed in the vicinity of lock No. 2. This will supplement the existing Carleton street bridge. This, of course, will ensure the service necessary for the development of that area east of the canal. We have been assured that all costs accrued to date and additional costs to be expected in the future, because of the changes brought about by the canal revisions, will be borne by the federal government through the seaway authority. While the changes to the canal system are enormous and will affect the whole Niagara peninsula area, these changes have been necessitated by the great and unpredictable increase of traffic through the Great Lakes, which no doubt reflects the tremendous industrial growth on both sides of the border.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted a question to the hon.

Prime Minister and he refused to accept it. This is his prerogative by the laws of this House, but I say when the laws of the province have been broken—

Mr. Speaker: Order! On what point does the member rise at this time?

Mr. Sargent: I say the laws of the province are more important than the laws of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order. I am afraid I have no notice that he was going to rise on any point of order today. The member asked the Prime Minister a question yesterday and the Prime Minister took it upon himself to answer this question in due time; the member has to wait until the question is answered.

Mr. Sargent: He has had ten days now.

Mr. Speaker: That is the prerogative of the Prime Minister.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): We had to wait for six weeks for ours.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The member does not have a point of order at this time and I would ask him to please be seated.

Mr. Sargent: When anybody else breaks the law, he goes to jail, but—

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order.

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, in last night's Brantford *Expositor* there was a very interesting item. A young star athlete won the Canadian legion cup, emblematic of the oratorical championship of the Paris high school. This was 35 years ago, Mr. Speaker, and today this young man is the hon. member for Kingston.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member for Kingston to stand and take a bow.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the gallery, perhaps you could give the name of the hon. member for Kingston.

Mr. Gordon: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the name is mentioned in the item — Sylvanus Apps.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I had two questions yesterday. The first is: Will the hon. Attorney General immediately match the Ford Foundation's offer of $20,000 to finance a two-year experimental bail project for Toronto's magistrate's courts?

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has a similar question. Perhaps the Attorney General will answer both?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That was put in yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but the leader of the Opposition did not ask the question. I asked him to defer it until today.

Mr. Singer: Oh! Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the question for the Attorney General is this, sir: In view of the offer of the Ford Foundation to contribute the sum of $20,000 towards the financing of an experimental bail project in Toronto's magistrates' court, patterned on New York's Manhattan project; and in view of the qualification that the sum of $20,000 must be matched in Toronto, will The Department of the Attorney General contribute the additional sum of $20,000 to this important experiment? If the answer is in the negative, may the House hear the reasons for the refusal?

Second, since the hon. Attorney General apparently appointed persons to the advisory committee on the bail project, including four persons who are engaged in the enforcement of the law, was consideration given to the appointment of Professor Martin Friedland? And if not, why not?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, there has been no request made for any contribution by The Department of the Attorney General or by the government to this project. I learned recently that an offer was made by the Ford Foundation to the Rotary club of Downsview which we have been assisting in every way that we have been asked in this study of the matter of bail.

The representative of the Rotary club did inform me, and I think I should place on record the notice which we did receive and the terms we have made. A letter dated April 27, 1966, addressed to me, answers generally both these questions. Mr. Stanger, who is the gentleman of the Rotary club particularly in charge of this project from the Rotary club's point of view, said:

> Mr. Bull, Chief Magistrate Klein and I met yesterday and enlisted the following proposed members of our advisory committee: H. H. Bull, QC, L. R. Hackl, Arthur O. Klein, QC, the dean of Osgoode Hall—

then there is a note as to the resignation of Dean Leal—but the dean of Osgoode Hall, whoever he may be, and when appointed—

—James Mackey, chief of police of Metropolitan Toronto; John M. Magwood, QC, and Samuel Stanger.

This follows closely to the suggestions made in your letter of March 1 to Mr. Nobbs. We shall assume it meets with your approval, unless we hear otherwise from you or your secretary.

We plan to mail invitations on May 4 to the gentlemen listed. Incidentally, Mr. Bull and Magistrate Klein insisted that I be the Rotary member of the committee—

I would pause there to say that the appointment, therefore, was made by Mr. Stanger and the two persons he mentioned as being associated with him. Then he added.

I am sure you will be pleased to know that Ford Foundation has indicated serious interest in financing us to the extent of $20,000, $10,000 per annum, provided this community would match that amount. Bill Whelen is in charge of our financing activities.

Many thanks for your suggestions and continued interest. I shall keep you informed of developments.

So, Mr. Speaker, I did not appoint the committee. Actually, in the names that were suggested to me—the dean of Osgoode Hall, along with Professor Friedland, both were suggested—and I did in my suggestion state that I thought someone should represent the law school. And the person of the highest rank there was chosen. There certainly was no objection to further names being added to that committee.

With respect to the suggestion as to whether we should assist financially as a government, there has been no request made. The suggestion put forward to me was an indication that it was to assist the Rotary club.

Mr. Stanger, the gentleman particularly carrying on the project, indicated in his letter which I have read that it was expected they would raise the funds, apparently in their own way, as it is in line with the service work that the Rotary club has been doing.

I have had no requests nor has the government had any requests in this matter. I might add that it is a matter in which I have been very interested since it was first brought to our attention. We have given every assistance in advice and in urging our officials to take part and I am very interested to see how the study progresses. So far we have had no other requests.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would permit a supplementary question. Does he really think that as important a legal problem as this, that goes so deeply to the root of our judicial system, should have to depend on a charitable drive being organized to do the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The procedures of bail are laid down in The Criminal Code of Canada and this was simply proposed as a study to see how it might have to be improved, particularly in the area of accepting more personal recognizances which are permitted under the provisions of the code.

The Rotary club of Downsview was very interested in asking if it might have our cooperation in making such a study to which we quickly said yes. They asked if they might do it in that way. They have asked for no other assistance and there are various opinions about whether the Manhattan project, after which this, perhaps, is patterned, would work here; how our conditions differ and how the project might find reasons to vary the procedures there.

I think it is very important but we were not asked to do other than to assist in this preliminary study.

Perhaps, after this study, which is designed to run through a period of two years with the assistance of the Crown attorney of Metropolitan Toronto, magistrates and court officials, and so on, after we have the benefit of that study, I think we may find ourselves continuing our interest, and perhaps to a greater extent.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my second question to the Attorney General is: Has he any information as to when the decision in the Tilco Plastics injunction proceedings will be given by the chief justice of the high court?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The answer to the question is "no."

Mr. Renwick: Would the Attorney General permit a supplementary question? Would he not consider that it is highly improper in the administration of justice in the province of Ontario that 27 citizens of this province should now have been in jeopardy, so far as their personal liberty is concerned, for some three months?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think that justice should be swift, as well as sure.

I am not sure that I agree with the hon. member for Riverdale that these persons have been in jeopardy for this period. They perhaps put themselves in jeopardy and they were brought before the court as a result of this. I do know that the chief justice, before whom the hearing took place, has been an extremely busy justice since the time he heard that case, but I am sure he will not delay his decision one moment longer than is necessary.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. When the Ontario Boat Lines of Timagami were sold by the ONR to the Shell Oil Company, was there any obligation on the new owners to maintain the existing services?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): As I have been out of the office attending other meetings, I did not realize there was a question from the hon. member, but I will take it as notice and give him the answer tomorrow.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. In view of the problems existing—and I am referring to the wage problems—in the Canadian national institute for the blind, has the Minister considered increasing the grant of $100,000 in order for them to pay a higher standard of wages to their employees?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): The grant given to the CNIB, as I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, is not directed to any one specific purpose of the institute itself.

They designate the use to which the money is put. Prior to 1965-66 the grant from the government was in the neighbourhood of $60,000; last year this was increased for the fiscal year 1965-66 to $100,000, and this same rate of grant will continue for this coming fiscal year.

Mr. Thompson: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Prime Minister. Would he inform the House if he intends to implement the programme for medical centres as announced in October, 1964, and can Queen's University expect the same consideration given to the University of Toronto in the very near future?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The first answer is, of course, we intend to implement it, and it is in the course of implementation now. It is not a question of are we going to, the implementation is under way at the present time. I really do not understand what the hon. leader of the Opposition means about Queen's University receiving the same consideration as the University of Toronto. These matters have to be dealt with individually. Each programme is different. There is a programme going on at Western and there is one going on at the University of Toronto and one at Queen's, and each one will be dealt with according to the circumstances of the individual institutions.

I think that the hon. Minister of University Affairs will be making a complete statement within the next few days as to what exactly has been done.

Mr. Thompson: As a supplementary question, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister has read the article in the Toronto *Daily Star* of yesterday referring to Queen's University: "The 'poor relation' in Robarts' family"? That is the headline on it. I do not speak from any conflict of interest, but as a graduate of Queen's it seems to me that there has been a great deal of preference given to the University of Toronto, and as yet Queen's University are unaware of what kind of grant they are going to get.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that there is a good deal of competition among all the universities for the taxpayers' dollars in this province.

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a statement in response to certain allegations made by the hon. member for Grey North and certain statements that he released to the press concerning licensing matters in the county of Grey. I undertook to investigate his allegations and to make a full report to this House.

In a statement to the press on May 13th, this member further alleged that:

> The Prime Minister of the government has clearly broken the law as written in the statutes of this province.

He further stated:

> A licence was granted to Talisman inn, Euphrasia township, a ski resort, when a few weeks previous they had been turned down in a vote.

He also stated:

> (1) The Talisman ski resort requested a liquor licence and held a public referendum. The vote was defeated by a great majority by the citizens of Euphrasia township. A few weeks later, the club

was granted by this government a charter for a club licence. The Act specifically states, and I quote from the statutes of Ontario, 1961-62, page 345, chapter 73, section 2, subsection 24(a) as follows: "Notwithstanding the restrictions and prohibitions imposed by any municipal bylaw under The Liquor Licence Act, being chapter 215 of the revised statutes of Ontario, 1914, or this or any other Act relating to the sale of liquor by retail, the board may issue a club licence or a club licence (restricted) to any club that is affected by any such bylaw and that has been organized and in active operation for not less than three years prior to the time of application for a licence."

To follow the Act, as written, the application would have to have been submitted through the proper channels with proper hearings back in 1962.

In reading the allegations of the hon. member for Grey North, one can only conclude that he must be unaware of the amendments to The Liquor Licence Act enacted in the session of this Legislature in 1965, following the complete review of that Act that took place prior thereto.

In this connection, I would direct hon. members' attention to the statutes of Ontario, chapter 59, which became effective on Royal assent, i.e., on June 22, 1965. Specific reference should be made to section 9 of the amending Act which is as follows:

(9) Section 24a of The Liquor Licence Act, as enacted by section 2 of The Liquor Licence Amendment Act, 1961-1962, is amended by striking out "organized and" in the eighth line and by striking out "time of application for" in the ninth and tenth lines and inserting in lieu thereof "issued to it of" so that the section shall read as follows:

Notwithstanding the restrictions and prohibitions imposed by any municipal bylaw, passed under The Liquor Licence Act, being chapter 215 of the revised statutes of Ontario, 1914, or this or any other Act relating to the sale of liquor by retail, the board may issue a club licence or a club licence (restricted) to any club that is affected by any such bylaw that has been in active operation for not less than three years prior to the issue to it of a licence.

It should be noted that the words "organized and" were deleted from the revised section 24a and that the words "issued to it of" were inserted in place of the words "time of application for." It is also important to note that the relevant time relates to that prior to the issue of a licence in place of prior to the time of application for a licence.

Until this amendment was made, Mr. Speaker, "organized" was capable of being interpreted as meaning "incorporated" so that it might have been asserted that a club must not only have been in active operation for the relevant period but that it must also have been incorporated for that period. The amendment of last year clarified the intent of the legislation.

Accordingly, since June 22, 1965, the requirement of section 24a is that a club be in active operation for not less than three years prior to the issue to it of a licence. From this it will be clearly seen that incorporation for a three-year period is no longer a necessity and that the active operation for a three-year period is computed back from the date of issue of a licence, not from the date of application for a licence.

I have asked the chairman of the liquor licence board of Ontario for a full report concerning the granting of a licence to the Talisman country club and he has supplied me with the following information.

In the course of dealing with the application of the Talisman country club for a licence, the board had submitted to it, and considered, material consisting of a solicitor's letter, oral representations, and a formal application verified by affidavit, to the effect that the club commenced active operation in April, 1962. There is what would appear on the surface to be a variance between a letter filed with the Provincial Secretary in the submission of an application for the incorporation of Talisman country club and the material submitted to the liquor licence board of Ontario in support of the application for a club licence. However, the board has informed me that it is satisfied the requirements of the Act and regulations were met.

From the board's point of view, the significant date is April 1962. The licence to the Talisman country club was issued December 21, 1965, a date which was three years and eight months beyond April, 1962.

The vote in Euphrasia township actually took place on June 17, 1964. The licence to the Talisman country club was issued, as I have stated, on December 21, 1965, a matter of nearly 18 months after the vote; not, as alleged by the member, "a few weeks later." It should be noted, too, that no licence was issued to "Talisman inn" or "Talisman ski resort," being the terms used by the hon. member. Nor was a licence issued to the Talisman Ski Resort Limited, a commercial venture.

I would also point out that the "charter" to the Talisman country club was dated December 3, 1964. This was not, I would emphasize, "for a club licence" but a charter for the purpose of incorporating the club.

I should like to turn now to some other aspects of the allegations made by the hon. member for Grey North. He stated—*Hansard*, 3372—that:

> There are many, many clubs better than Talisman, millions of dollars invested in that area, in my riding, that cannot get a licence. They want the same rights as Talisman, but you will not give it to them —they have applied—they have applications in but they cannot get any action at all.

He also said in a statement to the press:

> All ski resort operators and all people in the tourist industry in this province were specifically instructed that they must follow the Act "to have been organized and in active operation for not less than three years prior to the time of the application for a licence."

As I have stated previously, Mr. Speaker, the word "organized" was deleted from the Act in June, 1965. Here, as in the preceding, the member for Grey North has apparently failed to take into consideration the amendments to The Liquor Licence Act which were enacted by this House in the last session.

He went on to state, this is in his press statement, that:

> Georgian Peaks, a competitor of the Talisman club, has had its application for many months and they are told that they must wait for three years.

I am told by the chairman of the liquor licence board of Ontario that this simply is not so; the Georgian Peaks ski club has not been informed by the board that it "must wait for three years."

The Georgian Peaks ski club, which is situated in the local option area of the township of Collingwood in the county of Grey, commenced active operations in December, 1960; but did not make application to the liquor licence board of Ontario until November 26, 1965. On that date, its secretary wrote to the board asking if it would entertain an application for a club licence to enable it to serve liquor, beer and wine, either with or without meals. A preliminary application was heard on February 4, 1966. The application itself was heard at a special meeting of the board in Kitchener on May 3, 1966. As soon as the board's investigation, which appears to be routine and favourable, is complete a decision will be reached, probably within a matter of days.

The member for Grey North also made mention of the Blue Mountain club—*Hansard*, 3340—which is said to be in the township of Collingwood. No application has been made by this club or by any club of a similar name operating in that township. There have been only two applications from clubs which are under local option in the county of Grey and these are the Talisman country club and the Georgian Peaks ski club.

I shall deal next, Mr. Speaker, with the allegations of the member for Grey North, concerning that revered place, the London Hunt club, which has preoccupied the Liberal Party for so many years. In his statement to the press of May 13 last, the hon. member stated:

> Further, one of the first golf clubs in the province to receive a club licence was the London Hunt club. I suggest this was given to accommodate the friends of Mr. Robarts and possibly why the Act was written.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the licence issued to the London Hunt club was not in any way issued to accommodate friends of mine nor was this "why the Act was written." The amendments of 1961-62 were brought about as the result of representations from many organizations and many parts of the province to the government as part of a thorough review of all legislation dealing with liquor in the province.

As a result of these amendments which permitted the issue of licences to clubs in local option municipalities scattered throughout the province, the board in 1962 received applications from the following fifteen clubs:

Arnprior golf club, McNab township; Bay of Quinte country club, Sidney township; Beverly golf and country club, Beverly township; Brockville country club, Brockville; Burlington golf and country club, Burlington; Dundas Valley golf and curling club, Dundas; Hamilton golf and country club, Ancaster; London Hunt and country club, London township; Maple Downs golf and country club, Vaughan township; Muskoka Lakes golf and country club, Lake Rosseau; Ridgetown golf and country club, Forest; St. Thomas golf and country club, St. Thomas; Strathroy golf club, Strathroy; Summit golf and country club, Richmond Hill; Thornhill golf club, Thornhill.

As a result of these applications, special meetings to deal with these applications

were held in Barrie, Belleville, Brockville, Hamilton, London, Ottawa, Toronto and Windsor during the latter days of June, 1962. Licences were issued in every case, 14 in the month of July, 1962, and the 15th some time later.

Obviously, the London Hunt club was treated as the other applicants and there was no question of accommodating friends of mine, as the hon. member has alleged. It may be of interest to hon. members that club licences have been issued to 73 clubs since the amendments of 1961-62 became effective.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with the allegations respecting one Alexander S. Graydon.

The member for Grey North said—*Hansard*, 3368:

> Talisman is owned by a man named Alex Graydon. He is the principal stockholder in this company from London and is closely allied, I understand, with Labatts.

And then he stated in a press statement:

> It is a violation of The Liquor Licence Act to have any brewery in connection with a licensed operation and to compound this mess a director of Labatts, Mr. Alexander Graydon—whose mother was a Labatt—is given special treatment.

Section 29 of The Liquor Licence Act reads as follows:

> 29—(1) No licence may be issued or renewed under this Act,
>
> (a) to a person who is under agreement with any person to sell the liquor of any manufacturer;
>
> (b) to a manufacturer of liquor, or his agent, or to a person who is so financially interested therein as to be likely to promote the sale thereof;
>
> (c) to a person who by reason of any agreement, arrangement, concession, obligation or understanding, verbal or written, or direct or indirect, with any other person is, or by reason thereof, may be likely to promote the sale of liquor of any manufacturer; or
>
> (d) for premises in which a manufacturer of liquor has an interest, whether freehold or leasehold, or by way of mortgage or charge or other encumbrance, or by way of mortgage, lien or charge upon any chattel property therein and whether such interest is direct or indirect or contingent or by way of suretyship of guarantee, RSO, 1960, c. 218, s. 29(1).

The chairman of the liquor licence board of Ontario informs me that the board has never interpreted this section during the past 22 years as preventing such persons from being members or directors of licensed clubs, or of preventing clubs from being licensed by reason of such membership or directorship.

The board does not feel that simply because such a person may be a member or director of a club he would use his position to, or be likely to, promote the sale of his company's products. The board does not feel that because Mr. Graydon is a director of Labatts he is likely to promote the sale of products of the Labatt Company.

Moreover, regulation 12 of the present Liquor Licence Act is as follows:

> 12—(1) An adequate stock of liquor, when available, shall be maintained upon every licensed premise,
>
> (a) of the brands and types; and
>
> (b) in the form of containers, that are commonly in demand in the place where the premises are located.

Mr. Graydon was quoted in the night edition of the Toronto *Daily Star* of May 13, 1966, as saying:

> My connection with Labatts does not influence sales of beer at the club—the club carries whatever products the members ask for.

The board's records verify these statements.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that the remarks of the hon. member were completely irresponsible.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would permit a question arising out of that statement?

Mr. Speaker: The statement is not debatable, but if the Prime Minister will answer a question, that is in order.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: If my friend, the hon. Minister of Mines, will just be patient, he will hear it in just a moment.

I wonder if the Prime Minister could tell us how a profit-making organization can be treated as a club by the liquor licence board of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is not a profit-making organization. There are two organizations; this club rents quarters, as I understand it, from the profit-making organization and it is run as a non-profit club.

Mr. Singer: It is a guise to get around the liquor laws and the Prime Minister knows it.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General has asked for the unanimous consent of the House in order that we return to the introduction of bills as he has a few bills to introduce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I ask a question, please?

Mr. Speaker: No, no questions. The Prime Minister is not accepting any further questions.

Introduction of bills.

LEGAL AID

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting legal aid.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few very brief remarks to the House with respect to this bill, which is very important; a somewhat momentous piece of legislation. It has resulted from the recommendations of the joint committee on legal aid, which was established in 1963 by the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, the then Attorney General, and the report of the law society of Upper Canada. The report of that joint committee was released by the Attorney General and tabled in the Legislature last year. One of the recommendations of the joint committee was as follows. The recommendation was actually No. 21 and reads:

> If the need for a new legal aid plan is accepted, the government of the province of Ontario should request the law society of Upper Canada to propound such a plan.

Pursuant to that recommendation, the Attorney General requested the law society of Upper Canada to propound a plan and, consequently, the legal aid programme committee of the law society was appointed by the treasurer.

The report and the plan of the legal aid programme committee was approved by the law society of Upper Canada in convocation in March of this year and was submitted to the Attorney General, thus the government has had the benefit of the views of the joint committee and the law society of upper Canada in the preparation of this legislation.

The bill provides for legal aid to persons who are unable to pay for, or can pay only part of, the cost of legal services. The plan will be financed from provincial moneys, but administered by the law society of Upper Canada.

The bill provides that the law society has the power to establish and administer the legal aid plan subject to the approval of the Attorney General.

There are various controls in the bill which leave the overriding control with the government. There are many features which I shall speak to perhaps on second reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General permit a question? Is it the government's intention to carry this bill through third reading and Royal assent in this session?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would think that is the government's intention.

RULE AGAINST PERPETUITIES

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to modify the rule against perpetuities.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the law reform commission last year, I think in its first report to the Legislature, dealt with the modification of the rule against perpetuities which is a court-made rule having to do with the descent of property, the length of time it may be controlled in an estate. That report was tabled in the Legislature during the last session and the report contained a draft bill to modify the rule against perpetuities. It was deliberately left on the table and not dealt with in order that we might have representations, suggestions, proposals, with regard to it, and to give an opportunity for further study. A number of representations have been made, both to The Department of the Attorney General and the law reform commission. As a result of those, the bill as submitted last year has been modified and a report, which I shall table very shortly—in fact I had intended to table it today—a further report from the law reform commission has been submitted with a bill slightly amended from the bill which was tabled with the report last year.

I do not think I need to give a dissertation at this point, on the ruling of perpetuities.

Mr. Singer: Why not at this point?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sure some of my legal brothers might enjoy it, but perhaps the

other members of the House might find it rather boring.

The principle of the bill, however, is simply that instead of declaring a direction in a will void for offence against the rule against perpetuities, generally the principle is to wait and see if conditions come about which will enable the bequest or devise to be carried out.

Mr. Singer: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General permit a question?

When this bill comes before the legal bills committee, could he arrange to have appear before the legal bills committee Dean C. A. Wright who probably is one of the few gentlemen who really understands this important principle of law?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I should be very glad to invite Dean Wright, and I trust he would attend. He is certainly, very knowledgeable and an expert in this field, and, I may say, was of great assistance in the drafting of this bill and in preparation of the report which accompanies it.

Mr. Singer: Good!

THE ACCUMULATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Accumulations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I need say nothing of this bill except that it is a very brief amendment, complementary to the bill I just introduced, the bill modifying the rule against perpetuities.

THE TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the same remarks apply with respect to this bill as those I stated with respect to The Accumulations Act.

THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the same remarks apply to this bill as those with respect to The Trustee Act and The Accumulations Act. They are simply complementary to the bill modifying the rule against perpetuities.

Mr. Speaker, I have with me the report No. 1A of the Ontario law reform commission, which is in respect to the rule against perpetuities, and I would propose to table it at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(*continued*)

On vote 407:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise some other questions on housing with the Minister. I understand that the short drop in the amount under limited dividend housing has been from $463,000 in 1965-66 to $130,000 in 1966-67. It results from the fact, I understand, that OHC is no longer responsible for limited dividend housing, and that has been transferred to The Department of Public Welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I question this move. What experience has The Department of Public Welfare in the housing field? Are The Departments of Public Welfare and Economics and Development going to co-operate in this field?

I feel that it is another shortcoming in the OHC. I had the understanding that a good tenant, with sufficient income in public housing, could arrange to switch over to a mortgage and eventually, if he wished, could own the house outright. My understanding at present is that this is not being done in any OHC housing in Ontario. I think it must start soon. The arrangement I have mentioned gives the people in public housing a goal to shoot for, and gives them a certain added pride in their own home. I realize that there are many persons in public housing that are in town houses or multiple units, and these are going to call for special arrangements so far as ownership is concerned.

But it is far from impossible, and I think the Minister could work out something, whereby the people would have a goal to

work towards in their pride of ownership. I would ask the Minister, after I have completed these remarks, if he would say whether he is working towards such a system.

I was happy to learn, Mr. Chairman, that the turnover in OHC is 12 to 15 per cent a year, compared to about 20 per cent in private housing. Apparently in OHC housing, 50 per cent of the people receive some sort of subsidy, while 40 per cent live there on their own means. These are overall figures that I am using.

I wonder if the Minister could inform us whether any particular projects have fallen below these percentages in terms of turnover and private-public mixed. On the whole, Mr. Chairman, public housing tenants have proven to be good tenants—I want to underline that—and really there is no reason why they should not be. Far and away the most of these people are hardworking Canadians who happen to earn less than some of us. But I get tired, Mr. Chairman, of newspapers who portray these people as some kind of slobs, and I get tired, frankly, of members of the Legislature who try and portray these people as emotional misfits. For example, there are some who say they must have a social worker to integrate these people who move into public housing; to integrate them into a middle-class way of life, or into the apartments and other things which are being provided.

I think the people who make this kind of suggestion, no matter how well meaning they may be, are really doing an injustice to the people who are wanting to be integrated. They are quiet, unassuming people, who want to get a decent roof over their heads and fit into the community. They do not want social workers and others to be emphasizing to them that there are some kind of traumatic experiences under which they have to have psychiatric or psychoanalytical treatment in order to fit in. I say that that kind of approach with respect to public housing is not helping the integration of people into public housing.

I understand that the OHC has tenant relations officers, but these people are not trained social workers. If a family has a problem, they know where they can get help. If they need help with budgeting, these people can help them. If they need help in a number of areas, they can go to these people.

I would like to now turn to emergency housing, a problem which has existed in Toronto because we have, in my opinion, a serious lack of co-ordination. The city of Toronto buys some emergency housing units and so, of course, does OHC. Consequently, we have two agencies bidding one against the other for a limited commodity. Because there are two agencies in the field, there is a great temptation to pass the buck.

I think one agency should be responsible for providing emergency housing in Metro, and that agency should be OHC. It already has a good deal of experience in the field. In the first four months of this year it provided emergency housing for 92 families.

This still leaves a good deal of responsibility with the city welfare department. It would have to screen initially applicants for emergency housing. People require emergency housing for a number of reasons. There is the family that is threatened with eviction because it cannot pay the rent. The welfare department, after reviewing the case, could well find it was cheaper to pay the family's rent for a few months rather than try to find other accommodation. Then there is the family that is evicted, and temporary quarters are usually supplied for this kind of family by Toronto at the Ford hotel. But no family should have to live in a hotel for long. Emergency housing should be available as quickly as possible.

Finally, there are newcomers to the city—I am thinking of families who come from the Maritimes, not only from Europe; families who come from the Maritimes and from other areas. The welfare department should have the responsibility of assessing whether these families can make good in Toronto, and if they can, housing should be available for them. Even if the OHC did take over the Toronto housing authority and the Limited Dividends Company, the city would still have important responsibilities in housing.

As I suggested, the welfare responsibility would be for screening many applicants for housing, and the city would be partly responsible for the housing registry, the waiting list for public housing. It would have the key job of surveying, assessing and planning redevelopment projects along with Metro council.

Just to conclude the remarks I have made, Mr. Chairman, OHC was given the job by Metro council to get 45,000 units of housing by the end of 1967. And this—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Four thousand, five hundred!

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, yes. This request is one which, I believe, has to be met,

but OHC will have to keep striving to keep up the commitment.

As I see it, there is a real danger that the commitment will not be met. Municipalities delay and hinder the schemes laid before them in the form of builder proposals; and I also question whether OHC's goals will be met when we see that its capital disbursements of $9,750,000 are the same as last year.

I also question how the department reached these goals in the first place, when OHC does not have any real study of substandard housing at hand. I know that OHC has done a 25-year study of total housing needs, but it was purely a statistical study. I realize that housing studies are the responsibility of the municipalities and The Department of Municipal Affairs, but so far little has been produced. OHC cannot operate this way. If the surveys are not done in a reasonable length of time, then I believe that OHC has to take the responsibility for them. The odd fact is that Ontario is building public housing and yet it seems to me it has no idea at all how much of a dent it is making in the province's stock of substandard housing.

I would like to just re-emphasize the need for emergency housing and for public housing with respect to human beings. I have a number of applications here which I was able to get, showing the sense of desperation on the part of Canadians to get a decent roof over their heads.

Here is an application that I have, Mr. Chairman, which is from a family of six. They are living in a two-room apartment in this city where we enjoy a great deal of wealth and affluence and are inclined to get very complacent and disinterested. This is a family of Canadians, a family of six, living in a two-room apartment for $90 a month. There are four children who are living together with their parents in a single bedroom. I would think that would shake up the Minister of Public Welfare, among others, to feel, as we sit in these plush seats here, that we should be coming up with a bit more dynamic approach than just year after year listening to statistics of this kind.

The applicant has had his name on file for over eight years—eight years. His income is $3,840 a year, but the family allowance brings it up to $4,224.

Here is another family, and this family is struggling to get out of a slum area. They complain that their sons—there are five of them ranging in age from four to ten years—are subjected to some kind of abuse from the neighbourhood children and that it is common for the children in the area to spit and to swear and smoke and so on. But the interesting point in this application, is that the man and his wife, although spending less than a third of their income—and their income is $3,456—on rental of the house, appear to be trapped. There is no similar accommodation available for them in another area without going to the housing authority. Here we see this really pathetic and tragic story of a family trying to pull themselves up. Their application has been waiting for years, through a lot of bureaucracy.

Here is another one. This woman is obviously in bad financial shape. On the basis of the income figures that she supplies, and considering that she has four children to feed and clothe and that she is spending about 40 per cent of her income on accommodation at the present time, one would surely consider this urgent. Yet again you have the pathos of a woman with four children going through all the bureaucratic red tape of writing to try to get some decency into the lives of herself and her children.

We picked these up in a file somewhere with no action being taken.

I have another one. It is, again, a woman in desperation, in an urgent situation. She spends about 40 per cent of her income on housing accommodation.

I simply want to say, sir, we are not talking in just academic terms when we are referring to emergency housing and public housing and even housing for middle-class people, young people who are trying to start out. We are talking, really, of the sinews of being part of a community, of giving people an opportunity to have some dignity within our society. I think this government has got a real responsibility to move into this picture, to cut through the red tape which obviously exists, to move on municipalities which are lax in either surveys or their approaches to housing.

I would hope that the hon. Minister—I think last year and the year before, when he first became Minister, he told us, "Give me some time and I will achieve certain goals." Last year I remember that the hon. member for Scarborough West and I said that we would hold off in this area until the Minister would report next year. I think he has tried to make sense and I congratulate him on what he has done in some of the areas, and I congratulate the chairman of the Ontario housing corporation on the fact that—I will put in this vernacular—he had the guts, despite pressure and outrage from snobbish citizens around the area, to say: We are going to push forward on this.

I congratulate the hon. Minister on what has been done, but I say that he has a great deal more to do in this area.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. Minister was going to reply to the comments of the hon. leader of the Opposition. If he is not, then I will carry on with—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to. Since the hon. member was speaking last night, I thought that perhaps he would want to continue.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, I will do that then.

Last night I brought up the idea of the rental appeal board and a resolution that had been unanimously passed at a meeting in the city of Windsor. Two questions in the brief presented to the government that I failed to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister were:

1. This meeting endorsed that a rental appeal board be established in Windsor for the duration of the housing crisis; and

2. That we call upon the Premier of Ontario to enact such emergency legislation as will enable this board to be initiated immediately.

I asked the hon. Minister yesterday if the government had taken this into consideration and what their intentions were concerning this resolution. We are all aware of the multiplied deleterious effects of inadequate housing, especially the deleterious social effects that it can have. We also are aware back in our own community that we have land available, but it is not serviced, and to get the land serviced we have to go to the OMB. To go to the OMB we are under limitations on our capital works, so we are trapped in a vicious circle. How do we get out of this circle to provide sufficient housing for the area?

Now, one of the members of the hon. Minister's own staff, Mr. P. E. H. Brady, deputy managing director of the Ontario housing corporation commented in a meeting back in my own community sometime last week—I think it was May 18—that in 1966 there is a critical need for housing; a great need for more housing. Despite the high cost of land, services, labour and the lack of mortgage money, he urged government and the housing authority to co-operate more closely to produce more housing, and he said that the housing contractors can build quickly and well. Even in an affluent society such as ours, there are many thousands of families and individuals who cannot afford a decent roof over their heads. The great majority who require housing are decent hard-working people who, for one reason or another, are limited in their earning potential. He came up with a figure that one would have to have a minimum income of at least $7,500 a year before one could afford to purchase or build one's own home.

Mr. Chairman, an income of that magnitude is not too common, especially among those who have been unemployed for a long period of time, and only in the past two or three years have they been able to find employment back in my own community. The fact that they cannot get homes has had a very skyrocketing effect on the rents in the community, and it is so bad that there are many citizens who have to pay well over 30 per cent of their income. In fact, the housing authority charges as much as 30.2 per cent of the individual's income for housing, and I understand that the figures state that not more than 25 per cent of income should be paid for housing; if more than that is paid then one is deprived of other necessities of life.

There has been, and still is, a shortage of mortgage money. Mortgage money is readily available if the individual is willing to pay 10 per cent and 12 per cent for money. But how can an individual who is working, or who has just started to work, afford to be paying such high interest rates to get mortgage money? High-rise apartments are going up, but the fact that high-rise apartments are being built does have a sort of hurting effect on the small builder because the skilled tradesman prefers to work on the high-rise project where he brings his equipment and leaves it there for a fairly long period of time, rather than move it from one small project and then to a second and a third. So even the small builder is being handicapped today, and the handicap is primarily a result of skill shortages in the community.

Now, the government will either have to come up with low-interest loans to those people who would like to purchase homes, or will have to subsidize their rental in some fashion, because many cannot afford to pay $150, $160 and $175 a month in rent for housing accommodation.

I would like to ask of the hon. Minister first if the rental appeal board idea has merit,

and what the intention of the government is concerning this? After he replies to this, I have a few other suggestions I would like to make.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has asked a question about a rental appeal board. We received a letter from the chairman of the rental appeal board and I replied to him and sent a copy to the hon. member—which I am sure he has.

Our feeling is that this is not in our jurisdiction at the moment. The only time rental control has taken place in this country has been in cases of emergency. I think we all recognize that while there may be a shortage of housing in certain areas, it does not necessarily mean that rental control should be used carte blanche, but I think it would be very difficult to apply it in one area and not in another.

In connection with rental control generally, it is my understanding—and I think that some members of this House are more familiar with it than I am—that whenever rental control has been applied in the past, it has ultimately resulted in the rapid deterioration of the properties involved. We recognize that the revenues obtained from the property rentals must first be applied against the indebtedness of the property, i.e., repayments of principal and interest; payments of municipal taxes which continue to climb; adequate maintenance expenditures, and administration costs. All these things continue to go up for the owner of the property, and it is only if there is a surplus left over after he takes care of all these increases that the landlord can be accused of profiteering, and this has to be proven before one can say that rental control should be applied.

On the repayment of principal and interest, this is a costed amount, and I think it is recognized that it remains that way and you know where you are going with it. But municipal taxes are rising steadily and they increase, as I said, as do the maintenance costs and other factors in keeping a home together, particularly if you are the property owner.

Therefore, we feel that were rental controls in such areas and the owner could make savings on maintenance and administration—certainly if it is a competitive condition—he is going to reduce his rent. There is no competitive condition in rents in Windsor right now, as I appreciate. But if the maintenance of the home is allowed to lapse, it deteriorates the neighbourhood and, therefore, more money has to be spent by the landlord. If he cannot get that out of revenue or from his tenants, certainly it deteriorates the home; it deteriorates the neighbourhood. I think this was true during the last emergency period when rent control was in effect.

These are some of the things that must be seriously considered before one would apply rent control of any kind. I think that the hon. member will agree that Windsor is enjoying unprecedented prosperity at the present time, and naturally a great many people have been attracted to Windsor because of the high income jobs that are available in the parts and in the motorcar industries, and many tenants are in full recovery rental projects right now. As you know, we have had some difficulty. People are living in housing projects down there now which are a part of a federal-provincial-municipal partnership. Perhaps they should move out and find accommodation on their own. We have been lenient about it, as the hon. member knows, because there was nowhere for them to go. So in areas like that the Ontario housing corporation has bent over backwards to try and help solve that kind of a problem.

I do not have any crystal ball, but I think today we see signs of some adjustment coming in the construction industry, and I am quite sure the private builders are going to provide more accommodation. I think we have evidence of that in what has happened in Windsor in the past year.

For instance, in the city of Windsor, the Ontario housing corporation now has 797 family units occupied and under administration, 205 under construction, 141 about to commence, and 216 units going to tender. In addition, the corporation has proceeded with the servicing of the land in Sandwich, which we talked about the other day, through annexation, and further public housing is going to be built on this land. The remainder of the land that is being serviced will be available for private owners to build on, or, for the developers to come in and make a proposition.

In addition to this, I understand that the NHA just recently insured loans for 155 units in Riverdale area alone. There are a further 300 units in the same area which will be started within the next month or so.

I am of the opinion that the situation is a difficult one, but the Ontario housing corporation is not in a position to build homes for people who can afford to rent off private developers. That is the last position we should get into, competing with private developers.

Now, I think the city of Windsor recognizes there are opportunities there. There is a need there, and perhaps some pressure by

the newspapers will invite private developers to come in and participate in this prosperity which would be better than having the city request the Ontario housing corporation to build houses for people who are not within the category requiring some subsidies. One of the things—and I am not trying to be facetious—that worried us about the Windsor situation which we heard from the rentals committee down there; was the LeGoyeau apartments, just built in Windsor, advertising: "Work in the U.S. and live in Canada." Somewhere there are some properties available for rent in Windsor, but the hon. member says the rent may be too high for the people he is talking about.

Mr. Newman: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is one of the situations where they are advertising bachelor studios at $125 and up, one bedroom $160 and up, two bedrooms $180 and underground parking $15. It is obvious that the developers are in there, but they are going to rent their property to the highest bidder. I can appreciate the squeeze Windsor is in. But again, I think we have done everything that the city of Windsor has asked. We have never turned down a project from the city of Windsor. We have moved as quickly as they have asked us to in supplying housing in the Windsor area. I believe with the annexation that is now taking place and the availability of land which is not in Windsor proper, as the hon. member knows, now being readied, in the next year, or the next few months, this land will be available for private developers to get in and start doing some building.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, what you have said is correct and I can also say that we appreciate what has been done by the hon. Minister's department. They have been most co-operative when it comes to the requests from the community. But in the meantime, you still have the problem of rent gouging; that has not been answered at all. The request by the Windsor district labour council, I think it was, was for a rental appeal board, not a rent control board. Whether this appeal board would have had any authority under law is not the case in point. It would embarrass the individual who would be rent gouging. By that type of embarrassment they would hope to be able to maintain the rates of rentals at a reasonable level. Your department of government already has rent control. You control rentals in motel units, do you not? You control rentals in hotels. You have a maximum, fixed rental on the motel units.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We do not control it. I think they suggest what the maximum should be so the customer—

Mr. Newman: Well, all right; you suggest a maximum.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, could not a similar suggestion be made to certain types of homes? Could not the department undertake a study of the home and in co-operation with municipal authorities, knowing the taxes, knowing the location, the value of the home, say that on this home maximum rental, or suggested rental, should be $100 a month? A home in a better locality, a better type of home, could have a maximum rental suggested of maybe $125 a month. You know, you are going to have to subsidize these people either with welfare or you are going to have to provide housing for them. I think that by rental control you are preventing some of the social problems that are going to become more and more serious as time goes on. It is a rental appeal board that the organization is suggesting, not a rental control board, because the rent control Act is still in effect, if I am not mistaken. It has never been repealed. So that if a municipality wishes to set up rent controls I think they have the authority to do so at the present moment—any municipality in Ontario. What about this rental appeal board, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I wrote to Mr. McArthur, the secretary of the fair-rent committee. That is the chap who wrote me. I said not to come down because my estimates were going into the House. I was not sure when I would be in, but I concluded by saying: "I would suggest, however, that you let us have a report on your meeting so that we can view the recommendations and be guided accordingly."

As soon as Mr. McArthur drops us a line we can take a look at it and see if we could be any assistance to him in this matter. But I have not heard from Mr. McArthur yet. I might also suggest that while Mr. McArthur is proceeding with his investigations, there is, right now, a request from the city of Windsor for a copy of the analysis of the overall situation in Windsor. This is under way, as you know, between central mortgage and housing corporation, ourselves and the city of Windsor. I think it would be perhaps moving too quickly to accept any recommendations of Mr. McArthur's until we have had the study completed. Perhaps

out of the study we can answer some of the questions the hon. member poses.

Mr. Newman: You are right, Mr. Minister. May I ask of the hon. Minister if he has considered industrial housing for the community, seeing that the community has this acute situation? Some type of co-operative housing where industry and government could get together and amortize the cost of the home over a long period of time and be able to rush into a programme in a community to overcome the emergency?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is one of the things we hope to get when we get the housing corporation rolling and take care of the immediate needs of housing. Condominium is one that your hon. leader brought up a few minutes ago. This is another form of housing that we are examining with the central mortgage and housing corporation to see if it is possible to provide housing under this basis, where people can become home owners in condominiums. It is used extensively in Europe, as we know. At the moment I do not believe it is too active over here, but we think it has some merit; we are taking a look at it.

Mr. Newman: How about, Mr. Minister, prefabricated homes? I understand the province of Quebec has come up with a prefab type of home that could be set up in a municipality in a matter of months, and overcome housing shortages.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are familiar with some of these prefabricated housing programmes, because we have been interested in doing the same thing as they are doing in Europe. I think as you may have read in the press the other day, something like 50 homes are thrown up in an afternoon. We have looked at the prefabricated homes for two reasons. First, for homes for the Indian people that we are talking about in the pilot scheme. If the emergency is there, and it perhaps is, there is nothing wrong with using prefabricated homes if they meet the standards that the people require, and on which central mortgage and housing corporation will advance money.

Mr. Newman: We could assume that after the studies are completed in my area, if this would be the case, you would be ready to come into this community with prefabricated homes for the emergency?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think we would examine it very carefully. I would not want to give you a yes or no this afternoon, but let me say that we are looking at it with interest.

Mr. Newman: Right. Mr. Minister, in my comments on the Throne debate, I made a suggestion on the use of mobile homes. Has anyone in the department taken that into study to see the feasibility of using mobile homes as a solution for housing shortages and for emergency rental housing in communities?

Hon. Mr. Randall: To the best of my knowledge, nothing has been done in providing that kind of home accommodation. Again, it is one that I presume could be looked at to see if in certain areas it would fit. But it is a pretty expensive way to house people. I think if you look at some of those mobile homes, it is a fairly expensive proposition.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, you do have large homes in a community that are occupied by only one or two individuals—older homes. They would be glad to get rid of them at a fairly decent price if you would permit them to go into senior citizens homes. In the meantime, while you are building senior citizens homes, you could consider accommodating those people in mobile homes, if they were willing, until the time a senior citizen project was completed. Then the mobile homes could be moved out; you could use them for farm labour. They could be sold, after they had been used for a period of time, for summer cottages. So there would be very little loss in the use of the mobile homes as a solution to housing shortages in some communities.

Four months ago, in fact it was February 1, I asked a question concerning the scale of rentals for government-owned homes in a community. When can we expect an answer? This is now four months.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The answer to that is very simple: We will have an answer as soon as the federal government accepts the rental scale that we have suggested to them, and have a chance to study it. They are doing that right now. We are in constant discussion with the federal authorities on the change in rental scales; we have made some recommendations and I am quite sure that we will get a decision on it before too long. But things are changing very quickly insofar as incomes, living conditions and the cost of living are concerned. I appreciate that the central mortgage and housing corporation, like ourselves, will have to give some study to this before they can make any decisions. But we have

done our preliminary work and made a proposition to CMHC and we are waiting for a reply from them.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, would you consider a rebate to individuals who have been overcharged, as it is today, paying 30 per cent of their income for certain types of government housing? That is much too heavy a price to pay for housing in government homes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think, answering your question, that many of the families we are talking about are being undercharged in some areas. Those people are the people we suggested should be living in private accommodation. If they are paying 30 per cent premium, it is because they should not be there, they should be in some other accommodation.

Now, as soon as housing is available by private developers, the problem that you may have will not be there. I do not think we would consider any rebates under the present renting scheme.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Minister, I have brought up the case of a family with three children, $95 a week, paying $163 a month rental. That is much too much.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is not one of ours, is it?

Mr. Newman: Well, I understand it was one of yours, but I am not sure of that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think so.

Mr. Thompson: I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister if he would be good enough to answer some of the questions that I raised?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be delighted to.

The first question you brought up, I think, was the limited dividend problem. When we formed the Ontario housing corporation, the limited dividend companies were—and still are—building homes not only around Metro but in other areas, and our government was giving grants to limited dividend housing developments. The last one I can think of is the Thistletown project, where we financed a mortgage for $820,000. We made a grant of $530 thousand-odd to reduce the rent that the tenants moving into that area would have to pay. But along with that, we built other housing through the Ontario housing corporation which eliminated the need for limited dividend. We feel that we have moved ahead of limited dividend housing, and it is no longer required.

Now, insofar as homes for the aged, we build those homes outside the Metro area. But Metro still wants to build their own homes for the aged in the Metro area and we give them a grant per unit, as you know. Outside of the Metro area, we also build the homes for the aged and provide the facilities, as we have done up there at Thistletown. We do not feel there is any need for limited dividend companies from here on in, because as quickly as we can find houses, as quickly as we get a request from a municipality, we are building the number of houses that limited dividend housing was building. So I think that takes care of the question you may have had in mind. As to, has it disappeared and have we replaced it with anything?—We have replaced it with Ontario housing corporation.

Now, you bring up the matter of emergency housing, and again I just want to suggest that we are very sympathetic to those who are put out on the street overnight. This happens. It happens in every community and the welfare officers, as a rule, can take care of those people for a matter of 24 hours or three or four days, and this is what is happening in Toronto.

If they have somebody burned out, as we have had—I think you mentioned this lady's name a few minutes ago—if we have cases like that, it is only a matter of a few days before we find accommodation for them, either through this agency, or through the Metro authorities.

So emergency housing is really transient housing. It is really not permanent. If we were to take people out—say they are evicted from one area—and move them into one of our housing units, and then have to take them out of there again for somewhere else, because it did not suit them, or did not suit the area in which they wanted to live, we would have two moves on our hands. So I think what we are talking about here in emergency housing is something that all welfare departments in Metro or anywhere else will have to deal with on a day-by-day basis. But as soon as they get into difficulties in finding permanent locations, then they come to us and we find it for them.

Let me just give you a few cases here. I think you mentioned a lady with four children? We heard about the case. We took care of it as quickly as we could, and if you have had anybody who has been looking for emergency housing for eight or nine months, we would like to know about it.

If they come to us, I think you have had enough experience to know that we will move as quickly as we can and find a home for these people. But what has happened to us in the city of Toronto here is that people have been evicted for not being the kind of tenant that they want in the area, and the Toronto authorities have put them into emergency housing and said: "It is your problem, now find them a home." They have evicted them from one area, and then call them emergency housing cases. So you see the position we are placed in.

We have had to find accommodation for these people. I have a number of cases here.

For instance, there is case Family A, a deaf-mute couple with five children who were given notice to vacate a privately-owned house because the owner required possession. The family was immediately offered accommodation by the Ontario housing corporation in another part of Metro, but they managed to obtain accommodation locally by their own endeavours. On moving day, having moved their furniture from their previous house, they discovered that the new landlord had changed his mind. In their distress they appealed to the local welfare administrator who contacted Ontario housing corporation which was able to house the family the same day.

This is going on constantly. We hear about the odd case, but I think if you check our figures for the number of people we have housed out of the city of Toronto—I think it is 900-and-some-odd we mentioned the other day, we have these emergency cases on our hands—we move as quickly as we can when it comes to our attention. I can assure you we are not at all callous about it, because of the 1,204 families housed, 611 were from the city of Toronto, 593 from other municipalities than Metro, and among these were 40 families from Alexandra Park, 41 families from St. James Town, and the six families from Napier Place.

We are going to have to live with these emergency cases every day in the week. We have had people apply to us for housing and at the same time, they get in touch with the newspapers and say they are going to be evicted. Now, it is difficult for us to stand up and defend ourselves in those cases, but if people will come to us and tell us what their problem is, we will endeavour to find a place for them to live. We realize they cannot live at the Ford hotel indefinitely, and they cannot live in a motel indefinitely with a family of children. All these cases, as I say, if they are brought to our attention are handled as we have a sufficient knowledge of the difficulties, and we have housing available. Of course, as we acquire more housing I think there will be less and less cases of an emergency nature such as we have been dealing with.

Mr. Thompson: I raised the question that there are two agencies connected with emergency housing in Toronto, and it is my feeling that there should be one agency so you do not get duplication and overlapping. The agency should be yours, OHC. I notice you came out yesterday very clearly discussing the city of Toronto, I wonder if you would do the same with respect to emergency housing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me just say this. If the city of Toronto accepted the proposition we made, we would have to assume the responsibility for emergency housing. But I can recall back a few years ago, when we did not have the Toronto emergency housing, and it was handled by the welfare department—I think the man's name was Mr. Soule—and we had very little difficulty. It is difficult for me to understand why we do not have these same day-to-day problems in other municipalities around Toronto, or in Metro, but we certainly have them in the city of Toronto. I agree with you that if the city of Toronto accepted the proposition we have made on several occasions we would have to accept the responsibility, but we would also set up the necessary authority to handle it on a day-to-day basis.

The Ontario housing corporation's main objective and main job is to provide permanent housing, not for emergency purposes only.

I think that we have covered most of the questions. If you have any others, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, through you may I point out to the hon. Minister that there are a number of municipalities which have not done a study of housing? Obviously, for the hon. Minister to do his job around Ontario, he should have an assessment of what the needs are. Would the Minister consider a time limit for municipalities to do a study and then he could move in and get on with the job?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was just trying to think of some figures while I was waiting for some information here.

Mr. Chairman: While the Minister is waiting for that information, the member for Kingston.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have the information, sir. As you recall when we held our symposium with the federal authorities, we invited all the municipalities to come and understand exactly what the housing programme was all about. Since that time we have been in touch with each municipality and suggested—and I think the figures indicate we have more than doubled the requirements, the number of requests from municipalities for studies—that all they have to do is call us and we will make the study for them. It is a matter of them saying: "We want housing here" and we will go in and make the study.

But we have not just sent men out into every municipality, because there are something like 900-odd in Ontario; it is only those that are interested that will get the study. But we have even small towns like Palmerston and we have gone in and made a study and built 12 units. So it is not limited to just the major metropolitan areas. If there is any area that anybody knows about that should be studied, if they will get in touch with us we will send the people out to make the study.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the Minister; he will send the people out to make the study even though the municipality may not have asked him to do this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not unless there is a need for homes. First of all, we have to know is there a need for homes in that area. We do not go around ringing doorbells looking for a place to build Ontario housing. But the municipalities are all aware that housing is available to them under this programme if they will get in touch with us.

Some local civic authorities may be more active and more conscientious about housing than others. The ones we hear from who say, "Will you come out and make a study?", we put on the list, go out and make the study and advise them whether or not they need housing. In most cases, this has resulted in housing in almost all the areas that we studied.

Mr. Thompson: My concern, Mr. Chairman, is that—and I have not the figures here, but this summer I was particularly interested in housing and we did a study of municipalities, where there had been ARDA programmes and some others, examining the need for housing. But unfortunately you do get a certain resilience on the part of certain municipalities and councils who feel a sense of shame or something in admitting they have rundown homes and people living in very difficult circumstances. And they are not prepared to do a survey.

If I could mention the hon. Provincial Treasurer, the purse strings of the Conservative party, I think it came as a revelation to him that in his constituency there are people who are actually living in poverty. I guess it is this kind of complacency, a cocoon that some people build around themselves because they do not want to look at some of the hard, harsh circumstances under which some of their fellow citizens are living.

I feel there are municipalities and there are councils who want to keep quiet about the Peyton Place in housing, the shame of some housing situations. And knowing the sort of aggressive approach the Minister has, I think he would be fed up with those people and say, "Look, we are going to provide decent housing for our citizens, and to heck with the municipality automony and all that; we are going through that kind of bureaucratic blockade. We are going to provide decent housing, we will push right in on it. If you will not make a survey, we will." And I am hoping this will be the approach of the Minister on it, I think he has a first-class person as chairman of his Ontario housing commission, I have been impressed with some of the work that has been done, but I want to underline that there is still a great deal to do as you look at some of the surveys of the conditions under which people live in Ontario.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact at the present time that the CMHC loans are almost nonexistent now as far as private builders are concerned. They are not able to obtain any money through CMHC. I was wondering if there has been any indication from the federal government that these loans now are going to be cut back as far as the low-rental housing is concerned as it applies to the Ontario housing corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know if the hon. member was in the House when I read some figures off yesterday. And I have since read in the press the hon. Mr. Nicholson's statement that money for housing will be available, that he has his budget approved in the House and there is no shortage of money for NHA housing. I will just read these figures again. While they say housing starts have slowed down, it is not true. From January 1 to April 30 in 1965, there were 3,993, this year it is 4,078. Completions were 4,871 last year, this year they are 6,212. Under construction at April 30 last year were 21,943, this year 30,270. And approved loans

by NHA January 1 to April 30, was 2,798, this year 3,140; and approved direct loans to private individuals, January 1 to April 30, was 256 last year; this year it is 737. So I think some of the reports are erroneous.

Mr. Apps: I am glad to hear those figures. It is hard to convince people who have applied for loans and have not been able to get them.

I have another question: There is a fair demand for low-rental housing units for people who have to go about in wheelchairs. It is very difficult for them to live in the normal low-rental units because of the fact they have to climb up stairs. I was wondering whether these people would also be eligible to apply to get into a special type of low-rental housing that would enable them to get up ramps and so forth and make it much easier for them to get in and out of their houses?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was in Windsor earlier in the year and we built housing for that type of tenant and could not rent it. It was turned over to the senior citizens development. There may be needs in various communities, but the experience has been that most people can get along in ordinary accommodation without having it especially built. But if in an area there is a greater number of those people than in other areas, if they get in touch with us, let us know what the score is, I think we could find some accommodation suitable for them.

Mr. Apps: If it could be proved that the need arises, there is no reason why it could not be made available?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the catastrophic shortage of housing in Metropolitan Toronto. Not merely low-rental housing but housing of all types which, in my opinion, despite the figures of the hon. Minister has been caused by the curtailment of mortgage money which has been the policy at Ottawa to a great extent.

I have had in my office three calls in the last day and a half from people actually not in the low rental, in the medium to low class, who have been renting houses and have to get out June 30. One foolishly sold his house for a $1,500 investment which he had in the house. He cannot buy a house, he cannot rent one. These families are probably in the $4,500 to $5,500 bracket. They are not considered low-rental, but the very fact is, in Metro today people cannot find houses to live in. I agree it is out of the orbit of which we have been talking, but I would strongly suggest to the hon. Minister something has to be done quickly and seriously to release money to build houses for our expanding population in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the housing commissioner would consider raising the taxes that are paid on homes for senior citizens in the areas? I understand the tax collectable on these units is $25 to the municipalities. The municipalities think that while they need the homes, they are not realizing enough in view of the services that they have to supply.

I have an instance in my own town where they have not yet dealt with it favourably just on account of this $25 minimum tax coming to the municipality. They do need the homes. They have the applications there and they have the land which is serviced right by the municipality. It is the property where the former public school stood in the town. There are now eight senior citizen units there as well as 12 other units, and they have done a fine chore. They are very happy with them, yet I think some of the municipalities are just not happy with the amount of taxes that do come to them for the services given.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there are two rather isolated items I would like to raise with the hon. Minister. One is that, in my experience, there is a persistent shortage of bachelor apartments, particularly for senior citizens.

I was interested yesterday, for example, in the York township housing corporation, the Beach Hall apartments, of which I happen to be a director this year, that the superintendent reports they have applications for 60 single senior citizens—widows or widowers—whereas they would be glad tomorrow to take couples. I am wondering, since this is a general pattern, whether or not consideration has been given to purchasing individual units scattered across the city and fitting it into the kind of programme that you have got, so that you will meet this rather persistent need and catch up on this backlog of single senior citizens.

Conceivably you would be able to achieve another desirable objective in housing policy, and that is of getting them scattered around so that they might be able to be in much the same community in which they grew up. They will not be uprooted and taken to some other area at a stage in life when they find

it a little difficult to adapt once again to new friends and new circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think I can comment on that. When we first started looking for housing, advertising in the press, it was for a larger bedroom count to take care of the families. Since that time we have been able to take on a number of apartment projects in which the majority of them would be one- and two-bedroom apartments and some bachelor. We were somewhat leery of taking on some of these projects because, we said, well this is not giving us the bedroom count. Then we found the very thing that you suggested; a lot of senior citizens did not want to go to senior citizens homes. They wanted to live in the area in which they had been brought up. For instance, I was in the riding of the hon. member for Beaches the other day and a dear old lady was telling me her friend was just taken out to Sunnyside somewhere and she had always lived in the east end.

In the search for housing already in stock we have taken into consideration some of these one- and two-bedroom and bachelor suites for the same reason that you suggested here. We have very little of that accommodation—in fact, I do not think any of that accommodation is now available. We can always find a tenant to go in. I think as we continue with our programme of buying stock already on the market, we are not turning down any of these units. This ties in with the project we are undertaking to provide student accommodation. We are not going to get student accommodation right in the college grounds, but if there is an apartment house within a reasonable distance of the college, we would be very fortunate if most of those are one- and two-bedroom apartments. Then we will get more accommodation for more people in those areas and will not have to turn those projects down.

We have turned down, in some areas, apartment houses because of the bedroom count. But now we think we have broken the back of the big-family problem which we had about a year ago. They are always going to be with us, but I think we have taken care of the worst of the problem. We are looking at anything in the way of an apartment house in an area where senior citizens have access to bus service. Some of the areas where apartments have been offered to us, of course, are away out in the sticks as far as the old people are concerned. Unless there is a bus service or the subway service right by few of them want to move out there, as you can appreciate. But if apartment houses are available in such areas as the Beaches, we are looking at them. We are picking them up where we can to accommodate the kind of person you are talking about.

Mr. MacDonald: I am very glad to hear the Minister's comment that they are looking into this. If you do, and get a stock, I think I can direct some patrons to you—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I may say your members have been doing a pretty good job of giving us customers.

Mr. MacDonald: All right. The second point I wanted to raise with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is that on two or three occasions in the past year, I have had letters of protest, sometimes from individuals and sometimes from labour councils in different parts of the province, with regard to the problems arising in a city when a strike takes place.

In many instances, the private owners will be willing to grant a moratorium on rentals for the duration of a strike, particularly if it is a tenant of whom they have had some considerable years of experience and they know he is reliable. But in your housing accommodation they are unwilling to do this. What rubs it in a little is that if, after the strike has gone on for some time and a wage increase has been secured, immediately the rental goes up, because it is geared to income. This is the principle upon which you are operating. On the one hand you will not grant the moratorium to meet the temporary need, and on the other you want to have your cake and eat it too; you will take your increase in rentals geared to the new income as a result of the strike effort.

I am wondering if some thought has been given to this, and whether or not you could at least conform with the normally less humane approach of the private landlord?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have not had too much experience with that. To the best of my knowledge, we have not had any major problems since I took on the Ontario housing corporation. I think perhaps there would be an injustice here, but looking at the other side of it, of course, it is a matter, if you allow a man on strike of his own volition to live in a house at the taxpayer's expense; you could be criticized for subsidizing a strike.

If I was an employer, that is the attitude I would take. If I was working for the union I would take the same attitude you

are taking. I think that there is a middle-of-the-road course in a case like this. It is hard to create an injustice for the family because the breadwinner is on strike. Sometimes he is on strike through no fault of his own. He may be a victim of circumstances. We have not had any major problems this way, but I think it is one thing we will have to look at if it develops into any major proportions.

Mr. MacDonald: You are willing to take the benefits of the strike when a wage increase has been won.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think so.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I want to underline what has been said by a couple of members this afternoon, that there is a very real problem in that area of the income group which is just above the group which can economically live in the public housing and yet cannot find accommodation in the private sector. Those of us who are targets for the requests for people of this kind are frustrated and bewildered.

I saw the other day a man who earns about $7,500. He had a large family, and no private landlord will take him in because of the size of his family. But because of the rental policy of the housing corporation, his rent would be almost prohibitive if he could get into housing accommodation under the Ontario housing corporation. It seems to me that in that area, some adjustment of policy is due, particularly to look after people with larger families. I think the hon. Minister might well look into that.

I was delighted to hear him indicate that his department wants to know about problem cases, because I certainly have been giving that department a good many problem cases over this past year or so. I reiterate what I said the other day: I am amazed at the number of miracles which that department comes up with. In the case of desperation, they seem to be able to find, very often, the solution to a problem. Not a perfect solution always, but at least it is a solution which carries the family over a time of crisis.

The other day I raised a problem and the Chairman ruled that perhaps I was out of order at that time and should raise it at this point of the estimates. The problem is still here; the problem of Mr. Robert Cook, an immigrant from Ireland who has been here six weeks. I was talking to him again at noon; he has not been able to find accommodation. His family of five children, along with his wife, are arriving at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. He wanted to come to Ontario; he had heard about Ontario from our literature and so he wanted to settle here. He was assured that he would have no trouble in getting accommodation. Because he was also assured that furniture was reasonable in price, he disposed of his furniture on the other side. The other day he saw an advertisement in the paper that he could furnish three bedrooms for $140. He was overjoyed. He thought: "This is exactly what they told me over there; this is fine." I warned him that it likely was $140 down, plus $140 a month for the rest of his life. He had better be wary of this kind of a deal. He thanked me for the advice I gave him.

He began to look for a house, because he felt it was easy in Canada. At the same time, he sent word for his family to come. They are coming tomorrow. I told this problem to the hon. Minister the other day, and the Minister's staff. I came up against the almost insuperable barrier that the policy of the Ontario housing corporation is that a man must be in this country for one year before he can get the kind of housing offered. This seems to me to be incredible—we bring in immigrants to this country, find jobs for them and give industry that service.

Then we say to them: "Leave your family at home for a year unless you can find private accommodation." What they do not know is that a family of five will not be accepted by a private landlord under almost any circumstance, particularly in the low-income groups.

This is a field that should be explored by the hon. Minister. He should take a look at this; if we are going to bring immigrants in, either through our own offices or through the Canadian office, we should say to them: "If you are coming, you may have difficulty with housing." Or we should change our policy and allow these people into our own housing units and not say to them that it will be a year before they can possibly bring their family over. If we are going to keep that rule, then make the issue clear to them.

This man today is very harassed and worried. He works all night and he hunts for a house all day. During this past week he has had almost no sleep. And at a time which should be a happy family reunion at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, he is going to meet his family with desperation in his eyes. One possible solution has been offered today—a two-bedroom apartment for five children and the couple. This is not satisfactory, and the rent is very high for him.

I would say to the hon. Minister that here

is a problem; the man is here and his family is going to be here tomorrow. He is worried, he is desperate; he is harried and he is a victim of policies for which the hon. Minister may not be primarily responsible, but which should be different and for which he should make representation to Ottawa and to his own overseas offices.

I would ask the hon. Minister if he has any answer. His own staff cannot make policy; they are hamstrung by the policy which is laid down and I would ask him in a situation like this just what is Robert Cook to do tomorrow at 3 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As I understand the gentleman's case, he is not a public housing client. He has sufficient money that he can rent from a private owner, if he can find accommodation. Is that right?

Mr. Young: He is getting $82 a week. He has $200 saved which must go to buy cots or something for his family to sleep on. He has gone down this afternoon to the station to bring home the trunk with the linen for the beds and tablecloths, and so on, which has been sent over here. That is all he has, $200. I have advised him to go to certain places to perhaps find cheap bedroom furniture, and I hope he will do that. But he cannot do it until he has a house, which means he works all tonight and tries desperately tomorrow to get some furniture—if he gets the house in the meantime—and tomorrow meets his family, dead on his feet.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Suters has suggested to me that if either the hon. member or Mr. Cook will get in touch with him between now and the time his family arrives, we will see if, through private developers, we can find some accommodation and help. I agree with the hon. member that he is on a spot, but if he has been here—I do not know how many weeks he has been here—

Mr. Young: Six weeks.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —but I think perhaps he would have been wise to find a spot to live before he told his family to come over. Now, perhaps there were circumstances which did not enable him to do that. Perhaps his home was sold and the family was—

Mr. Young: He was assured that he would have no trouble before he left Ireland.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know who assured him, but we will do what we can for him. If these cases are brought to us—

Mr. MacDonald: He read the speech of the hon. Minister of Mines and was given a false impression.

Hon. Mr. Randall: In this case, if the member will let Mr. Suters know where Mr. Cook can be located, we will see what we can do for him.

Mr. Young: I will see that the details are brought forward and I will be looking for a miracle tomorrow.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I was just going to say that if I found a friend of mine in that predicament in my area I would invite him into my home and he would be looked after until he was fixed up.

Mr. Young: The hon. Minister must have a very big home. We are delighted that he is living in that kind of a house!

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Since I have been in the House for the last 11 years, the subject of public housing has been a continual controversy in Metropolitan Toronto and I have often thought that it became too much of a political football. I could never determine, as an outsider, who was to blame for the lack of adequate public housing in the Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto area. I have always noted that the council would blame the board of control and the board of control would blame the housing department of the Ontario government, and at times I felt that the subject of public housing became too much of a political football.

I cannot say the same for the Hamilton situation, although I can say that the Hamilton situation is in a very serious condition today. The reason it has not been a political football is that there just has not been any attention paid by the city council to the need for public housing in the city of Hamilton.

We know that both sides have some responsibility, both the municipalities and the Ontario housing corporation, and I understand that it was a simple matter. Municipalities would decide what they needed in regard to public housing and they would make their request to the government. They would go in and build the houses. The hon. Minister told the House yesterday that that was their job, as long as they had the go-ahead to do the job.

First, I want to lay my criticism on the city of Hamilton and I feel that the lack of action in the past few years by the council

and the mayor of the city of Hamilton with regard to low-income, low-rental housing, is a serious indictment upon them. In this time of full employment, affluent society, and at a time when the corporation of the city of Hamilton has multi-million dollar expressway programmes, doing civic centre programmes and uptown development, we find we have a serious problem because of the lack of low-rental housing.

Anyone who might have paid attention to the situation in the past three or four years knew it was inevitable that we would reach the stage we are in today in the city of Hamilton. There just are not houses available there. The people who are really faced with the problem are the public welfare officers, children's aid societies and the social workers, who are frustrated. At times they must be somewhat heartbroken to know that they have to separate man and wife and put them in with relatives. They take the children, who are then scattered throughout the community in foster homes.

I understand that in the past year there were some 25 to 30 evictions for various reasons. I think the main reason was the fact that the income of the breadwinner was not high enough to pay the rent. Also, there was a market for the landlord to raise the rent and rent the dwelling to people who could afford to pay it.

We have heard the term used in this House previously in regard to the lack of public housing, and it is "housing by headlines." Certainly, housing by newspaper headlines in election years seems to be the only interest of the Hamilton city council in regard to the hundreds of low-income families who seek decent accommodation for which they can afford to pay.

The situation is deplorable, has been for years, and it gets worse as time goes by. I just want to give an illustration, Mr. Chairman. This headline was in the Hamilton *Spectator* of Saturday, April 30, and it reads: "200 to 300 public housing units said needed."

On April 14 of this year in the Hamilton *Spectator* there appeared: "Copps' campaign —speed homes for our needy."

Again, on April 15, 1966: "House scout to help low-income families."

On May 4, in the Hamiton *Spectator* we read: "City seeks 700 housing units."

Again on May 9, the Hamilton *Spectator*, "900 low rental housing units sought by the city." Then, to top it all, we have on Tuesday, May 24: "Attack on home shortage plans for the city."

This is a statement by the mayor of Hamilton who has now realized the situation is serious and is going to call together some important people to discuss it. And, of course, he is going to have the Hamilton house builders association, central mortgage and housing corporation, Hamilton real estate board and local housing authority in attendance to see what can be done. Certainly, the time has gone past when they have to make investigations. They want homes, and they want them immediately.

The housing corporation's responsibility, as I mentioned before, is to act on requests from the municipality. In April, 1964, the city of Hamilton requested a survey in Hamilton to determine the number of low rental housing units needed. The result of that survey I raised in the House during the estimates of the Minister last year. I was disappointed in the half-hearted efforts made by the people taking the survey. I was convinced they did not do the kind of a job that was necessary. They did a newspaper advertising programme and set out forms in the paper for people to fill in who felt they might need public housing. This did not fill the gap.

Nevertheless, from that survey, on September 15, 1964, the city council passed resolutions requesting housing. They asked for 200 family units on September 15, 1964 and 100 senior citizens units. On February 26, 1965, they requested 100 senior citizens units. I understand that out of the 200 family units we have 46 family units constructed and 18 purchased, for a total of 64. I understand that in the senior citizens units we have 40 units complete and 146 tendered for. I ask the hon. Minister first, if he has been requested, if his department has been asked to send someone to attend the meeting in the city of Hamilton on June 2 to deal with that situation? He might tell me what the situation might be. The result of the decision by the city council is that they are now asking for, in their last request, 580 units for pensioners, senior citizens, and 332 units for families, a total of 912. If it takes as long to provide the request at this time as it did the request in 1964, it is going to take some 18 years to get up to date with the request in regard to the serious situation at this particular time. I would ask the hon. Minister to inform the House and myself if he has had any recent request because of the continuing seriousness of the situation and the fact that the city council at succeeding council meetings boosted their demands.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We realize that Hamilton has a housing problem. I might say in

defence of Mayor Copps, and he is not of my political faith, that I think he is one man that has been very conscious of the need to provide housing for the people of Hamilton. I can assure you that we have had many meetings with Mayor Copps. He is not at all backward in coming forward, as you well know. He has been in my office on a number of occasions. I am informed by Mr. Suters we will be attending that meeting you talked about on June 2. We have been invited to attend and we will be attending. I do not think that Hamilton has been neglected.

We were asked for the survey in April; we gave it to the city of Hamilton in September, and started building houses right after the first of the year. So I do not think there has been any undue delay. The city of Hamilton is the same as anywhere else. If they will let us know what they want, we will move on it very quickly. We have proven, I think, that we can do that. For instance, 46 units were built; we purchased 18 units, 46 senior citizens units are already built, and there are 146 senior citizens units being built now. As you know, we are servicing land up on the Mountain to build more homes, perhaps the quantity you are talking about. If they ask for them we are in a position to build them and I would think the meeting on June 2 would solve some of the problems that you bring up.

I recognize that Hamilton, like many of the industrial areas, is having housing problems. You will well recall the problems we had with getting people to vacate after the old federal-provincial relationship. But we took our time there, and gave people an opportunity to stay on, even though they were beyond the economic rent stage. I would think that at the meeting in June when Mayor Copps comes forward with his group and tells us what they want, we are prepared to move and co-operate with them and build as quickly as we can possibly get the land serviced.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the last request of the Hamilton city council was in September of 1964 for 200 family units. You have provided 64 of them in almost a two-year period. They also requested in September, 1964, 100 senior citizens units; you have provided 40 of them, and have tenders out for 146. Is the delay on your part? You have not fulfilled in almost a two-year period the request for 200 made in September, 1964.

What is the good of the city council sitting down next week and telling you that they need almost 900 units in the city of Hamilton? If you read these press reports, all interested people, from public welfare officers, children's aid society, social workers, city council, have now recognized there is a serious problem. You tell us that we could only get 64 in a two-year period. If they ask you next Wednesday, or on June 2, for 900 units, what is your answer going to be to them? That you can supply them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I just gave you the answer; you were not listening. They asked for 200 units. We put out a tender and there was no land available. It was not our fault the land was not there. We were prepared to move, but there was no land available. As a result of that advertisement for tenders, we are now servicing land which can provide the 900 units, so I think we have gone as far as we can in this department to provide the houses. We cannot build them on top of houses, we cannot build them out in the lake. We have to have the land. This is the reason why the 200 houses were not built. I am sure you know that and I am sure the council knows it.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I agree that this lack of serviced land has become a problem.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are servicing it now.

Mr. Gisborn: Somebody has to take the responsibility for it. As I said before, three or four years ago, anyone that was keeping in touch with what was going on knew that, inevitably, unless something was done, we were going to have a drastic shortage of homes. Not just low-income homes, but homes. We understand that there is no doubt that the land developers and speculators have a lot of land in the Hamilton area, and they are waiting for it to be serviced by the city. Who are we going to blame? I said that the criticism has to be laid at both doors—on the city council's doorstep for their lack of foresight in developing and servicing land rather than going into urban renewal development and to civic centre and uptown development. I think that the need for low-income groups, as far as low rent houses go, should have come first. I think that the provincial government should be a little tougher with municipalities in regard to public housing. It is not good enough to say now they found they have a serious situation in regard to low rental houses; that we will have to wait until we get land serviced. It is just not good enough.

Mr. Chairman: I have a couple of other members listed—the member for Humber and

the member for Brant. I wonder if they would defer to the member for Hamilton Centre on the same point?

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I can throw some clarification on the housing situation in Hamilton. I agree with the opening remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth East, but as chairman of the housing committee up to November, 1963—a committee of five people, a controller and four aldermen, primarily set up with the authority to recommend to council whenever there was a need for public housing—I must agree with the member that they have been very lax in their duties. They made no recommendation until the situation apparently became critical. Representation was made from the department here; one of the members of the committee called and asked me what he should do to get this promoted. I said: Get hold of your chairman, and have him make the recommendation to council. Now, we get a headline that we need all this housing.

There has been a slowdown on the part of the council. The housing is badly needed. Furthermore, as was customary for the housing committee which is a mayor's committee, solely constituted for this job—it has not, to my knowledge, been meeting with the housing authority to find out in a continuing programme of what the need is.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hark back to the comments of the hon. member for York South and the hon. Minister whose estimates are before us, on senior citizen apartments. I believe I am right when I say that although this province greatly subsidized these homes, or institutions, the initiative must first come from the municipality. Mr. Minister, I believe I am right in that.

Then I have to say this for the record and say it very loudly, that despite my great admiration for Metropolitan Toronto as a government, they have sadly neglected the Lakeshore area for senior citizens apartments. You can go north to the Kipling Acres complex that reaches to Albion road, and I think it is one of the finest in Canada, if not in America. They are well established in Scarborough. We have approximately 50,000 people in Lakeshore municipalities, Mimico, New Toronto and Long Branch, and a recent survey showed that from three to four and a half per cent of that population could be eligible for senior citizen apartments if they were available.

As I have said, the closest apartments, if there was accommodation available, is approximately 20 miles away from where these people have lived an average life of 30 years in the municipality. It has been my contention that on the Lakeshore there should be senior citizens apartments provided for that population, the only part of Metropolitan Toronto that has been forgotten in a rather fine programme of senior citizens housing.

I would go back to the comments of the hon. member for York South. I agree with him that the bachelor apartments are the ones most needed, and possibly would supply to the best advantage the needs of the people who are eligible for those apartments.

Commenting on the Minister's comments that they will if necessary go in and buy houses or apartment buildings where land is not available, it has always been the hue and cry along the Lakeshore that there is no land available. I can tell you, outside of two years ago, there were apartments there for sale that could have been bought cheaper than if we had attempted to build accommodation for senior citizens.

So I suggest to the Minister, while it is not directly in his line of authority to tell Metropolitan Toronto what they should do, I do want to put it on the record that the Lakeshore municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto have been sadly neglected as far as housing accommodation for senior citizens is concerned.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I thought perhaps the hon. Minister wanted to respond to the comments just made.

But I am interested in the announcement made by the hon. Minister that CMHC is going to participate in the building of university residences and that the hon. Minister is trying to extend this to residences serving other postsecondary institutions.

It has just been brought to our attention that CMHC funds are in short supply, and the hon. Minister in his remarks indicates that perhaps nothing will be done until towards the end of the year.

I wonder if he can tell us specifically what plans he has for building university residences in Ontario, when he will proceed with this, where they will be located.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We first of all will be bringing in a change to The Housing Act to enable us to set up a separate corporation run by the Ontario housing corporation and by civil servants. It is required in order to operate a non-profit company to build

this kind of accommodation. This is what central mortgage and housing require, otherwise the money will not be forthcoming. They will only advance the money for student accommodation to a non-profit organization.

Mr. Nixon: What would their share be?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Ninety per cent, the same as in regular housing. We will put up the other ten.

I will bring an Act into the House tomorrow on that, and the hon. Minister of Education advised the House of our intentions. We have had discussions with Mr. Nicholson.

They have also indicated that perhaps accommodation for student nurses and other people in educational facilities will also require the same kind of facilities. There is no immediate plan available as to where this is going to be built. It is going to be built where the needs are immediate.

The immediate need for accommodation might be right here in the city of Toronto. It may be up at the university in Ottawa. There is no set plan at the present time as to where we are going to start first. If we get ten projects, we are prepared to get going with ten projects.

We will be meeting again with central mortgage and housing and with Mr. Nicholson, as soon as the legislation is through, to discuss the project. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Education, I am sure, under University Affairs, will have more to say about this. It is not a matter of a survey. We know in many areas the need is there now. I think in the city of Guelph alone, with the young people going to the agricultural college up there, that all the homes have been opened to provide whatever accommodation has been needed in the past. With the extension of the universities across the country it is obvious at almost every university, if it cannot provide its own accommodation within its own grounds, we are going to have to provide accommodation in that area. This is what we intend to do.

How many projects will be under way within the next few months I could not tell you at the moment, but we are prepared to move just as soon as the legislation is changed. The money is available. There is no reason why we cannot get under way with the programme just as soon as we decide that the time is convenient for us to get going.

Mr. Nixon: Do you know whether Ryerson has been mentioned as a possibility?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, the hon. Minister of Education talked to me about Ryerson. There are no definite plans on it, but Ryerson is one area where we are talking about student accommodation. This indicates, as the hon. member suggested a few minutes ago, where perhaps purchasing an apartment house in the area would solve the same problem, without having to go through the building procedure.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the second thing I wanted to raise was the Minister's announced plan to provide housing for Indians. He specifically said for those people of Indian descent, rather than on Indian reserves.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I meant Indians on reserves.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, it would be on reserves only?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not necessarily, no. But actually Indians in any area where housing is needed, and they need them in many of the areas that we have discussed here in this House. The first project is the one up in Moosonee, as we discussed the other day when I spoke to the House. This is one of the first projects we are going to get under way and there is another one, I believe, up in the Red Lake area which we are getting under way. So by Indian descent I meant people who were off the reservations and requiring the kind of project we talked about in our presentation.

Mr. Nixon: Or on reservations.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Or on reservations. The reservations are included in this Indian committee that we have here. We are working with Ottawa on it. Certainly the housing accommodation on the reservation will also be in the same programme. We talked about the prefabricated houses for these projects, to get houses under way as quickly as possible.

Mr. Nixon: Two things leading from that. On our trip through northern Ontario this past summer we saw some Indian accommodation that has been built by the federal authorities at Pickle Crow, which had been practically ruined by those people who had the opportunity to live in it. I feel that the planning of the housing was really not correct for what was required there. The hon. Minister has indicated in his own statement that in many of these communities are families who are living off the reserve, who

need help more than just the provision of housing. I feel that it is not for us to tell them how they should live or even how they should use the homes that are provided.

But one suggestion I would like to make is that when the Minister says he is carrying out research to establish a type of home that could be built by local labour, he takes the Indians into the planning of this home so that the home itself will not be the sort that would fit on some residential crescent somewhere. But that it would, in fact, suit the needs of these people, whether they are on reserves that are somewhat urbanized, such as the one in my own constituency, or those that are lost in some tiny communities or even the bushlands in the north.

I feel it is very important that the Indians have a real say in the design and the development of the house itself and that some research person does not give the Minister or his people a plan which does not fit the needs of the Indians concerned.

Hon. Mr. Randall: What the hon. member suggests is in line with what we are doing. There was a group of Indian chiefs introduced in the House a few days ago. We met with them while they were here. In fact, our people are meeting with them today and we are discussing the kind of housing they require and that they can participate in building, so I think we are on the same wavelength so far as that type of housing is concerned.

Mr. Nixon: Of course, I agree with the need for a consultative committee of the type that has just been reborn under the Minister's direction, but I am familiar with a number of these people who built their own homes and they do not get on consultative committees and very few of them even get to talk about these important, specific matters with their representatives. I would think it might even be worth sending somebody from Ontario housing into the areas themselves so that they can talk with the chiefs, of course, but also to the people who are going to live in these homes and, in fact, build them. I was very interested the other day when I was travelling in the Kenora region to find the representative of the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation there talking to the Indians. He was not going to sit back and wait for the chiefs to come down and give them their opinion, representative though it may be. I feel the responsibility is more than that—to talk to the people who are going to be building these homes and living in them, too.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I have a variety of observations and questions for the hon. Minister. Like the hon. leader of the Opposition, I am somewhat perplexed, I admit at the outset. The Ontario housing corporation leaves me in an ambivalent state of mind. I frankly find it suspect; I am sure there is something profoundly wrong with its operation. I am going to make some suggestion of where that malaise lies.

But I must admit that on the surface, and to be true in certain areas outside Metropolitan Toronto, the corporation has done something of a job. It is not true in Windsor. I thought the member for Windsor-Walkerville was very kind to the Minister today; I think the people of Windsor are getting a serious runaround by the Ontario housing corporation with their efforts to find housing and have substituted for it yet another survey. I think the people from Hamilton are in a fairly serious state in regard to housing. But in certain of the outlying communities, it is true that the housing corporation has done a job.

I want to preface my remarks by taking issue strongly with the primary theme put forward by the leader of the Opposition, or at least one of the major points he made. I think it is worth distinguishing our view at least in this area from the Minister of Economics and Development and the leader of the Opposition. I do not think there would be any great gain or any great wisdom in taking over of the Toronto housing authority by the Ontario housing corporation. I do not quite know how some members have been drawn into that orbit, but apparently it is now the fashionable thing to recommend. I suggest it would be very deleterious, because one of the most important things about the Toronto housing authority is that it has shown more compassion, more understanding and more genuine interest in housing problems in the core of the city than the Ontario housing corporation has even begun to demonstrate in a wide variety of areas. When Albert Rose who, after all, sits on the board of the Ontario housing corporation, submitted his report on the consultative nature of housing in Toronto, he said—and I want to read it into the record because I think it is valuable—under the title, "The case for a housing department in the city of Toronto":

> The case for a housing department within the administration of the city of Toronto rests squarely upon the special housing needs which exist within this city. The committee's discussion has identified

> the special problems of unattached persons, homeless transients, the disabled, independent elderly families, foster families, newcomer families, from outside and inside Canada and, cutting across all of these categories, the broad classification of low-income families. The special situation of the city of Toronto with respect to housing prices, that has been described as the worst since the end of World War II, is not merely that of any central city in a modern metropolis, but is unique in Canada. It is not just a difference in degree when one compares the situation in Toronto with that of Vancouver, Winnipeg or Montreal, but there is a substantial difference of a kind which justifies the adoption of extraordinary measures of public administration.

I do not think there could be any more valid statement in relationship to the situation in the city of Toronto—made, I might point out, by a key member of the board of the Ontario housing corporation. This leads to the second point that I think is important to make, which is that it would be profoundly wrong, I suggest, to further destroy what little municipal initiative and incentive remain in the province of Ontario, because the Ontario housing corporation has begun to devour everything in sight. I am not sure that that is a desirable kind of behaviour; I am not sure that we will not regret that seriously in the future.

The European pattern is a municipal focus pattern. The Minister would be right to argue that the municipalities in Ontario and some in the metropolitan area have shown a considerable reluctance to move into this field and to exercise their social responsibility. But the Ontario housing corporation began its devouring tendencies at precisely the point when the metropolitan level was beginning to think seriously of housing needs and when the city of Toronto was prepared to move in this direction. I am not at all sure that we should abdicate yet another authority which is trying very hard, under very difficult circumstances, to the Ontario housing corporation.

You see, Mr. Chairman, I fear that the Ontario housing corporation is really one grand real estate operation with great Madison avenue flair and very little else. This is of very great concern. It is buying land and houses right across the province of Ontario. In 20, 30 or 40 years' time, we will own outright some of the best core municipal land in the province, and can hold that land for ransom and make it very difficult for individual municipalities to intelligently plan urban renewal projects, housing developments, urban amenities in the nature of parks and conservation authorities, etc.—any of the kind of things that they might wish to do. We may be severely hampered by the extension to the Ontario housing corporation. Again, I want to quote from the Rose report because they were seriously concerned about this factor. He says:

> The committee feels that it has a great responsibility to emphasize the significance of housing and planning policies and present decisions for the future of the central city. The senior levels of government should not own large amounts of land within the boundaries of the municipality. Five, ten or 20 years from now, there may be serious conflict between the city and the province with respect to the taxation of Crown-owned land, with respect to the possibilities of expropriation for future development, with respect to zoning policies, and with respect to land use control. For a city and a metropolis the size of Toronto, there is already a tremendous shortage of land in central areas. In the view of the committee, the important part of the solution to this problem lies in judicious land use planning within large urban renewal areas.

The possibilities, Mr. Chairman, for judicious land use planning will be destroyed by the consistent policy of the Ontario housing corporation to devour land in the best municipal areas and hold title to that land outright 30 to 50 years from now, thereby putting the municipalities at a very serious disadvantage.

I use the words "Madison avenue flair," Mr. Chairman, because there has been a distinct "housing by surveying" inclination on the part of this department, on the part of this Minister.

One of the reasons—and I think that one of those reasons will emerge in a year or two's time—one of the reasons I suspect that the Minister will be in difficulties is that the need for housing accelerates as fast as the Ontario housing corporation begins to fill the gap. In fact, according to the housing registry in the city of Toronto, the need is increasing, the demand is even greater than was the case when the Ontario housing corporation began.

And to submit these reports by the Ontario housing corporation to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto on housing, is to litter the desks of responsible municipal officials with paper plans and units that have not yet been erected, that are still on the draw-

ing board, that are—if I could put it this way without offending him—rather like the blue book of the Minister of Public Works. They are a part of a grand design and no one knows whether it will come to fruition.

Another thing, and perhaps the most serious law of all, I suggest to the Ontario housing corporation, through the Minister, and which I think is really the Achilles heel of the housing corporation view, is that the Minister is not really a Minister of housing; he is a Minister of shelter. He is Ontario's landlord. He has the most constricted view of housing that it is possible to hold. Purely as a form of shelter, purely as a conglomeration of bricks and mortar erected to keep a roof over people's heads but to be of no consequence in relation to the other social amenities and the other social needs.

This corporation, this department, completely neglects the social aspects of housing. My colleague for Woodbine pointed out to me when we were chatting about this that it was Mumford who said housing was a biological entity. But that is not true for this department and it is not true for the Ontario housing corporation. Housing is shelter and shelter alone and the Minister gave it away yesterday when he said, "I will build houses anywhere, I cannot hang them from hooks in the sky but I will build them anywhere; you just show me where to put them." And that just about sums up the entire attitude to housing on the part of this government.

That just cannot continue to obtain because this government is responsible for some fairly substantial projects. The Regent Park project, the Scarlet Woods project, the Warden Woods project, and the social and economic problems attendant on project housing which this department is neglecting are very real indeed. I want to take a few minutes to go over those problems because I think they are important.

I am very familiar, Mr. Chairman, with Warden Woods which, as the Minister knows, falls directly within my own riding. I also got hold of—and I commend it to the Minister if he has not yet read it and to the leader of the Opposition, if he ever has time, I recognize his work load—the only study I have seen in this field and I am really quite intrigued by it. It was done at the behest to some degree of the Ontario housing corporation, conducted by Sylvia Goldblatt as a master's thesis on the social integration or isolation among residents of public housing projects.

She studied Warden Woods and Scarlet Woods with a great number of interviews conducted amongst the families concerned, interviewing all the departmental officials, many of the politicians, local and provincial in the area, and a very, very thorough piece of work it was. It revealed some very wide areas of concern as indeed did George Mortimer's article in the *Globe and Mail* in February of this year in his article, "The Lessons of Warden Woods."

Let me refer to some of these social problems the hon. Minister is totally neglecting: First, in the setting of rents in project developments for low income families it is absolutely imperative, I suggest, that debts be taken into account, or you are just compounding the circle of despair. There is no other way I can put it to you. The refusal to consider debts is one of the most serious drawbacks to the entire rent-geared-to-income propositions.

I would go further. I would say that there should be a form of delayed action rental increases, if I can put it that way, so that when a man who is already on a marginal wage receives a slight increase in salary, he is not thereby immediately tied to proportionate increase in rent and never gets himself out of the debt situation, which is one of the prime factors of him being in a low rental project to begin with.

I urge upon the hon. Minister the calculation of debts into the rental would make all the difference in the world, because after all the financial factor is the basic factor for projects like Warden Woods, which are the major projects of the Ontario housing corportion. To neglect the attendant woes is to again view housing purely as a series of shelters and nothing else.

Just before I go on to the second point, I might say that financial problems are of such great concern that in the case of Warden Woods the fact that there is a two-fare zone to reach downtown Toronto prevents most of the people from travelling at all. In the surveys that have been taken those who have been interviewed demonstrated that, and I can give the Minister case after case from my own experience. It is the type of financial situation in which two fares prohibit travel.

The second point is that a goodly number of these families have fairly serious social problems and I do not want to overdramatize it. They reflect a cross-section of the community, except because of the nature of the design which the Minister's department itself has constructed they are confined to a given project in a given area. So you have

within the given area a great number of one-parent families; for instance—a deserted mother with several children, or even less fortunate circumstances. You have a certain number of families on categorical assistance programmes. You have in other words areas of social needs that are actually exacerbated by the public housing people. And this, I suggest, should be taken into account because it gives rise to problems to which the Minister and his department should be prepared to respond.

The third area is this very ticklish one of the question of community. The hon. leader of the Opposition made some fairly general observations about leaving them alone in their own community. One of the things about these projects is that they are in a very real sense not communities, nor can they ever be communities. They are housing projects for people for whom housing is an interim measure at time of crisis; they are there with the distinct hope of moving on, preferably within two or three years.

There is, therefore, no viable tenants' association developed. Even the society looks upon the project as a sort of transient experience and I suggest that it is therefore valuable for the housing corporation to think of providing some support of services to get them over the two or three years more rapidly, to facilitate the sense of independence to which these projects are supposed to lead, to help with the relationships with the outside community.

This does not mean that he has to acquire a cadre of social workers attached to the corporation. I quite admit that. But there may be real value, as many of the community people will say, for the Ontario housing corporation to purchase services available in the community—from public health nurses, from children's aid society personnel, from some of the welfare officials to help in all these supported needs. To suggest that a tenant relations officer can perform that task is absolutely ludicrous. The tenant relations officer who services Warden Woods lives in Regent Park South and is responsible for something in excess of 1,000 families, so let us have no nonsense about a tenant relations officer being able to handle things like debt and emotional maladjustment and financial difficulties and health problems. It just does not work.

The comments of the people in the community are rather stronger than mine. Let me read George Mortimer's conclusion into the record. I am sure the Minister has seen it but it is worth putting on the record.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Who is George Mortimer? I never heard of the man.

Mr. S. Lewis: George Mortimer is a reporter for the *Globe and Mail.*

Hon. Mr. Randall: Does that make him an authority on housing and social welfare problems?

Mr. S. Lewis: No, I am just reading his remarks into the record.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right. I just wondered if he was an expert. I just wondered if he was an authority, that is all.

An hon. member: What is an authority?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is an expert who helps you go wrong with confidence. Go ahead!

Mr. S. Lewis: I am suggesting that what he did was to interview all the key community people involved and this is basically what he found, and I am just giving it to the Minister.

The lessons of Warden Woods are these—

Maybe the Minister does not want to hear it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be delighted, you go ahead.

Mr. S. Lewis: To continue:

When you rent a poor family a cheap apartment you may solve one of the family's problems, but in doing so you may create new problems. By moving the low-income families to a place that is too far from stores, entertainment and welfare services or by concentrating too many problem families in one area, then you are in danger of creating an economic ghetto.

Reverend John Hess, a Mennonite minister who works in Warden Woods, says the place is exactly that: "A ghetto for the poor."

OHC policy for the future is to sprinkle low-income families among more affluent families. Will this help them or will it mean that some of their problems will go unnoticed because they are less concentrated and less conspicuous?

By failing to provide adequate community services or by failing to co-ordinate housing with other efforts in a general pattern of services for the public well-being, public housing schemes may leave tenants with so many other difficulties that they are overwhelmed. Housing takes some

of the pressure off, but not enough to help them. In this case, much of the benefit of public housing has been lost. Money spent on it has possibly been poured down the drain.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not personally prepared to go as far as that, because I have great respect for the citizens of Warden Woods and what they are endeavouring to achieve. But I know that there are almost insuperable social and economic problems and that in the neglect of all the related social aspects of housing in the absence of what the hon. Minister himself has called the "hoped-for social integration," then merely providing the shelter does not help the situation at all.

There are no recreation facilities to speak of; no day nursery facilities; no centres of any kind; no privacy to speak of; considerable removal from shopping and transportation, and so on, not to mention all the other difficulties. So that project housing can be characterized as housing which begins to solve a problem but creates many others.

I am not going to begin to quote from Mrs. Goldblatt's analysis of these two areas; I would say that she is an expert, and it was done under the aegis of the Ontario housing corporation. It demonstrates that there are these very real problems in developing project housing.

Mortimer is also ambivalent; let me be fair. He is complimentary on one end and concerned on the other but I think I have read the conclusions fairly into the record.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): The hon. member has read enough into the record.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, that is basically the nature of our concern about the government's housing programme. I hope that the hon. Minister might consider moving into this related field which I have discussed —the field of the social aspects of public housing, and perhaps alter his tendency to view housing purely as shelter and without any human component at all, except in emergency circumstances.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a few questions about the area which concerns me particularly in my riding, Donmount Village. I want to restrict my remarks to the area which falls within the area of responsibility of the hon. Minister.

One of the principal factors, as he is aware, in that redevelopment urban scheme is the displacement of a large number of persons who have been living in their owner-occupied homes. I would quote the exact statistics from the study of the Napier Place—now known as the Donmount Village redevelopment scheme—which shows that 135 houses are going to be removed to make way for this redevelopment scheme, and that 80 per cent of them, or 108, were owner-occupied.

The problem which immediately arises is that those homes in that area of the city which has been designated as an urban redevelopment area are all in fair condition, but as a result of the expropriation, the owners are going to receive, for practical purposes, the market value of the property. But with the number of dollars which they then receive, they are not going to be able to continue their status as owners of homes. The question of The Expropriation Act is not one which is appropriate to be dealt with under the hon. Minister's vote, but I am wondering whether he has given any consideration to the widening of the function of the Ontario housing corporation to actually buy homes on the market, and to provide those homes to such persons as the people of whom I speak in Napier Place, at a reduced price so that these people may continue their status in our society as single-family home-owners.

I realize that to make that suggestion will perhaps shock some people that persons such as the residents of this area should in some way or other be provided with what to some people may be considered a handout. But when one analyzes it, it is not a handout at all. What it simply means is to the extent that it is within the philosophy of the housing corporation in the city of Toronto and in the metropolitan area, they should continue to be owners of their own homes if they are involved in an urban redevelopment scheme and are displaced by expropriation. If it is within the philosophy of the corporation, they should continue to be able to occupy their own home, knowing full well that in the market situation in the city of Toronto today, it is unlikely that you can get a house for the price at which the expropriating authority will provide compensation to the owner.

It would seem to me that the housing corporation could buy homes and provide those homes, as a matter of policy, at a reduced price which would permit such citizens to continue to own their homes.

When the housing corporation is providing rental accommodation for such persons and subsidizing their rent to enable them to pay

a reasonable proportion of their income for housing accommodation, it would seem to me that it is not very much further as a step in the policy of the department to actually provide homes for such persons as represented by the residents of this area. It has the further very definite advantage that rather than continuing to place the people who are being moved from one renewal area into another area which undoubtedly will be slated for redevelopment in a short period of time, it allows a great number of people to actually get established in the kind of home which meets the standard the housing corporation wishes the people in the province of Ontario to have for their accommodation. By removing these people from a continuing problem of housing accommodation in the province, I think it would go a long way to relieving that particular situation which the hon. Minister knows exists in the Donmount Village area, and which undoubtedly is going to exist in other areas. After all, the Donmount redevelopment area is about 28 acres; I think the actual area of which I speak only comprises about 12 acres.

I have a number of other questions, but I would like the hon. Minister to comment on that particular one.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the question really should go to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. He is in charge of urban renewal; my responsibility, as the hon. member recognizes, is to house the people if they come out of the area and to provide housing for them when they go back in. Insofar as providing them with a home of equal value, this again is something that will have to be discussed with the hon. Minister in charge of urban renewal. I am sure that he will have something to say on it when his estimates go through the House.

I am aware of the problem, as the hon. member well knows. I appeared at city hall, along with him and the young gentleman who represented the group. I appreciate there is a problem here and that an answer has to be found. I do not have the answer at the moment, but in talking to my colleagues about it, it may be that we will come up with an answer. But my responsibility at the moment is to provide them with accommodation when their houses are demolished and get them back into the area that they want to go back in when the area has been redeveloped. I think that is as far as I can comment on it at the present time.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Noting the hour, I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 27, by Mr. A. H. Cowling.

Resolution: That in the opinion of this House, when Mr. Speaker is in the chair, the speeches of members of the Legislature, except the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, or a Minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such Minister, or a member making a motion of no confidence in the government and a Minister replying thereto, should be limited to 40 minutes; and further, that no member, except the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, should speak for more than 30 minutes at a time in any committee of the whole House.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Carleton, the resolution standing in my name.

I think we have all come to the conclusion at the moment that there is just too much talk going on in this House. I do not say it is all coming from that side of the House, I say that quite a bit of it is coming from our side too. If there are any offenders, we are all offenders. But I do say, Mr. Speaker, that the sessions seem to be quite a bit longer than they used to be. I have some interesting figures here which I thought I might give to the House so we could get the situation in perspective.

I compared the 1955 session with the 1965 session; that gives us ten years. In 1955, the session *Hansard* cost for reporting, transcribing, and so on, was $13,236.44. Printing, paper, and so on, cost $19,925.20, making a total cost of $33,164.64. The interesting part is that the price per page per printing was about $13.00 for each copy, and there were 1,508 pages. Now, in the 1967 session, the *Hansard* reporting and

transcribing cost was $31,000, compared with $13,000—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): In 1967?

Mr. Cowling: In 1965, rather! I was thinking of the centennial year. In 1965, reporting was $21,000. Printing and paper was $99,000 for a total cost of $131,471. That is just about $100,000 more. It was $18 a page and the number of pages was 4,556. In other words, the number of pages increased by three times in the ten years. Now, I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget is considerably larger now than it was then. I think in 1955 it was around $600 million; now it is over $1 billion. But just because we are dealing with larger amounts is not any reason why we should speak at the length that some people are speaking at in this House at the moment.

It seems that there is too much repetition; I think all hon. members will agree with that. I have heard speeches here in this session of the House that I have heard several times in the past ten years, Mr. Speaker. I remember when the hon. member for York South first came into the House in 1956. He was elected in June of 1955; until that time he was the leader of the CCF in absentia, I think it is called. He used to sit around in the galleries and listen in. Eventually he made it and he had a great many items he wanted to get off his chest.

Mr. MacDonald: Not eventually—I made it the first time I ran.

Mr. Cowling: No, and some of the speeches were good. I can say that they were all long. He has lost a lot of the old fire in the past ten years; he is not talking as fiery as he used to, and he is not talking as long as he used to.

Mr. MacDonald: I have lots of help now.

Mr. Cowling: That's right. I am coming to that.

Mr. MacDonald: We operate on the team basis.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, I should say the hon. member does. As a matter of fact, I heard a speech here a while ago on mental health. It was quite a lengthy speech by one of his team. I listened from time to time because it went on for quite a while. When it was completed, I said to myself: "The member for York South has dusted off his old speech of 1956 on mental health and handed it to one of the team, and asked them to dig up a few hours on that one." Basically it was the same, and that applies on several other speeches. Now, for the leader of the Opposition: I am glad he spoke up there, sir.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, I have been listening to his speeches, too, for a while, Mr. Speaker —since 1959, I guess it was. As a private member he spoke on many subjects, not for too long, and rather interestingly. I always enjoy listening to the leader of the Opposition; he has a nice Irish brogue; it is rather pleasant. Since he became the leader of the Opposition, he has lengthened his speeches considerably. And in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, they are not nearly as interesting as they used to be, because they are too long and they are too repetitious. Believe me, we have some members on this side of the House who I think should be cut down a little, too.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Minister of Mines.

Mr. Cowling: Well, no. He is all right. He is fine. But when one stops to consider—

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Any members in particular?

Mr. Cowling: I am going to think about that; about some of the specific ones. Some of the greatest speech-makers in the world gave short speeches. I think of the great wartime speeches of Winston Churchill. We all know them and many of us heard them. They were never long, never more than 20 or 25 minutes, yet they were some of the great speeches of our times. Of course, the Gettysburg address of Abraham Lincoln was, I think, about three or five minues—a wonderful speech. If these great men of history can get their message over in a period of 15 or 20 minutes, I do not see any reason why we should not be able to do it here. For example, the hon. member for Grey South has been a member of this House for 40 years. I have heard many of his speeches; he is undoubtedly one of the best speakers in the House, and always has been. Even when he was the leader of the Liberal Party he never spoke longer than 20 minutes or half an hour, and I heard all of his speeches. Surely the man who leads the great Progressive-Conservative Party in Ontario, the hon. Prime Minister, has the most important messages and announcements to make in this House. He is responsible for these. I well

remember the first speech he made in the House. It was in the session of 1952, and he moved the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I venture to say that that was probably one of the longest speeches he has ever made in the House. Now, he never speaks any longer than 20 or 25 minutes and he makes some pretty important announcements.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is this. If the leaders of our Legislature can get across their points in a reasonable length of time—

Mr. Singer: What about Design for Development?

Mr. Cowling: Wait a minute. I did not hear all of that.

My point is that if our leaders can get across their message in a reasonable time, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the other members cannot do the same thing.

I realize, although I have never had the pleasure of sitting in the Opposition—and I hope I never will—that their job is to oppose. I think, mainly, they do a good job of that. But unfortunately, some of the hon. members get carried away in their speeches; they seem to think that the other members of the House need to have whatever they are saying repeated several times.

We are all of good average intelligence in here. I think that when we have heard a comment two or three times it has sunk in and it has done the job; I think that repetition, particularly in the estimates, has become completely out of hand, at least to my way of thinking.

The 1955 session of the House, many of us will remember, lasted from January 25 to March 28. Until two or three years ago, the House used to be able to complete its business, and I think quite satisfactorily, always by Easter and we would start in January or February. I never remember, Mr. Speaker, when the Opposition complained that we were hurrying through the session, or that we were moving too quickly, or not allowing time for adequate debate.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member was out if he did not hear it!

Mr. Cowling: I was never out. If we want to talk about attendance, I am here as regularly as anybody and I always have been.

It seems to me that from time to time the CCF, or the NDP, would complain about the lack of time for their speeches, but I never remember coming up to Easter time when it was necessary to move things so fast that all members did not have an opportunity to express their point of view.

Last year, of course, we went until June 22 and this year, who knows? We could be going on here for quite some time.

I simply say, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to be very brief because there are other speakers, this resolution could be amended and it could be changed. I realize that, but I think there should be some time limit in this House on speeches when the House is debating estimates and when the Speaker is in the chair. There is a time limit in Ottawa. There is a time limit in the Parliament of Great Britain. There are other places where they have a limit on the length of time that a member should speak.

As a matter of fact, we had the opportunity of visiting California just a year or two ago at the meeting of their Legislature. And in many cases where a member wanted to speak at length on a particular subject he would have the speech printed and passed around among members and those that were interested would read it.

Maybe that is worthy of some thought, Mr. Speaker. I realize that many of the hon. members like to speak for home consumption, for the benefit of their own constituency and for the benefit of the press in their constituency. Most of the members who speak on the local subject are very brief, and I think they put it across really well.

If we have a time limit in the House I think that we will eliminate repetition. I would hope that we would eliminate repetition, that we would give everybody including the hon. members on this side, as well as the Opposition, adequate time to explain their point of view, and to express whatever views they may have on any subject. But I think the way the House is progressing now, that there must be a time limit if we are going to complete the business of the people of the province of Ontario.

The Budget is a billion dollars or more, so there is much debate and discussion to be put in on the estimates. I realize that the House does not pass these estimates in ten or 15 minutes.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. member is just out by a billion.

Mr. MacDonald: It was closer to two.

Mr. Cowling: I said a billion or so. I will not say what is a billion, it is a good big Budget.

I talk to members of the Opposition in the hall from time to time, as we all do, and they say, "How long do you think we are going to be here"? Or I would say to them, "How long do you think we are going to be here"? Now really, we have not any more to do with it than they have, as far as the time limit is concerned. But I think if all hon. members feel that we can conduct the affairs of the House efficiently and reduce the speeches to a reasonable time, that many of the hon. members who have matters to take care of locally, and many of us have, will have time to do that as well as conduct the affairs of the people of the province.

So I hope that the hon. members will support this motion, and indeed that we could have a vote on it and get the business under way.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I think we might as well all be honest and admit that in approaching a subject of this kind we are bound to be biased to a certain extent. I think it is also fair to say that our biases will be determined to a considerable extent by where we sit.

I think it is usually true that members on the government side think the Opposition takes too much time, while the members on the Opposition side think that they waste no time at all, but use all available time constructively.

I think we might as well recognize that we have those different points of view. Having said that, I would say in response to what seemed to be the major point of the hon. member for High Park, who introduced the resolution, that I have not noticed excessive repetition in this House. I think I sit here and listen as much as most people and I have not noticed excessive repetition.

Some repetition is inevitable, Mr. Speaker. In any area where free speech prevails there is going to be a considerable amount of speech that some people consider unnecessary and repetitious. But that is one of the characteristics of free speech. Frankly, I do not think repetition is necessarily a bad thing. Sometimes it is useful, in trying to get a point across, to make it a number of times in somewhat different ways. I also think that we should recognize that there are different forms of repetition.

For example, I have in past years sat here and listened to quite interesting speeches from the hon. member for High Park, which were word for word repetitions of items that appeared in the city of Toronto handbook. I do not think it was wrong of him to indulge in that form of repetition. I would say for myself that when I quote from others I usually try to identify the source of the quotation and give credit to the person responsible for it. But whether or not that is done, it is useful. It can be useful, I think, for items sometimes from even the city of Toronto handbook to be read into the record. It may be useful for those to be elaborated on by other members.

I do not think that we can lay down absolute rules as to what furthers the debate and what merely impedes it. There are different opinions on that, and I think we should recognize that is inevitable in the democratic process.

Now I do not intend to deal with the specific proposals contained in the resolution, the precise time limits set forth there. I do not think that this, as the member for High Park suggested, is really what is before us. What is before us is the question of principle as to whether or not time limits on speeches are necessary and desirable in this stage in the development of the Legislative assembly of Ontario.

Personally, I am not opposed in principle to time limits on speeches. I can certainly visualize situations—we are engaged in a debate right now which is one of those situations—where time limits are desirable. However I do not think it is really good enough just to say that there are time limits at Westminster, there are time limits at Ottawa, and therefore, presumably, there should be time limits here.

I think every legislative body should be considered in its totality. A rule should be considered only in relation to the total rules of the assembly, and the total needs of the assembly. If we consider the proposal for a time limit on speeches in this assembly at this time, I would suggest that a case cannot be made out for it. That does not mean that time limits are not appropriate at Westminster; indeed, they are probably vitally necessary. But I think we should consider this in relation to our situation. And to illustrate my point, Mr. Speaker, I want to consider it under three heads.

First of all, I would put before the House the proposition that a time limit on individual speeches will not solve what apparently the member for High Park considered to be a problem, although I do not. It will not solve the problem of the length of the session. I have not gone through the speeches that exceed the time limits proposed in the resolution. Therefore, I am talking without having made, shall we say, a scientific analysis of

the question. But I am willing to hazard a guess that if you took all of the speeches that exceeded the time limit proposed in the hon. member's resolution, and assumed that those speeches went to the time limit only, you would cut out of the business of the session not more than three or four days. So you would save, perhaps, a few days in a session that now runs into several months. If the member is concerned, as apparently he is, with the extending length of sessions, I would suggest to him that merely to impose time limits on speeches will not really solve his problem.

We actually would have to go much further, and do what they now do at Westminster; that is, develop a convention under which specified times are allocated by agreement to specific debates. In other words, in Britain they have an elaborate pattern. Topics that are considered to be important are given a fairly generous amount of time, and others are given only a very short time. That sort of thing is really the only way in which the hon. member will reduce the length of the session, or increase the amount of business that can be transacted within a given period of time.

I think that it is necessary for them to do such a thing in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, because there the volume of business has expanded to the point where, without time limits and allocations of time, it would be impossible to transact one year's business in one year. When you face that situation, obviously you have to do something to make more economical use of time. It is obviously essential to transact one year's business in one year. But we are far from that situation, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Ontario. The longest session we have ever had—except, I think, for one very long one back in the early 1920s—was the session of last year which ran on, including recesses, for between four and five months. We took up a little better than a third of the year, so we are not faced with any severe pressure on time. We still have lots of time here to carry on the amount of business that we have to transact without imposing arbitrary rules which, to some degree or other, will limit freedom of speech. That is the second aspect of the matter that I wish to call to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker. There is no need for time limits on speeches or for the more drastic, and what is really the only effective procedure, of allocating time for debates.

I do not know how long this session will last, but let us assume it goes on until the end of July. That will mean that we will have been in session for six months; frankly, I long ago gave up forecasting but I doubt it will go on until the end of July.

Last year, we increased the indemnities of the members of this House quite significantly. I am not going to get into any debates of last year. I took exception, as everyone knows, to making the increase in indemnities retroactive. But as to the amount of the indemnity that was ultimately arrived at, I said then, and I think now, that it is probably a reasonable amount for the work that we were doing then and for what we foresaw we might be doing in the future. The indemnity, inclusive of the part that it is free from taxation, is $11,000 a year for a member resident in Metro Toronto and $12,000 for a member resident outside Metro Toronto. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is quite fair remuneration for, shall we say, up to half a year's work. I feel a little nonplussed, Mr. Speaker, when in one session we increase the indemnity because of the expanding volume of work and in the next session we seem to develop a pressure to reduce the amount of work. If we are going to do that, maybe we should reduce the indemnity too, but I think it would be better to take the time that is necessary to transact our business in what is admittedly the fairly leisurely pace that we adopt in this House. We can still afford the luxury of a leisurely pace. Therefore, I think that we should enjoy the luxury; we should enjoy the opportunity to consider these important matters that have great effect on the lives of our citizens, to consider them in a leisurely way which always makes for, I think, more deliberate consideration and therefore more effective consideration.

The final aspect of the matter to which I wish to call attention, Mr. Speaker, is that no change in the rules, and this resolution, after all proposes a change in the rules, should be considered in isolation. If we want to consider the management of the business of this House, I think we should consider it in the total picture. When we talk of Westminster and Ottawa, having time limits on speeches, we should also mention the fact that in Ottawa and in Westminster they have certain other procedural devices, such as debate upon adjournment, which we do not have here. In fact, we do not even know what the adjournment time is. They have a fixed time for adjournment, and then they reserve the half-hour preceding adjournment time as a period when the Opposition can exercise initiative by raising

matters that can be debated in that half-hour. One of the problems in this House is the lack of opportunity that the Opposition has to exercise initiative. In another phase in Great Britain, when the Opposition puts a motion of censure on the order paper, it does not sit there until the end of the session. It is debated almost immediately. In Ottawa they have, during the course of the year, their six supply amendments, when the Opposition can call the tune on any issue it wants. I understand that we have been working towards something comparable in this House, but it has not matured into anything as yet.

These things should be considered just as much as other procedural devices. We have in this House a set of written rules that are hopelessly out of date. The last time they were revised was at least 30 years ago. They have been encrusted and, what is worse, they have been completely replaced by the Speaker's rulings. I am not objecting to Speakers making rulings, in an attempt to codify revised procedures. The point is that it is very difficult for members to know where they are when the written rules do not mean anything half the time.

In the few cases where they do mean something, they are probably out of date. So that if we are going to consider time limits, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that we should consider them in context of the total rules of this House.

It has been proposed from this side of the House, from both the Liberal group and from our group, for as long as I have been in this House—which admittedly is not a very long time, but a few years—that we should set up a select committee perhaps under the chairmanship of the Speaker to consider the rules. The government simply will not give any consideration to the proposition at all. It is satisfied with the process of accretion which, over the years, has been very much to the advantage of the government and very much to the disadvantage of the Opposition.

For example, the rules clearly set forth that there are certain days of the week when private members' bills take precedence. That has been completely wiped out, but it still sits there in the rules. That is to the advantage of the government. I am not saying the government should not have that advantage, but let us not start talking about imposing certain limits on Opposition speeches, and that is mainly what this resolution is directed to, if we are going to consider the various ways in which the rules have been changed by custom to give tremendous advantage to the government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my final point is that if we are going to consider this particular change in the rules—and as I said, I do not object to the principle—we should consider the total picture in terms of a complete overhaul of the rules of the House with a view to providing a system of procedure which will give the government adequate freedom of action in carrying out its responsibilities but will also ensure to the Opposition the maximum possible freedom of action in holding the government to account and in prodding it into action.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion I want to show myself, as I am, indeed, a very charitable person. But there were some who suggested that the hon. member for High Park might feel that with the summer months, and his holiday time in Manitoulin Island, a very beautiful section, that he was chafing a bit to head up towards that area. And some of us can understand. I may say at time I have a very similar feeling, but I think it is particularly hard for the backbencher for the government, who sits there, of necessity silent over long periods.

As you will recognize, Mr. Speaker, there are too many of them; they are redundant and they have nothing to do. And one of the great situations of Parliament is that around here we have the poor fellows having to sit quietly with no position to take. And, of course, it must be irritating to the member for High Park that he must sit steadily. Let me say that I enjoy very much the recitation which he gives to the House in his speeches. I have always noticed that if there is any suggestion about the insurance industry we are going to get a repeat performance from the member for High Park.

And, may I say, in a more charitable approach than he gave to me, that I think year after year as he repeats that same speech, he does it with a little extra flourish, even though the words are the same. I have always enjoyed it; so I do not want to criticize repetition on his part. And I would feel, really, that the member has more than just a kind of tattered, half-hearted approach in suggesting the limitation of time. We agree with the principle which, I assume, is that we should have more efficiency in the Legislature. We agree with that. We have these antiquated rules going away back to 1867 and we are still trying to work in a modern, twentieth-century society with these rules.

And, as the member for Woodbine has said, we in the Opposition have been asking, asking to get more efficiency with respect to government business.

And who is responsible for this sluggishness? Who is responsible when we ask the question in the corridor, "How long?" I say the government is responsible. The government looks after the business of this House. Indeed, the hon. Prime Minister, who lacks the complete understanding of what Parliament is, suggested that the government has the right to decide every bit of government business.

Of course, this is a complete ignorance of what Parliament means, because I think the House leader himself has started to learn that an Opposition has rights to initiate some legislation in the Legislature.

The Prime Minister, at the start of this session, showed his utter ignorance of Parliament and the rights of an Opposition in Parliament. But apart from that, he said it, and it is quoted in *Hansard*. I would say it is strong language and it shocked me a bit that the Prime Minister would come out with such a statement as that.

May I say, sir, that as we look at the inability of a government to arrange business —let me just chronologue some of this—and to the House leader because he follows on in the tradition of other Conservative governments in this province, it is a strategy. No question in my mind that it has been a strategy on their approach. They try to suffocate proper debate and proper analysis of legislation coming through. And I come back to this: in the three weeks supply session this government over the years have believed that there was a place for Parliament to have orderly business. Would this be the approach they would take? In the three-year supply session from 1960 to 1964, look at the kind of hysteria with which, in the last three weeks, they suddenly try to cram through all the legislation.

But members were asked to study an average of 28.6 pieces of new legislation in the three weeks before the session ended. In every session from 1960 to 1964 members were asked to give reading to an average of 43.8 bills in the last three weeks; they were asked to consider 88 bills in the committee of the whole House; to give third reading to 88.6 bills. And what is the situation now? We have seen where, at this time in the session, when you get the champing on the part of the member for High Park, at this time in the session as we get in towards June, the government as yet has not brought in some of the major departments for the scrutiny of their legislation.

The government has not brought in major legislation, and now they are starting this whine about why can we not get through a little quicker. I will say that the real concern about the procedure of Parliament, and the efficiency of government business and the examination of it, rests with the government.

May I say that when we are talking of just the approach, the approach in connection with speeches, I think it is interesting to know the abuse on the part of Ministers. I said this before, I will repeat it again, that it is certainly a responsibility of a Minister to make a statement about government policy. On the other hand, in Britain the practice is that when there is a bill coming in, at the introduction of a bill, it is a written statement. What is the practice here? The practice here is that in 1964 there were 136 statements by Ministers. And let us look at the Prime Minister, the man who you say is brief. He stirred up—not with the content of his explanation, but the length of it—he spent an hour telling us about it. And in Design for Development he read us a pamphlet which he was putting out, as if we could not have read it ourselves and saved the time of the House and the cost of *Hansard*, about which you complain.

We have asked that there should be a select committee. With respect to the Speaker what a position in which to put a Speaker, especially an able man such as we have! The rules, such as rule 28 and rule 35, are completely broken by this House, and have been over long periods; on motions of supply, for example, to make amendments to the motion of supply. Now they are trying to patch up and give the appearance of somehow getting a semblance of order.

Take initiative by the Opposition to bring forward legislation.

Lewis's book to some is almost like being fundamentalist with the Bible, or Koran with the Mohammedans. They feel that Lewis's book surely tells us exactly what takes place here.

Let me say Lewis's book is completely out of date now in connection with what takes place in this Parliament. We ask that at this time, in 1966, instead of taking the tiny little area that is the length of time of debates, which certainly should be studied, let us have a look at the whole machinery, let us bring it up to date.

We have brought in other ideas. We

brought in ideas, for example, regarding radio and television. There are numerous approaches by which we could get greater efficiency in this Legislature. The only people who can bring that about are the government by having a select committee to look at the whole of the procedure, to look at the antiquated rules which the hon. House leader knows are broken and not practised in this House.

The only way they can do it is to have a select committee, which the Opposition parties have been asking for. If this was the principle behind the resolution by the member for High Park, that he wants to move into the 20th century in connection with the deliberation of legislation, in connection with his approach to this Parliament, then, sir, we are right behind him; so let us have a select committee.

Mr. S. Apps: (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, as I look down the list of members who are due to speak on this particular resolution, I am somewhat hesitant in standing up because I see all of them have been in this House much longer than I.

However, I thought perhaps it might be enlightening to some extent to obtain the views of someone who has not been here for very long. In speaking to this resolution, I do so with no intention of trying to limit debate in any way but I feel that there are several good reasons why a reasonable time limit might be considered.

Before going into that, I would like to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that he is deceiving himself when he says that the backbenchers—and I take it he is talking about the backbenchers of the Progressive-Conservative Party—are frustrated because of inactivity, that they do not have anything to do. I would like to point out to him that the backbenchers of this particular party have a great deal to do, and work at it very hard; and the rather contemptible way in which we are referred to as "backbenchers" I think would indicate to us that we are excess baggage, that we have nothing to do and as a result are rather discontented.

Mr. Thompson: I think some of the hon. members opposite should go into the front bench and some of the front into the backbenches.

Mr. Apps: I would like to point out that we feel we have a contribution to make to this Legislature and I can say to him that from the backbenchers as I know them of this party, they work very hard at their jobs, they are very conscientious and I am sure are doing an excellent job.

It may not seem quite apparent to some of the hon. members of the Opposition because we do not have the opportunity of getting up and speaking as often as they do. As a matter of fact we accomplish probably a great deal by using the phone and writing a few letters to get the answers that many of you are requesting on the floor. I might suggest that we could save a fair amount of time if the same procedure were used by some of the members of the Opposition and of the NDP to get the same answers.

I think we are all anxious to do as good a job as we possibly can, and if speeding up the work of the Legislature will help us do that, well I am in favour of it. I am not particularly convinced that definite time limits should be established, I think this could be considered. I think the three parties might get together to consider ways and means of deciding when a debate should be terminated and how long individual legislators should debate on it.

I feel that Cabinet Ministers in our own party do not need a great length of time in speaking before they present their estimates. I think in some cases they spend too much time trying to go over the work that has been done and it might appear in many cases that they are trying to prove to the Legislature that they have been doing a good job. Well, they do not have to do that because they are doing a good job and I do not think they need to take an hour, an hour and a half or two hours in presenting their estimates in order to indicate that to us. I think this could be done in 30 to 35 minutes at the most.

The Opposition does a pretty good job in asking questions and I think from the questions that the Ministers are asked they can bring out the things that they are doing and show us and show the people of Ontario the kind of department they are running.

I might say the interest of some of us I am sure lags when a speech goes on for 45, 50 minutes, an hour, hour and a half, two hours, two and a half, three hours and four hours. And I would like to compliment the hon. member for Woodbine—I do not do this very often—but he made a good speech today. He said a lot and said it in 15 minutes. I think he would accomplish a lot more if a lot of his speeches were done in the same way.

As far as the Throne speech and the Budget speech are concerned, it is very difficult to maintain interest over a long period

of time. Over a long speech it just is not practical and this must be self-evident to the people making the speeches. First of all by the attendance in the House. Members get up and leave after a half an hour or three-quarters of an hour, because it is tiring to listen to what is being said for such a long time. Any time one goes out to make a speech to any service club or any club such as that, even a political speech, the first thing one always must remember is that after speaking for half an hour interest lags.

I can assure hon. members the same thing happens here in this House when speeches go on for three-quarters of an hour or anywhere up to two hours, interest certainly does lag. The attendance in the House certainly indicates that to the speaker and even those who are in the House in many cases are spending their time not listening to what is being said but in writing letters, reading and so on. So it must be evident to the speakers that when they go on for a long time they are not accomplishing very much. The interest is lagging and I would think members of the press after a while—and they are a pretty long-suffering group—they too go to other areas when these speeches last for so long.

So in speaking to this resolution, I think first of all a great deal of valuable time would be saved if we could get together and determine some rules and regulations as to the length and number of speeches in various categories.

Second, I think the House attendance would be greatly improved because members would want to stay when they realize that the speeches are not going to drag on and on, that members are not going to read a lot of editorials from various papers.

Third, I think there would be more interest maintained by everyone concerned and they would get much more out of the speeches and the speaker himself would accomplish a great deal more.

Fourth, the impact of the speeches would be greater.

And, fifth, the business of the House would be speeded up and I think this would be welcomed by everyone concerned and I think we would get along much faster and much better.

I would urge in speaking to this resolution that serious consideration be given to determining some means whereby we could get together and work out some regulations that would help speed up the business of this House.

As far as wanting to get home is concerned, I do not care when I get home as long as I feel that I have been able to make a contribution to this House. Hon. members opposite are deluding themselves if they feel that we in the Conservative Party are anxious to get home because we have other things to do.

I can assure them that we are working just as hard at home for the people of our constituency as we are when we are here in this Legislature.

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I must say, first of all, that I find the speeches are very interesting. A lot of good horse sense has been spoken by all of the speakers and I agree that the time has come when I think we could to some extent shorten our speeches. Perhaps I could offer an example myself. Hon. members all know how seldom it is that I rise and take any time. Sometimes I think it is better to remain silent and be considered a genius than to speak at length and remove all doubt.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. E. Johnston: But actually my friends and hon. members, I think that a lot could be done in getting together on this; all of us I believe agree on the principle. I agree 100 per cent with what the hon. member for High Park has said, and, in fact, all the speeches have meat in them in this regard.

It has been mentioned here—at least the inference has been made — that when the House prorogues our work is done. I can tell hon. members from my experience with 11 years in this House that my work as the member of my riding never ceases. I am just as busy when I am at home as when I am in Toronto attending this Legislature. I can tell the House I think it applies to everyone of us here, that if we want to do the job that is to be done in our riding it then becomes a full-time job.

Many of us are not in a position to give full time to the job. I do not think the urban members grasp the magnitude of the work a rural member has to do. We have to wrestle with the problem of municipal roads, highways, health and welfare, lands and forests, education and many others. All of these departments generate work in the rural areas, to a much greater extent than they do in the urban, and so it is too that in the rural areas the people themselves over the years, I guess it has become a tradition from away

back, they expect far more from their members than they do in the urban areas.

So with all these things in mind, I believe the time has come when we as legislators must consider the position we put ourselves in by unduly taking up time in this House that I think could well be saved and put to much better advantage at home rather than sitting around here.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, in considering this resolution insofar as it pertains to the conduct of business in the House, I am reminded of an event a few years ago when a number of school children were here observing the proceedings one afternoon. A day or so later after their departure two or three of them wrote a letter to one of the metropolitan dailies and one of these children in his letter referred to his own disgust which resulted from his observance of the conduct of our business. He adverted to the fact that he saw some members reading newspapers, while another member was speaking; some doing correspondence; some talking to each other; some eating candy.

Also, he mentioned he saw one member take his shoes off.

I always thought that the reason for the allusion to the taking off of the shoes was the fact that what was being said at the particular time was more suitable for absorption by the feet than by the head.

This area, I submit to the member for High Park, is not one of clear-cut definition of the limitation of time that ought to be accorded to individual members. I myself feel, and indeed feel about myself, that some speeches should be brief and others might well be long. That is nothing more than a correlation of the quality of the content of the speeches and the research and work and stimulus to seeking information in the building of the speech. Again I have regretted, and it has been said here this afternoon, and I repeat it, I have regretted that there is not sufficient participation in the debates of the House by the private members of the Legislature. And I throw this out to the hon. member for Kingston, that surely we on this side are entitled to hear more than we do from the moonlighters in the back row, who almost to a man occupy important positions in the administration of the government.

Indeed, the hon. member who sat down, I defy him to show me any place in *Hansard* where, during the estimates of the Provincial Treasurer, he feels stimulated to get into the debate to inform us about what the Ontario racing commission is doing.

And so it goes almost right down the row. The responsible Minister takes the responsibility, to use the word again, for answering complaints and grievances and questions from this side of the House. Surely, we are entitled to some value for the money that we spend in the addendum, that we give by way of emolument to these people in the back row, who albeit some day hope to advance and progress down the hill into the more comfortable pew of the Treasury benches.

Once again I note in the resolution that the hon. member for High Park adverts to the length of speeches during the estimates. I hardly think that the phrase or two he has on that is sensible when one considers the efficiency of the handling of the estimates in this House, which, in fact, has replaced the Budget debate. The Budget debate has become all but obsolescent in the House and in a few years we might have the courage to terminate it completely, because the estimates, the handling of the estimates, have effectively replaced it. They have replaced it in a way of expedition and efficiency such as cannot be commanded by the Budget debate.

The Budget debate historically revolved around the expenditure of the public money. In dealing with the estimates we have the opportunity of getting an immediate reply from the Minister in respect of a specific item of spending of the public money.

Surely such a system cultivates the general good of the province in a much more effective way than the old Budget debate which often descends into nothing more than a disquisition on the beauties and serenity and the Godfearing qualities of the inhabitants of the particular riding that a member represents.

I certainly share the anxious concern of the leader of this party about some of the other rules of the House and the need for their reform. But generally in the setpiece debates that we conduct in the House, I do not think any real quarrel can be made about either the form in which they take or the length of speeches that appertain to them.

We may thank a merciful Providence, I think, and it is time somebody said it, that the dispatch of the public business in this House is much more efficient, much more sensible, much more effective than the threering circus that is going on down in the senior Parliament at Ottawa, where concurrently they never seem to get down to the

business of running the government of Canada but are distracted by other things which they consider to be important.

Perhaps a lot of people outside the House of Commons do not consider it to have the same amount of importance as elected members, but they have their problems. They are 265 members; we are only 108, which means that there is a much greater opportunity in the number of hours allocated to the handling of our business for participation by a greater percentage of the members who feel inclined to join in.

I am willing to hand out the challenge to my friend, the hon. member for Kingston and other able members of the House on the government side as he is, to participate more actively in the debates of this Chamber. We have not failed to note over here, of course—and our attention is always drawn to our problems here—we have not failed to note that in many respects participation by private members on the government side is at their own risk; there is somewhat of a danger for them to get in. That delightful young fellow, the hon. member for St. George in the back row, we have always felt has to a large extent lessened his chances of promotion because of some of the interventions he has made. Hon. members should have been here the day he dressed down the former Attorney General, who was in his seat earlier.

Who will ever forget the day the hon. Prime Minister wandered in here at five minutes to six and pulled the rug out from under two private members of the House who had made their position absolutely clear? So with those limitations, I say to the member for Kingston we would welcome, we would give up our own time, we would welcome a much greater participation by the private members from the government side of the House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 120



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 26, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 26, 1966

Estimates, Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Randall, concluded 3895

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett 3909

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3923

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature this evening, in the Speaker's gallery, the Liberal associations of York East and Don Mills; and a little later I expect, in the east gallery, the auxiliary of the Etobicoke general hospital.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order: House in committee of supply. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND DEVELOPMENT

(continued)

On vote 407:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on this vote, I understand that on either Victoria or O'Connor Drive—an area that the hon. Minister would know fairly well, as it is in his constituency—there is a complex being built; I think it is one of 240 units—I am not sure on this. But could I ask the hon. Minister if he is satisfied with the amount of parkland around this complex? May I say, to qualify my question, I understand that the complex does not have sufficient parkland.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): I understand from the director that there are 236 units there and the parkland is in conformity with The Planning Act. This is the usual arrangement when we build a project of this type.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, to clarify that, you say it is in conformity with The Planning Act?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The Planning Act, yes.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue the question which I raised with the hon. Minister earlier this afternoon, in connection with the Donmount Village urban renewal scheme. The hon. Minister is aware of the difficulty that we are having in the Donmount Village area of obtaining from the government some indication of whether or not there is any policy of the government to solve the problem with which that area is faced.

Now, I specifically exclude any discussion of The Expropriation Procedures Act from my remarks, because it is not the appropriate place to deal with it. But what I had pointed out was that 108 homes in that area, which are occupied by the people who own them, are going to be demolished.

A substantial number of them, by way of compensation on expropriation, are not going to receive sufficient money to be able to buy a home elsewhere in the city of Toronto. This means that they are faced with the necessity of becoming tenants in public housing, or tenants elsewhere.

Is it part of the policy of the housing corporation that people should become tenants and cease to become homeowners, when their homes are expropriated under an urban renewal scheme? That may be a question that the hon. Minister has not any specific view on, but I make the suggestion to him, that if he is going to subsidize rents, then there is certainly no reason why the housing corporation cannot buy individual homes and sell them to people who have lost their homes under an urban renewal scheme, by way of expropriation, at a price which will enable such people to continue to be homeowners.

I raise this question not only because of the Donmount Village problem, but also because it is going to be a continuing problem in the central part of the city, if urban renewal and redevelopment schemes are to be carried out.

Now, is it not possible for the housing corporation to sell to these people homes at prices which they can purchase, having regard to the amount of compensation which they are going to receive on the expropriation of their present homes?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, what the hon. member is saying, in effect, is that we make

a gift of cash or the equivalent to relocate these people in Toronto, or in the Metro area. Right?

There is nothing in The Housing Act whereby we can do that at the present time. I am aware of the situation in Napier Place. I am aware of the problems of Donmount Village, formerly Napier Place. I am aware of the problems and we have had a number of discussions within our own department, and with the housing authorities, to see if we can come up with a solution. We have not got a solution at the present time, and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has also given the matter consideration, because we, as you know, are bankers at the moment, in urban renewal schemes.

As I pointed out earlier today, my responsibility is to house the people while their homes are being demolished, and to get them back into a new home in their area when the homes are rebuilt. Now, what happens in the meantime, if they want to locate in some other area, if they have to buy in another area, has not been settled. I have no solution of that problem at the present time as I pointed out to the board of control when I was down at the city hall, and you and Mr. Bell, their lawyers, were speaking a few weeks ago.

But the matter is under consideration. If it is going to be a problem in the future, we are going to have to face it.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am still going to pursue this with the hon. Minister, because I do not think that he has quite understood the proposal that I have made, and that is—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand the proposal, but we do not have the answer.

Mr. Renwick: Do you buy single family homes?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we are buying homes anywhere at any price, that will suit the Ontario housing needs. But if we buy a home with the central mortgage and housing corporation for $13,000, it is obvious we have nothing in our Act to give it to somebody who has only $8,000 to spend without finding how we are going to take care of that $5,000 difference.

This is what the hon. member is suggesting. I am not thick in the head, I understand what you are driving at, but I do not have the answer. There is nothing in The Ontario Housing Act to make that decision at the present time but we are looking at it.

Mr. Renwick: What is the authority under which the hon. Minister subsidizes rents in properties owned by the housing corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Under The National Housing Act.

Mr. Renwick: The National Housing Act is the authority by which you subsidize rents in properties owned by the housing corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are not suggesting a subsidy, you are suggesting a gift. We have nothing in the Act to provide for a gift, but we can subsidize. Now, I appreciate the circumstances of people. We want to get people off the subsidized homes. There should be a way to make it possible for them to buy themselves another home. We are looking at that angle too, but there is nothing in our Act that will permit us to make a gift of $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000, much as I appreciate the circumstances. As I said earlier, we are working at it to see if we can find a solution.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said earlier that the housing corporation had made a proposal to the city. The leader of the Opposition has indicated that he feels the solution is that the housing corporation should take over responsibilities for housing for the metropolitan area. What is this proposal which the hon. Minister has made to the city that has been turned down? Does it have anything to do with urban renewal schemes at all or is it strictly an emergency housing proposal that he has made to the city?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think it was clearly spelled out in the paper tonight, if you read the article in the paper. There are two housing authorities. There is the Ontario housing corporation and there is the Toronto housing authority. Toronto housing authority operates 2,700 units. The city of Toronto is subsidizing those units themselves. We have suggested that if they want us to take over the 2,700 units, they can retain the ownership and, under the Ontario housing programme, we can take care of the subsidies that are required.

The federal government will pay 50 per cent, the province will pay 42.5 per cent, and Metro will pay 7.5 per cent. The city of Toronto will pay its portion of the 7.5 which could be a very few thousand dollars a year. And that is the proposition which was made to the city of Toronto. It has not been accepted because the board of control has not passed it yet. They still want to retain

ownership of the Toronto housing authority. That is the simple proposition.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, what thought has the housing corporation? Or does it have any responsibility at all in that portion of urban renewal schemes which are not expropriated, where it is proposed that existing houses be, with the consent and agreement of the owners of them, renovated or rehabilitated for continuing occupation? Does the Ontario housing corporation play any part in that portion of urban renewal schemes?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We do not loan money for the rehabilitation of homes. There is money under The National Housing Act for rehabilitation. They can apply The National Housing Act and the money is available for the rehabilitation of homes for private owners.

Mr. Renwick: Then the scope and function of the Ontario housing corporation, so far as urban renewal schemes is concerned, is not only a strictly limited one but it is nothing other than the provision of funds? Is this a fair statement?

Hon. Mr. Randall: And the provision of new housing into the urban area that has been cleared. Same as Alexandra Park. In Alexandra Park we put up our share of money through The Department of Municipal Affairs to clear Alexandra Park. And as soon as the land was cleared—we are down there now building homes, through the Ontario housing corporation. We have two interests in the project. One is to provide the money to The Department of Municipal Affairs, the other is to provide our share of the new housing.

Mr. Renwick: Well, I think this is the problem that concerns me, and concerns us here, the problem that my colleague from Scarborough West raised this afternoon—if in some way the Ontario housing corporation is going to become the responsible housing authority. If, let us assume hypothetically for the moment, it were to become the responsible housing authority in the metropolitan area, could that mean that the housing corporation would assume responsibility for a development under an urban renewal scheme? Or are we still going to be faced with this fragmentation of urban renewal between the federal government, provincial government and the city government?

Mr. Chairman: I suggest to the member that we do not be hypothetical about it, but that we deal with the vote as it concerns the OHC.

Mr. Renwick: I would be quite happy to put it the other way. The problem in housing in the core of Toronto under urban renewal schemes is an insoluble problem at the present time because this Minister has no basic responsibility for the implementation of the urban renewal scheme other than to have the property turned over to him and to build the building. No one—the federal government does not have any reponsibility for relocation; this Minister has no responsibility for relocation. None of the basic studies which are required in order to implement an urban renewal scheme for the people who are in the area are done by this government, nor by the federal government. And there appears to be a complete inability, now that a problem has come up under an urban renewal scheme, to get this Minister, with all the good will in the world, or any other Minister in this government, basically concerned as to what is going to happen to the families in that area.

If there is no responsibility on this Minister, my only aim and object is, as we eliminate one Minister after another, to find out on whom the responsibility falls. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister will understand why I am somewhat frustrated and irritated because I have letters from each Minister at the federal government and from this government disclaiming all responsibility in this area. The final letter, which I have received, states that it is now the problem of the Attorney General. The Attorney General looks up—I can well understand why he would feel that the problem of an adequate housing scheme under an urban renewal scheme should become his problem.

I personally think it is either this Minister or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. If—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): May I ask the hon. member a question? Who stated—I would be interested in knowing who gave the information that it is now the problem of the Attorney General? Whose statement is that?

Mr. Renwick: Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs wrote to me to inform me that it was not his problem, that I should discuss it with the Attorney General—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He will tell you next week.

Mr. Renwick —because the problem is one which must become a problem for the government to solve.

That is, on every occasion when an urban renewal scheme is to be implemented, is it going to mean that large numbers of owner-occupied homes are going to be taken by way of expropriation? And are the people from whom those properties are expropriated going to be denied the opportunity of living in homes which they own? This is not a problem which can be left to be dealt with at some future time.

The Minister says he has no authority to deal with the matter. I have attempted to suggest one possible way in which it could be dealt with. The only other possible way is to amend The Expropriation Procedures Act; and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs now informs me, as part of any discussion of that, that the hon. Attorney General is the only one who could permit, or would present, any bill to amend that Act to permit additional compensation to be paid if necessary, or to provide these people with enough money so that they can buy something in the neighbourhood of a comparable home in which they can continue to live.

As I understand it what this Minister says is that his responsibility is to relocate people; and the only place he can relocate them is in rental accommodation. I do not know how else I can put the problem. I think the Minister will agree I have had correspondence with him. We have been at meetings together, many other meetings, but this problem still remains unsolved. I do not know what can now be done unless this Minister, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, will give some indication that the government is seriously concerned with the problem.

If it is the government's policy—and they have to state it because of the shortage of houses in the city of Toronto—if they have to state that one of the prices that we pay for urban renewal is that there is no longer, in downtown Toronto, a place for the person who owns his own home—in an area which has to be subjected, in a period of time, to redevelopment—this may very well be the conclusion. But I think it is now important that the government indicate to us whether or not this is in fact the case.

I am not—this is not the principal point, it is one of the principal points; but it is not the main point. The main point is that, in an urban renewal scheme, some authority, whether it is the municipality, whether it is the Ontario housing corporation, whether it is the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs, has got to take overall responsibility for the original planning and implementation of an urban renewal scheme so that people do not unnecessarily get hurt in the process of urban renewal.

I understand this Minister's position—his position in Donmount Village. He stated it to me and it is perfectly clear: When the property has been expropriated by the city, when it has all been cleared, it will be turned over to this Minister—the 12 acres or whatever it is. On that 12 acres he will build a public housing development, and in due course people will move into it and continue to live in that area of the city. But, in the meantime, the 135 homes, and the people who occupy them, are going to be dislocated.

A tremendous number of people are going to have their lives disrupted without any preplanning as to where they are to go. Indeed, when the whole of this Donmount Village is completed, the accommodation available will house something in the neighbourhood of 300 people less than are housed in that area at the present time.

My concern is: If this government is going to take a responsibility to such a large extent for the financing between itself and the federal government, is it not possible to have the responsibility for a scheme right from the beginning to the end either fixed in one Minister—the responsibility of one Minister—or on a committee of Ministers in the so-called urban renewal partnership which exists, so that that partnership as a group will have a co-ordinated and cohesive scheme for urban renewal which will face the responsibility from the beginning of the project to the end of the project so that we are not faced with the kind of problem which has arisen in Donmount Village?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the Minister's observations that we should get his news out of the newspaper.

I listened, sir, with great care to my leader's remarks and to the suggestions which, I gather from the newspaper, the Minister adopted. It seems passing strange to me that the Minister will commend the thought raised in this Legislature over which he has power to exercise control.

The Minister in effect was quoted in the newspaper as saying, "I think it is a good

idea if we do away with or amalgamate the housing authorities in the city of Toronto with the Ontario housing authorities." But surely the point that we have been trying to make in this housing debate is that there should be one housing policy for the province of Ontario. And surely, Mr. Chairman, the one gentleman who can effect that is our good friend, the Minister of Economics and Development.

Does it mean anything when his answer comes not even in this House, but comes through the medium of the press, when he says, "I think it is a good idea, but I am afraid I cannot cope apparently with a recalcitrant municipal council"? His colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, is not with him tonight to whisper sweet nothings in his ear but surely he could have some influence over his colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. And surely if the Minister—I am sorry, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is here, I think he could move over a seat or two and he could whisper sweet nothings into the ear of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

But surely if the Minister of Economics and Development meant something when he gives statements to the press, if he meant something about unifying housing authorities, then he could have and should have spoken with a common voice on behalf of all of his colleagues on the Treasury benches.

If my leader's suggestion makes sense, and we think it does, the Minister thinks it makes sense, and the city of Toronto thinks it makes sense, are a half dozen aldermen or more in the city of Toronto going to frustrate the whole view of the Legislature of the province of Ontario and not allow this to come to pass?

In other words, do we or do we not have a housing policy for the province? How can it sit well in the mouth of the Minister of Economics and Development to answer what he believes—if he is quoted correctly, and he referred to it a few minutes ago and I gather he is quoted correctly—what he believes is a good sound criticism by saying that we are being held up by a few local politicians in the municipality in the province of Ontario?

Surely the proposition we put forward means nothing else than, let us have a common housing policy for the province of Ontario. Surely the authority to assert that lies in the lap of this Minister. To excuse it by saying, I said it in the paper, but I cannot bring my colleague, the most reasonable member of municipal affairs along with me, or his colleagues in the Treasury benches, just does not make any sense at all.

Are we playing games when we get announcements or pronouncements or apparent half-policy statements from the Minister of the Crown in answer to an objective, sincere and intelligent criticism, or do the words of any Cabinet Ministers mean anything?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Do we have a housing policy for the province of Ontario? That is a good question. Now, sir, perhaps we may be privileged to hear from the hon. Minister if, in fact, he is responsible for the provision of housing for our residents, how these several thousands of people in the environs of Sudbury, living in Capreol, Hanmer, Blezard and Rayside townships, get out of the seemingly insuperable and insoluble difficulty in which they find themselves, not unlike the dog chasing its tail; when a situation exists where central mortgage and housing corporation will not lend on mortgages in those four municipalities because there are no sewer and water services. There are no sewer and water services because there are not houses to provide enough taxation to afford them.

The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin —when I raised the problem in March in this Legislature, at a subsequent time when made his speech, seemingly the answer he wanted to tender was, "There are no sewer and water services in these four townships because the member for Sudbury is not in his seat." That appeared to be his reasoning, and at least that is the way the Sudbury *Star* captioned his remarks, and I pointed out—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That is not quite correct.

Mr. Sopha: I do not exaggerate; it is there for anyone to see: "Root says Sopha not in his seat," was the caption over the reproduction of his remarks. The caption over the reproduction of my remarks referred to the substance of what I had said.

Those people who engage themselves in the mining industry, or workers in the mining industry living in those four municipalities I have mentioned, have neither adequate housing nor do they have anything in the way of adequate sewer and water services. And that situation has existed for several years.

No private companies, sir, are lending any money in the area. Indeed, private capital if it wants to seek an outlet goes into a

municipality where the ordinary services are provided.

I think I am safe in saying that there have not been more than two dozen houses built in any one of those four municipalities in the last five years. I may sound parochial, but to make my point I am going to venture where angels fear to tread. During this session we from north of the French river—at least we on this side of the House, if not our colleagues from north of the French river on the other side of the House—have been conscious of the central theme of the session. That is — I think it is not unfair to suggest, and I will risk the accusation of parochialism—What can we do for the city of Toronto? What have we done for you lately, and what more can we do for you? Finance your subway? Seven hundred million dollars for roads for your great urban complexes—the hon. Minister of Highways—and so on.

An hon. member: Be careful, you are talking about the riding I love.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I know, I know; I may be talking about the riding of a good many hon. members who love the ridings in the urban complex. But I also reflect the views of a good many people in the boondocks of the province, in the faraway regions. And with all the emphasis on the needs of the city of Toronto and its reorganization of government by a man who comes from an even farther part of the boondocks than even I come from—130 miles farther to the north is the home of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs—and by way of substitution for anything in real terms and in real benefit, and in regard to this vote, the provision of adequate housing, we get the annual sojourn of the Cabinet into the north.

They have been there — the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture. They went up and shared the loving cup with the senator at a meeting, who gave them lots of advice and told us what fine people we were.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Well, are you not?

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, we are that, but we do not need to be told. We have a consciousness of it; we do not need to be told about it.

I understand they are planning another little trip of the Cabinet, come the falling of the leaves. They are coming up and they will repeat the process of last year and talk about what a great future the area has; and everything with us from year to year is always in the future, it never seems to arrive in the present.

To withdraw from what may appear to be facetiousness and get back to the solid ground of fact, this is a very anxious problem with the municipalities I have mentioned.

The housing authority has come into Sudbury and has provided a few houses for people in lower income groups. There are not many; they have provided a few. The strange thing is that, in contrast to other departments, I might mention in passing, without giving the impression that I am thin-skinned, this is a department where they never take the trouble to inform an Opposition member about what they are doing.

Everything is, "Oh, not in this department." Everything is done in the darkest of secrecy. I have to refer to that very good newspaper, the Sudbury *Star*, to find out what the housing authority is doing; that is where I get my information. They never fail if there is a government member hiding in the bushes somewhere. They never fail to get him out for the opening of the housing development. And suitably armed with cameras and television kinescope, they have a great shindig about it.

The only activity—I get it second-hand from the Sudbury *Star*—that is seen in the area is, as I say, the provision of a few houses in Sudbury and that not to the satisfaction of the residents. They ran into a tremendous donnybrook about the location of their houses. In the first place they decided to locate them they had to back off because they could not find a friend in sight for them —either on the municipal council, the ratepayers or anybody else—because they were going to transform an area into what was felt to be living quarters for people in lower economic groups where the permanent residents had already paid up to $25,000 or $30,000 for the houses they had built.

Then, of course, they moved to another area and caused a furor there. One wonders, in respect of a Minister who travels the world and rubs elbows with the diplomats, that some of the diplomacy has not rubbed off on him. I do not know whether he gets the same reception in other parts of the province but I suspect he does.

But tonight—and I wish my friend, the hon. member for Nickel Belt was here to support me, and I know he would. But he is engaged in very important affairs; his absence is thoroughly justified and I do not complain

about it—but I merely reflect for him what he would like to say about it because I know that he is very worried about the situation and gets many complaints from the inhabitants. The Minister is no longer listening but the Minister of Municipal Affairs knows this area very well. The inhabitants of Rayside, Blezard, Hanmer and Capreol townships are indeed very concerned about the lack of expansion.

Now, finally, let me say in respect of those four townships, let me inform the Minister that if there is to be the expansion of the urban development of Sudbury, if Sudbury is to become 200,000 or more in population by 1975 or 1980, then that expansion must find its way out into that part of the topography that we call "the valley," out to the northwest and out to the northeast where there is soil to be found rather than the hard precambrian shield. Many members no doubt are acquainted with the fact that the city of Sudbury itself was built in the wrong place, entirely in the wrong place, on the rim of the basin. It ought to have been located by the CPR, when they were putting the railway through, 15 or 20 miles to the northwest or to the northeast; but there were considerations which impelled them, I suppose, to locate it where they did.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Probably a Liberal planned it.

Mr. Sopha: No, I do not think any political party had very much to do with it. I think financiers of the CPR had more to do with it than—well, I might just inform the Minister of Reform Institutions, who is interested in these things, that the real reason for the location of the city where it is, on the rim of the basin on the precambrian shield, is the fact that Lake Ramsay afforded water of appropriate quality for the steam engines.

An hon. member: He knew that all along.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, he knew that all the time. Well, I might just say, in regard to the Minister of Reform Institutions—and I feel, what is the word, I feel benevolent tonight, that in contrast to this department, if the Minister of Reform Institutions is doing anything in the area he will inform you, he will let you know. Yes, indeed he will. And he will read a few letters to himself about it, extolling his virtues at the same time. The Minister of Transport is another one who is a contrast. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, of course, always keeps one informed. I am just going down the Treasury benches.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member wants to speak on 407.

Mr. Sopha: Will you tell the member for Lambton West to stop provoking me?

An hon. member: We are going to have to speak about crying in Sarnia again now.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I have made my point. I have laid the facts on the table and they exist. It does not matter really whether the Minister replies to them or not, because they are immutable; they are immutable facts that exist. These people cannot get housing —to go back to where I began—because CMHC will not lend money because there is no sewer and water; they have not the taxation and assessment to provide the sewer and water. How do they get out of the treadmill?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I always get a great thrill out of listening to the hon. member for Sudbury speak. He speaks so well, and as a rule he makes his point. He made his point tonight. I know he was not talking about Sudbury in particular but he did mention the fact that Sudbury is interested in housing. We have built in Sudbury, since 1963, 420 units either built, bought, or under construction. And 332 of those were in the last year.

We are providing housing as fast as the city of Sudbury requests it. With reference to the townships, the smaller towns he is referring to, perhaps he is a little bit of a mind reader. I have a letter here written on May 18 to Mr. H. Borland, the central mortgage and housing corporation, in Ottawa, by my director of housing, after a consultation with him and on discussions with the hon. member for Grey South.

Dear Mr. Borland:

> Following my meeting with Mr. Hignett and yourself on Friday of last week, I agreed to write setting out my understanding of our discussion. Some weeks ago I was advised by Mr. Pickersgill, Ontario regional supervisor of your corporation, that your lending policy precludes loans on dwellings in areas where no municipal sewage facilities exist.
>
> I was aware, of course, of your reluctance to lend in such areas but I had felt, following our meeting in Ottawa last November, that some flexibility existed. As a case in point, we had received a request for senior citizens' accommodation in the community of Gore Bay on Manitoulin

Island and, having agreed upon a site with the Sudbury branch manager, had retained an achitect to design the units. We also received an assurance from the medical officer of health that the number of septic tanks involved would not create a pollution problem.

Mr. Pickersgill's letter arose as a result of a similar endeavour on our part in the community of Flesherton, which is somewhat smaller than Gore Bay. My concern, and also that of my Minister, was that if your lending policy was to preclude such communities, the Ontario housing corporation would be able to do little or nothing to assist the large majority of rural communities in Ontario. On the other hand, it is not our desire to work against the policies which you and the Ontario water resources commission have established to combat water pollution.

I would now like to set out in point form my understanding of our discussions.

(a) Application for loans by Ontario housing corporation will be considered on an individual basis by your corporation.

(b) When a request is received from the unserviced municipality, we will obtain from OWRC their comments concerning limited development on septic tanks. We will then advise you of OWRC's views and ask whether you are prepared to consider a loan application when a scheme is being developed.

(c) When considering schemes in unserviced municipalities the Ontario housing corporation will use undeveloped land within the community proper. It will thus increase the density of the community rather than extend its boundaries.

(d) Ontario housing corporation will consult with the Ontario research foundation which has been carrying out development studies on a more sophisticated package treatment system for sewage. Wherever possible, Ontario housing corporation will use this system rather than conventional septic tanks.

I believe the foregoing adequately covers the points we discussed. If you are in agreement, we will reinstate our studies in the Flesherton area with a view to determining whether a development which meets these points is feasible.

I will look forward to hearing from you at the earliest convenience.

I think we have covered the points the hon. member is concerned about. We are concerned too. You must remember that 90 per cent of the money is put up by central mortgage and housing and if their policy is that they will not go into unserviced land there is not very much we can do. But we have approached them on the matter. We recognize what the difficulties are and I think we are going to have success with them.

Mr. Singer: How about Metropolitan Toronto? Can we not get an answer on that? I am sure my hon. friend from Wentworth East will yield for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Sudbury thinks we are doing too much.

Mr. Singer: Can we not get an answer on whether or not he believes what he said in the paper? And if he believes what he said in the paper, what is he going to do about it? Let us get back, let us not get diverted.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I know the hon. member for Sudbury feels very deeply about his problems and the hon. member from Hamilton is going to feel very deeply about his. But let us answer a question or two on Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Put the question. Let me know what your question is.

Mr. Singer: I told him it for ten minutes. If you want another ten minutes again I will give it to you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was very confusing, and I did not hear you; I did not understand.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry the Minister cannot grasp these things. Let us give him the same speech again.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview—I would suggest that he repeat the question. The hon. Minister did discuss Metropolitan Toronto matters earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Singer: All right then. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman; I am sorry the Minister missed the point. The Minister said earlier this evening that he agreed with the point made by my colleague and my leader when he suggested that the city of Toronto housing authority be amalgamated with the Ontario housing corporation. I was suggesting to him earlier this evening, Mr. Chairman, that if he meant what he said that he should not be deterred by the views of the few apparently recalcitrate aldermen on the city of Toronto council.

The mayor of the city apparently agrees with him. I was wondering why he did not avail himself of the good offices of his colleague who sits very close to him—the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Between the two of them, able gentlemen as they are, I was sure they could work out a system whereby if this was good policy to adopt over the province of Ontario, they could bring in sufficient legislation to enable them to do it.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, whipping away all of the subtlety of this question, if I have any subtlety at all at my command, if the Minister means what he is quoted in the paper as having said—which he referred to earlier this evening—why does he not do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does the hon. member mean by a few aldermen?

Mr. Singer: All right, I am sorry. I made this speech once and if I have to make it two or three times, I will.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All I want to know is what does the member mean by a few aldermen?

Mr. Singer: If my friend will sit down I will answer him. My leader said yesterday—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do not need to give the whole speech again. What does the member mean by a few aldermen? Does he mean the majority of the council or does he mean two or three aldermen?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I deplore as much as the hon. member for High Park all of this repetition, but it is unfortunate that two Ministers do not grasp it the first time around. So we will do it again for the third time around.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Downsview has the floor. If you would like to answer the question you may do so now.

Mr. Singer: Yes. My leader said yesterday that he thought it was a very good idea that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this not a point of order at all. He asked a question and he is going to get the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member merely to answer the question: What does he mean by a few aldermen? That seems to me to be simple to answer.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am not in the witness box. My friend had the temerity to ask me a question; I will answer it in my own way.

An hon. member: Oh, temerity!

Mr. Singer: Yes, temerity. I will answer it in my own way. Mr. Chairman, for the enlightenment of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, let me put it this way.

My leader said yesterday that it was a good idea if the housing confusion in the metropolitan area was resolved by amalgamating the Toronto housing authority with the Ontario housing corporation. These stories gather weight and the newspapers start reporting them; I gather that a newspaper reporter came to the Minister of Economics and Development and asked him if he thought this was a good idea. The Minister of Economics and Development said yes, he thought it was a good idea. Subsequently, another reporter went to the mayor of the city of Toronto and he said he thought it was a good idea. But the rocks on which both of these gentlemen ran aground was the inability or the lack of agreement coming forth from the aldermen in the city of Toronto.

Now, very simply, for my friend the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, I say this: If the hon. leader of the Opposiiton and the responsible Minister and the mayor of the city of Toronto all think this is a good idea, surely there is enough good intelligence on the front benches of government that would enable this policy to be carried forward.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many was it? A majority?

Mr. Singer: Why should a few aldermen be able to frustrate an opinion that seems to be eminently best, and which is seconded by the Minister, the mayor and last, but certainly not least, the leader of the Opposition?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the weakest argument I have ever heard, and the hon. member did not answer my question.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to substantiate my colleague's remarks. It is always indicative to me that we have something which is sound and of good principle which the Minister of Economics and Development, myself and the mayor of

Toronto agree with, that temerity was a good word for the Minister of Reform Institutions. His quaky little voice says: "How many?" He is thinking of votes, not of the principle of the reform. That trend of agreement has been dismissed, and I am glad that my colleague did dismiss it. The question is now directed to a man with a sense of principle who has an agreement with us to get on with housing for Toronto. He is not concerned about whether there was a majority or a minority, but rather on the point that if it is good and is worthy for the people, let us get on with it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I concede to the hon. member for Scarborough West; he is dealing with a Toronto issue.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: We have an occasional unanimity in our caucus, Mr. Chairman, and there is agreement. When I think back on what the mayor of Toronto once said about the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, and what the Minister once said about the mayor, I can understand why it is not always possible for them to agree on social policies.

What perplexes me is that I do not really understand why the Liberal Party has sidled into the pocket of the Ontario housing corporation on this issue without evaluating it fairly clearly. The fact is, and the Minister of Reform Institutions' question was a valid one, that the majority of the council of the city of Toronto take a different opinion; their opinion is supported by the consultative committee on housing policy for the city of Toronto, an exceedingly eminent group who made one of the best studies of housing policy that is available in this province. The chairman of that study, Dr. Rose, is a board member of the Ontario housing corporation. So it is not to be dismissed lightly when some of the forces suggest that simply to sweep away the Toronto housing authority is not necessarily an intelligent answer.

Mr. Chairman, the impetus to destroy the Toronto housing authority derives from what, on the surface, seems to be a logical proposition—that we should have a consistent housing policy across the province, amalgamated under the Ontario housing corporation. The Ontario housing corporation itself emerged in what appeared to be at the time a logical way. There was such a bureaucratic impact, such a labyrinth of red tape in housing policy in the Metropolitan Toronto area, that the Ontario housing corporation had to come forward and save the day. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that if one takes the analysis of hindsight it becomes evident that the impasse in housing at the Metropolitan Toronto level was the creation of the province, not the creation of the municipality.

The hon. member for Downsview, I will remind him, was one of the chief members in this House who told the former Minister of Economics and Development how his housing plan was a total fraud—an entire delusion, if I quote him accurately. Macaulay's folly, I think, he called it; that in fact it was the province that was responsible for much of the impasse.

Let me suggest a point to him in good faith; I seldom tangle with him because he is a pretty astute politician. I say to him, Mr. Chairman, that the Ontario housing corporation is perpetuating the mélange in housing in this province. Take a look at what my colleague from Riverdale revealed in the House tonight, what happened to the Donmount Village association and the Napier Place development. The city of Toronto, and this would also be true of the housing authority, is quite prepared to move, but the Minister of Economics and Development will not take a stand, the Minister of Municipal Affairs will not take a stand, and the buck is passed in a very cavalier fashion to the Attorney General, who does not even know what the subject is about. It is at the provincial level that once again a very important social issue has been frustrated; not at the municipal level; not at the level of the city of Toronto.

When the member from Sudbury stands in his place and talks about the absence of housing through northern Ontario, it is a totally valid point. And who promotes the absence of housing if is not the Ontario housing corporation? What about the truth in Windsor, and what about the truth in Hamilton, and what about the situation in Metro itself? These pretentious documents that you present to the metropolitan council reciting projects and numbers of homes include in those numbers projects that were decided on 10 and 20 years ago. It should not be attributed to the Ontario housing corporation at all. Imagine including Thistletown, Alexandra Park and Napier Place in your total figure.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They were all built in the past year.

Mr. S. Lewis: They were under—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member knows they were built in the last year—

Mr. S. Lewis: They were under way before the Ontario housing corporation—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member cannot even read, let alone understand, the facts,

Mr. S. Lewis: The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that it is easy to inherit a large mass of housing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The sod was not turned in Thistletown, so I took on the job.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, that—

Hon. Mr. Randall: In many of these projects, the sod was not turned till I took on the job.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are only two implications of that; either the Minister is now indicting everything his predecessor said and did, which, in fact, is true—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I could not care less about that!

Mr. S. Lewis: —or he is taking credit for that which is already under way, which, in fact, was also true. You cannot include in your figures all those projects on which everyone in the Metropolitan Toronto area has been counting for ten years, and then say that you are somehow solving the housing crisis. In the—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Counting what? Paper figures? Did they count Alexandra Park which was not started until a year ago?

Mr. S. Lewis: Certainly they were counting—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, they were not.

Mr. S. Lewis: They were promised Alexandra Park by—

Hon. Mr. Randall: What is the matter with you? Read the paper!

Mr. S. Lewis: I have got the paper.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Nothing was started in Alexandra Park.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Scarborough West has the floor; let him carry on without interruption, please.

Mr. S. Lewis: The equanimity of the Minister, his pragmatic temperament—

Mr. Chairman: Let us stay with the vote, if you will, please.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am sorry to disturb it, Mr. Chairman, I think—

Mr. Chairman: I suggest that we avoid personalities and stay with the vote.

Mr. S. Lewis: I hardly demean a personality that I describe as pragmatic; I consider that a compliment, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will take it as a compliment.

Mr. S. Lewis: I appreciate the Minister will, he is an affable—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have been called worse than that; go ahead.

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, the mayor of Toronto has said it for us. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would simply state—

Hon. Mr. Randall: He smiled when he said it.

Mr. S. Lewis: —that while the housing registry figures mount, and while the back dossier of thousands of homeless citizens and people who require adequate housing continues to extend, the only figures this Minister offers which are of substance, are figures that all of us counted on hitherto; figures that we assumed would come.

The actual number of units we require, in view of the waiting list, are double or treble what is given in this document which was presented to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto on January 27, 1966.

To come back to the main point, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister, through you, that his omniverous tendencies to swallow everything in sight are not necessarily enviable, and that the work of the Toronto housing authority, indeed the sense of initiative which is required in this field, should not be too lightly dismissed.

I suggest it should not be cavalierly dismissed when the Ontario housing corporation has not begun to prove itself, because it is still essentially a real estate operation and until it begins to acquire some social aspect and some intelligent planning, we cannot simply accept it without comment, as has been the tendency from time to time.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Chairman: I understood that you deferred to your colleague.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to say that it is not in my nature to be charitable to this government in any way because of my own principles and I consider that they are a sluggish, unconcerned group of people on the whole, as we look at the whole fabric of Ontario.

On the other hand I feel that the Minister, in connection with Toronto and housing, has shown that he gets a job done. I am not an academic in this area, I am thinking of the people who need homes.

Dr. Rose—I do not know the man, he has great qualifications—but I do not bow to him unless I see results taking place. Let me say this: I do not bow either to a council unless I see results taking place.

I have looked at such areas as Alexandra Park and I have seen that for 30 years there has been squabbling and difficulties and bickering. I have never been afraid of standing against aldermen or anyone else if we are going to get a job done.

And because someone is saying that Dr. Rose or the council are saying certain things now that he is on the Ontario housing board, that to me means nothing unless there is building being done for people who need houses.

As far as I am concerned, the Ontario housing corporation got on with the job, and the Toronto housing authority—you can be as academic as you want about having a closer relationship with municipalities—I think they have shown a failure over a period to get on with the need for people to have decent housing. And in this area—

An hon. member: They were frustrated.

Mr. Thompson: I do not care whom they were frustrated with, I want results. And in this area the Minister has taken the challenge and he has shown some results. If others want to talk about bickering, and saying that there is not a majority on council in support of it, all I am looking for in housing is to see that houses are being built.

And may I say that I consider as well that the Thistletown project was held up; everyone knows it was held up for a long period. Then the Ontario housing corporation came in and it seems to me that when we see the Minister doing something—and there is not that much that he does, there is not that much that you fellows over there do, you are complacent and comfortable and you have been in for 23 years. There are many of you whom we have to push.

Two years ago we told the Minister that we had had one before him and his approach to housing was to try to get headlines by thinking up a new approach, looking up towards the press gallery and saying he was going to have something that they had in Sacramento about five years before.

Of course, I must say this with some sorrow, that it did get some headlines when he announced this approach one year and in the next year, but there were no results.

In this particular area, this Minister has got results and it is such a startling situation to me to see in this decadent government one Minister who is actually producing something, that I am going to give—I was going to say condemnation, because I am used to giving condemnation to the government and it deserves it—but in this particular situation I will give the hon. Minister credit.

I say if he is doing a job, we congratulate him. And we think he, instead of being nervous about municipalities, nervous about them, should get in there and tell them to get on with the job. We talked about, for example, surveys. We know and the Minister knows, if he is in touch with the pulse of Ontario, that there are areas throughout this province where there is desperate need for decent housing.

My colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury, pointed out areas. All of us know this as we travel around this province. And I also know that there are certain municipalities where there are councillors—and I have said this before—but they feel it is a shame to indicate by a survey that they have some of these areas of housing, of which they should be ashamed.

It is a little bit like TB in the 19th century, frankly. Instead of trying to get on and help people to recover, they used to in my part of the world where I come from, hide them up in the attic, ashamed of it.

But if they would only look at what the problem is and then ask for help, then they could really do something about it.

I am saying to the hon. Minister: You can do a job, and do not be overly concerned about the sensitivities of municipalities that are reticent about moving forward to give decent housing to people. Do not be concerned about knowing whether it is the majority of council, or a minority of council. That has nothing to do with the question.

The question is to give decent housing to people and I want to say, and it is a rare occasion I do this, but I want to say to the hon. Minister that in Metro Toronto we challenged you two years ago, and we challenged you last year, and, frankly, I was less charitable than the hon. member for Scarborough West. I said I did not think you would produce these houses here, and I tried to get a vote of non-confidence in connection with an estimate, I think. But he said "No, we will give you a chance for this year."

Well, in this particular area, you have been startling in the fact that you are completely different to most of your hon. colleagues. You have shown results and, because of this, on our side of the House, we congratulate you on that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, how many names were on the Metropolitan Toronto housing registry at the most recent count?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The applications for housing in Metropolitan Toronto as placed with the housing registry in Metropolitan Toronto—the registry publishes statistics on the status of the waiting list on a quarterly basis. The following is a comparison of statistics on a half yearly basis over the past year:

Total applications for families: on March 31, 1965, was 3,480; September 30, 1965, was 4,770; and March 31, 1966, was 3,906.

Senior citizens: I do not have the figure for March 31, 1965, but I have the figure for September 30, 1965. It was 2,990; and March 31, 1966, was 2,912.

While these figures indicate there has only been a slight reduction in the peak figures reached in September 1965, it should be stated that applications are being received by the registry at the rate of almost 600 per month.

Family applications, by size of the family: single persons at March 31, 1966, was 569, as against 440 in September, 1965, as against 244 on March 31, 1965.

Two bedroom families: 453 in March, 1965; 714 in September, 1965; 622 in March, 1966.

More than two persons: 2,783 in March, 1965; 2,283 in September, 1965; and 2,715 in March, 1966.

There will be a substantial increase in the number of applications from single persons and we think these are mainly elderly people who we talked about this afternoon, who evaded or did not want to go to homes for the aged, but want accommodation in their own area.

But they are coming in at the rate of 600 a month and I think you will see that we have been holding back the flood. Because of the fact that they know that housing is now available we are going to continue to get them.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will make one brief initial observation and then I want to say one brief word about the hon. Minister's figures.

First, we know how you have been holding back the flood. We know of a letter that went out to the people who had gone to the housing registry to ask them if they still required housing. Those who did not reply to the letter were then struck from the list.

Let me say to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that a more unscientific method of ascertaining housing needs cannot possibly be devised. Indeed, there were subsequent reports, of course, of those who were eliminated because they simply could not reply, or they had moved, or they had given up hope, any of the innumerable human reasons. But leaving out that fact of maintaining the lists altogether, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the hon. Minister, by way of distinguishing this party from the Liberal Party, that when in March, 1966, you have roughly 4,000 families seeking accommodation, and 3,000 senior citizens, then we do not believe that the Ontario housing corporation has done a job in Metropolitan Toronto, or has begun to approach doing a job.

Until those figures are obliterated—and they are highly unrepresentative, they are just those who somehow found their way to the registry, they in no sense ascertain genuine need or demand—until those figures are obliterated, then the Ontario housing corporation remains primarily a paper agency, in the minds of this party.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. members for Toronto have had their innings, I would like to take you back to Hamilton. As I said previously, we do not have politics mixed up with our housing problems, but we also do not have any action either.

I have a couple of questions I would like to raise, sir, with the hon. Minister, regarding the Roxborough Park project in Hamilton.

Could the hon. Minister tell me what is the financial position regarding the amortization of that project, the full recovery project?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot tell you at this stage. I can get the information for you. That is a federal 75 per cent owned project. I do not have the figures.

Mr. Gisborn: Then I take it, sir, you would let me have a statement on the position?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Gisborn: Who would be in charge of the financing of maintenance of the project? I understand—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say the housing authority of Hamilton.

Mr. Gisborn: I understand that Mr. Jaguard, treasurer of the Hamilton city corporation, is also treasurer of the Hamilton housing authority. Could I obtain a copy of the financial statement from him, or does your department also have a copy?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have to get it through the federal people. We can get it for you.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise the question with the hon. Minister, regarding the project. I understand—I think I am correct in saying—that about a year ago the authority gave the Hamilton city council the go-ahead to change from the full-recovery programme to a geared-to-income programme and I believe subsequently the city council rejected the idea. I believe the board of control took it to council with the recommendation that they do not change.

I was a little disturbed about the decision. I felt that we had had problems with the full-recovery programme over the years. I felt that some of the reasons given by the members of the Hamilton board of control were not conveyed to the tenants in the way I would have liked them to have been conveyed, explaining the geared-to-income programme properly, but rather press statements that about 80 per cent of the people would be affected with higher rents. Of course this naturally scared the tenants somewhat, as to their decision not to push for a geared-to-income programme.

I would ask the hon. Minister if he feels now—first, I might say: Has the Ontario housing corporation the right to insist on a change in the programme in the Roxborough Park project? Is it in the hands of the city council to make the decision, or has the Ontario housing corporation the right to implement the geared-to-income programme?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. The city has a 7.5 per cent part. It has equal right to say whether it wants to break the contract it has signed. And the city elected not to change the basis of rent collection, as you know, a year or so ago.

Now that there is more housing becoming available and being built in Hamilton, we are going back to the city and see if we can get it reverted to rent geared to income, because I think this is where some of the tenants will receive the benefit and will not have to pay that 30 per cent premium that we have in the original contract arrangement.

I would think in this coming year, this coming fall, that we would be able to get central mortgage and housing corporation and city of Hamilton together and see if we can convert it over to rent geared to income, which I think it should be. We are trying to get them all on rent geared to income all over the province of Ontario, we are trying to get away from the old basis.

Mr. Gisborn: Thank you, Mr. Minister, and I certainly hope that this influence will convince the city council, although I hope they will notify the tenants to the benefits they will derive from it, because, of course, we are still having the same old problem of people being shuttled out, and there is a large backlog waiting to get in.

I would like to raise another question with the hon. Minister. If the hon. Minister will recall, I wrote him a letter on April 20, asking him to look into the dismissal of one Mr. John Murdock, former manager of the Roxborough Park housing authority.

I received a letter from the hon. Minister on April 27 telling me that he had asked Mr. Suters, the managing director of the Ontario housing corporation, to look into the matter and he would report to me.

I waited for some time for an answer, it might have been an oversight on the part of the department, but I feel that this person, Mr. Murdock, has suffered, in my opinion, an injustice. I know that he has some problem trying to get new employment because he was dismissed from a responsible position and it reflected somewhat on his abilities to perform the occupation. Has the hon. Minister anything on the request I made?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, the matter was brought to my attention and the housing authority, of course, has the complete responsibility of dismissing staff; it is not done by the Ontario housing corporation. If there is an inequity being perpetrated in this matter of hiring and firing staff we will know about it and sit down and talk to the authorities. In this case here the housing

authorities felt that their handling of the case was justified and I think you got a copy of the letter.

Mr. Gisborn: I am sorry, Mr. Minister, that is the reason I raised it; I have had no answer on that whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed the letter was sent to you. If you have not got it I will see you get another copy.

Mr. Gisborn: Fine, but do I take the hon. Minister's explanation that that is all there was to it; that you contacted the authority in Hamilton and they felt that that was their prerogative to dismiss the man and it was just that simple?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is written into the authority's agreement that they look after the staff and they make the judgment on whether the employee is capable of doing the job, whether they want to continue to employ him or not. If there is an injustice we will take a look at it. In this case we have had the facts and we wrote you accordingly and told you why he was dismissed.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, fine; I will pursue the letter when I receive it. I did not receive it unless it was lost some place and I would appreciate it if I could get one.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will see that you get one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, on page 65 of the hon. Minister's introductory remarks there is a table that he did not read into the record at that time in which he lists the municipalities in which Ontario housing corporation is building homes this year. I realize that the difficulty in providing housing is associated with the large urban centres, but we have raised in this Legislature for the last two years the need for some programme of assistance in the rural municipalities across the province. I cannot identify every one of these municipalities, but I do not believe there is a rural municipality in this list at all. Is there a programme that is an operating one whereby the corporation goes to these municipalities and even explains what is available rather than waiting for them to take the initiative that is apparently necessary before any assistance is forthcoming?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, in answer to your question, let me say this does not include them all. I cannot tell you whether the areas you are talking about are included or not.

Mr. Nixon: I am not speaking of a specific area.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I know. You are talking about the smaller centres. All I can suggest is this: We had two symposia in which we brought the municipal people together in Toronto. We explained where they fitted into the scheme of housing. We have since heard from both of them. They get all the literature; they get the Ontario housing material that goes to every municipality; every clerk in every municipality and every county is aware of the programme.

We have not gone out and made a town-by-town contact with the local clerk to see if he is well informed on housing matters, but I am pretty sure that communications have been excellent as far as we are concerned. The results as we see here, just some of the results, indicate that we are reaching most of the municipalities that are interested in housing.

Mr. Nixon: These places are not towns.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I appreciate that.

Mr. Nixon: They are not towns by any stretch of that definition. Quite often it is not even a post office centre. These are the types of homes that are referred to in the report of the Minister's economic council, when they talk about these rural areas that are so disadvantaged. I am not convinced that the local councillors are aware of the fact that a large amount of assistance is available, if they want to embark on a programme to provide this sort of housing. I have raised it before and I raise it again, and I would suggest that the hon. Minister might look into just how this information is getting through.

Vote 407 agreed to.

Vote 408 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to submit the estimates of The Department of Transport.

The work of the department continues to expand steadily—in volume, in complexity and in significance to the citizens of Ontario. This expansion of service is the result of

three fundamental factors: First, we are experiencing a population explosion in motor vehicles. Twenty years ago there were 660,000 motor vehicles registered in Ontario. Ten years ago the total was 1.6 million. In 1965 there were over 2.5 million. That is nearly 2 million more vehicles in a span of 20 years—four times as many as there were in 1945. And the number continues to increase at the rate of almost 100,000 each year.

Second, the motor vehicle has opened up a greatly increased mobility in our society, and it has become a substantial element in the economic health and development of the province.

And third: In common with almost every other major jurisdiction on the continent, Ontario has had an annual increase in the number of accidents. The toll of death, injury, suffering and financial loss is a compelling human challenge. To emphasize the urgency of this challenge, I would point out that traffic accidents have claimed 22,000 lives in this province in the past 20 years—a toll that is about the same as the population of the city the size of St. Thomas.

What causes accidents? What can be done to avert them, to reduce their tragic toll?

During the past year there has been an increase of public interest in these questions. It is my hope that this concern will continue and grow in momentum, for public attitudes are an essential component in the prevention of accidents.

The questions are perplexing. There is no simple, clear-cut answer to what causes accidents and how they can be averted. There is no panacea that can produce, all by itself, a dramatic improvement in the level of safety. What is needed, and what The Department of Transport is putting into effect, is a concerted attack on many fronts.

Let us look for a moment at some of the accident causes that are emphasized in public discussion of these questions. These include teen-aged drivers, drinking drivers, persistent violators of traffic laws, and the mechanical design and condition of vehicles. Each of these causes is important; each deserves, and receives, the special attention of my department.

But let us not be deluded into thinking that any one of these factors is the overriding cause of accidents, for it simply isn't so. Each of them is a cause for concern and attention, but each accounts for only a fraction of all accidents—and I include vehicles in this statement. I shall return in a moment to the currently topical subject of "the safe vehicle."

The leading causes of accidents are on the record, and there is no doubt about them to anyone who makes an objective examination of all the facts that are available.

The leading causes of accidents are these: drivers who are not paying close enough attention to what they are doing; drivers who do not yield the right-of-way; drivers who are going too fast for conditions; and drivers who go off the roadway.

It will be noted that these causes all involve the driver. What drivers are these? Again, the records show conclusively that the greatest number of accidents is caused by the so-called "average driver," the person who may have gone for ten or 15 years without an accident.

To sum up: most accidents are caused by the human failure of average individual drivers.

That is why so much of the department's programme is aimed at the individual, to impress on him his personal responsibility to drive at all times with deliberate care, courtesy and common sense.

That also is why the achievement of greater traffic safety requires more than dealing with special groups and factors—it requires the support of the general motoring public.

There has been a certain amount of criticism in recent months about the policy of safety, and traffic authorities all over the continent, in concentrating on drivers rather than vehicles. Yet the fact is definite and firmly established: most accidents are caused by drivers. Claims to the contrary are either irresponsible or ill-informed. This department will continue to attack the accident challenge in accordance with the facts. We will intensify our efforts to induce greater safety, both by attention to special isolated factors and by concentration on the skills and attitudes of the individual driver.

The subject of vehicle safety is very much in the public eye. This aroused interest is most welcome. Defects in vehicles are one of the causes of accidents, and the addition of safety equipment in many cases would reduce the degree of injury when accidents do occur. Improvements in vehicle design and safety features are certainly in the public interest.

But a strange thing has happened to this subject in recent months. In its own way it has become an "in" thing to criticize vehicle manufacturers and to suggest that vehicles are the major cause of accidents. The news

media reflect public interest, quite naturally, and vehicle criticism has been making headlines.

All this interest can be helpful to the cause of greater safety. My department is doing a great deal to bring about greater vehicle safety, as I shall outline in a moment. But it is necessary to keep the subject in perspective. If we permitted ourselves to be panicked by headlines, if we accepted the distortions and exaggerations on this subject as well as the facts, then we would be very poor servants of the people of Ontario.

When an evaluation is made of all the conflicting researches, statistics and opinions that apply to this subject, the first fact that emerges is this: defects in vehicles are a contributing cause in only a small percentage of all accidents. Official statistics on Ontario accidents in 1965 show that 94.4 per cent of the vehicles involved were apparently in good condition, and for 3.1 per cent the condition was not known. Those with defects accounted for 2.5 per cent, and in many cases these defects were not a contributing cause of the accident.

When we consider all the other factors—and when we take into account the unknown "hidden defects"—it is apparent that the mechanical condition of vehicles contributes to no more than three or four per cent of accidents at the outside maximum. This estimate includes defects resulting from lack of proper maintenance.

That is still a substantial number, and it is worth taking action to reduce it, but safer vehicles clearly are not a panacea for accident problems. While we seek to achieve greater safety in vehicles, let us at the same time remember that most accidents are caused by people like ourselves, by average drivers.

The second fact is this: manufacturers have done a tremendous amount of research, experimentation and testing in the development of safer vehicles. I can say this with first-hand knowledge. In their own way the manufacturers, like governments, are the servants of the public; their function is to supply what the public wants and demands. They may have been dilatory in not forcing the pace for safety with greater determination, and they are not immune to criticism on safety factors on some of their vehicles. But this is a matter of degree.

Their achievements in safety to date, though certainly not perfect, have been substantial; and their co-operation with my department, in the interests of more and faster progress in vehicle safety, has been excellent.

The third fact that bears on this subject is self-evident, but it is often overlooked: the prevention of accidents and the prevention or reduction of injuries are two different things. It is necessary to keep them in perspective. The Department of Transport wants all practical safety features in vehicles that will reduce injuries, and we have had a good degree of success in getting them. But efforts for injury reduction and prevention are a companion concern to our continuing efforts for accident prevention. It would be irresponsible to attack one with such zeal that we neglect the other. We need both, and will continue to press for both.

With these three facts in mind, I would like to review what is being done and what is planned in this field of vehicle safety. I trust I have made it clear that we regard vehicle safety, while not a cure-all for the whole situation, as one of the important factors in accident and injury prevention.

My department has acted accordingly. In the steps we have taken and our plans for the year ahead, I believe we are among the leaders on the continent in effective action for safer vehicles.

There are three points in our action programme: vehicle inspection, the setting of standards, and effective liaison with manufacturers.

This province was the innovator of mobile safety-check lanes, giving 38-point inspections of vehicles in all parts of Ontario. Until last year most of the inspections at these units, and at our permanent safety-check lanes in Downsview, were given on a voluntary basis.

Then we introduced their wide use for compulsory inspections, in co-operation with the Ontario provincial police. The results were excellent, and this compulsory inspection programme, is being substantially expanded during 1966. The department is obtaining more inspection units, and compulsory inspections utilizing the entire fleet will be carried out at about 80 locations this year.

In this programme, police will stop vehicles and instruct them to undergo the 38-point inspection as well as requiring the driver to show his licence and insurance papers.

We have examined the methods of vehicle inspection used in other jurisdictions, as well as reviewing our own experience. We are convinced that the method outlined will afford an effective entry into broad compulsory vehicle inspection and yield good results for Ontario in enhanced vehicle safety.

The second point of our programme for vehicle safety is the setting of standards. We set standards now, and we plan to set more.

For example, the province now sets standards for lights, flares for safety signalling devices, safety glass, brake fluid, reflectors and seat belts, and the performance of brakes. The police have firm and specific authority in law to remove from the road those cars that they deem unsafe, and, Mr. Chairman, they use this authority with considerable effect.

Legislation has now been introduced that will empower the Lieutenant-Governor in council to make regulations governing any devices in or on vehicles which could affect their safe operation, or which could prevent or reduce injuries when accidents occur. This will be a significant extension of existing authority.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Minister was quoted as saying he was not going to enact any regulations.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would point out that this new legislation, combined with what is already being done, will place the Ontario government in much the same position of control and authority that is now being sought, but has not yet been obtained, by the government of the United States.

The matter of safe tires has been under intensive study by the engineering committee of the American association of motor vehicle administrators, a continent-wide association of motor vehicle departments. An engineer on the staff of our department serves as a member of this committee. When the results of this research become available, it has been my intention to establish practical standards for tires and the marking of these standards on the tires in a manner that is clearly visible.

Finally, we will continue our effective liaison with the Canadian manufacturers of vehicles. This liaison was most productive last year, when six safety features were announced jointly by the manufacturers and me as standard equipment, and not "delete options," for the 1966 cars in this province.

Following further discussions with the Canadian motor vehicle manufacturers, I am happy to announce that we now have their assurance that at least three more devices will become standard on all their 1967 vehicles. These are the dual braking system, for increased safety of operation; the impact-absorbing steering wheel assembly, designed to reduce the probable extent of injury to the driver, and the four-way flasher, a system by which all four turn signals can be caused to flash simultaneously as a hazard warning.

Further devices are in an advanced stage of development, and these include the rear-window defrosters and the exhaust control systems to reduce the emission of deleterious pollutants.

As I have mentioned, vehicle safety is only one part of the total safety picture. I move now to my department's programme in regard to the most important single factor in accidents—the driver—and to other aspects of our operation.

As in vehicle safety, Ontario has introduced many pioneering measures in the fields of driver control and driver education. One of these is the demerit point system.

During 1965, more than 47,000 motorists reached the six-point plateau and received warning letters from the department. A total of 17,500 drivers reached the nine-point level and were required to attend a personal interview with department officers. The number of drivers whose licences were suspended under the point system was 2,745.

A total of 36,201 suspensions were applied by the courts and under the provisions of The Highway Traffic Act, so that the total number of licence suspensions in Ontario for all causes during 1965 was 38,946.

The examination of drivers and plans for a programme of re-examination have been given particular emphasis in the past and current years.

During 1965, department examiners administered 320,000 road tests and 407,000 written and vision tests. Of those trying their road tests for the first time, 30 per cent failed. The failure rate for written and vision tests was 16 per cent. There was an increase of 10 per cent in the total number of tests given at the department's 51 examination centres and 103 travel points throughout Ontario.

The re-examination of drivers, set to begin in 1967, is an important step forward in the campaign for greater traffic safety. This is so for two reasons:

First, this programme will re-examine licensed drivers on their knowledge of the rules of the road and traffic signs and visual acuity. In some cases, it will be the first formal test that drivers have ever had.

Second, the programme will remind all drivers of the need for a high level of competence and knowledge at the wheel. It will remind them that driving a motor vehicle is a serious responsibility of which they should be aware at all times.

Preparations for the re-examination programme are proceeding according to plan. The mechanization of the department's records will make it a practical thing to select appropriate groups of drivers for retesting. It is contemplated that the first of these groups will be those with accident records, and those with convictions for certain driving offences.

From my remarks earlier, it will be apparent that the department continues to stress the importance of safety education, and that we do this for an important reason; most accidents are caused by people. More than that, most accidents are caused by average drivers, or in some cases by pedestrians.

Therefore the attitudes of every driver and every pedestrian are important in the total picture of traffic and accidents. Every measure that can make an impression on individuals, and in some way influence them to drive and walk with greater safety, is very much worthwhile.

There was continuing development during 1965 in our programme of safety education directed at all segments of the population, from the preschool child to the senior citizen. This is a co-ordinated programme with a great many components, such as special materials for nursery school children, bicycle clubs for youngsters, regional road safety workshops, films, speeches, advertising and a wide variety of special publications.

Three points illustrate the scope of this programme.

My department is gratified with the remarkable rate of progress now being achieved in the field of high school driver instruction. In the current year, the number of schools offering this extracurricular course increased from 105 to 147. By next fall the number will exceed 200—about 40 per cent of all secondary schools in the province. The high school driver instruction programme has been endorsed and is actively promoted by the hon. Minister of Education and myself.

Students who learn their driving techniques in this course graduate to the road with safety habits and attitudes that will in all likelihood remain with them throughout their lives.

The department's new pedestrian safety film entitled "Step in the Right Direction," was premiered in March. It already has been shown or scheduled by 17 of the 19 television stations in the province, and by a great many organizations and groups. This film is attracting wide attention and it will make a real contribution to improved safety habits among pedestrians.

A promising innovation in our safety programme is now in the midst of preparation, and I think it is appropriate to announce it at this time.

Beginning in the fall, a "refresher course" will be made available to community groups throughout the province. It will be a course in modern driving techniques for drivers of all ages and experience, designed to help them upgrade their skills and knowledge and prepare them for re-examination. The Ontario safety league and the Ontario motor league are collaborating with the department in the development of this course. I want to take this opportunity to commend these groups for their effective work for safety, of which this course is only one example.

The plan is to provide a kit of all the necessary materials for a course that will require a total of ten hours—probably given in four or five evening sessions. These courses will be organized by safety-minded organizations on the community level, with advice and assistance from the department. There is a good prospect that the new "refresher courses" will be a significant addition to the campaign for greater safety.

The department's research activities are presently emphasizing the type of research that relates to accidents.

A bibliography has been completed of all current safety research projects and a team has been employed to evaluate this material for effective action. Specific study projects provide valuable information on which to base our consideration of new regulations and legislation.

In March of this year the acting director of our research branch, Mr. E. H. Brzezina, represented the Canadian good roads association at the sessions of the committee for road safety research in Paris, France. This committee was concerned with methods whereby highway safety research information could be exchanged between the various countries, so that all might have available to them the most up-to-date facts.

The final steps in the new procedures for issuing drivers' licences were taken during 1965. The full three-year system is now in effect for all Ontario drivers.

A computer has been installed this spring in the department's offices on St. Mary's street in Toronto. It is scheduled to go into live operation in July and it will be invaluable in streamlining many aspects of the department's administrative procedures. For example, it will be the chief instrument in the issuance of drivers' licences and it will have

important uses in the operation of the demerit point system, in research and statistical analysis, and in the establishment and operation of the new programme of driver re-examination. Planning also is under way for its use in the registration of motor vehicles.

The scale of activity of the highway transport board can best be illustrated by the number of applications it considered during 1965. They totalled 3,908 compared to 3,457 in 1964. This total included 2,748 applications under The PCV Act, 492 under The Motor Vehicle Transport Act (Canada), 148 for public vehicles and 520 for school buses.

I wish to again report progress in the department's efforts to conclude reciprocal licensing agreements with the other provinces in Canada. These agreements are aimed at giving Ontario truckers the privilege of carrying goods in other provinces without paying the full licensing fees of each of those provinces in addition to their Ontario fees. Truckers from other provinces are extended the same privilege in Ontario.

Agreements now exist with the four western provinces and New Brunswick, and during recent months my department carried out discussions on reciprocal licensing with the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications and her senior officials from the province of Quebec. As a result of those discussions, we have reason to feel optimistic that such an agreement will also be concluded with Quebec.

In the fall of 1964 I directed the Ontario highway transport board to conduct a review of The Public Commercial Vehicles Act. The board has completed its review and has recently forwarded its report to me.

The report contains a significant number of recommendations, many of which may be implemented by regulation under the Act. Other recommendations involve the adoption of new principles and would require amendments to the Act.

Implementation of the recommendations are under consideration by the department. However, it was my decision that no action should be taken on these recommendations during the labour dispute between the carriers and their drivers. It is my feeling that many of the recommendations must now be reconsidered in the light of any possible effect on the for-hire truck transportation operation caused by the strike.

The motor vehicle accident claims fund continues to pay damages to innocent victims of accidents occasioned by uninsured motorists, nonresident motorists, drivers of stolen vehicles and also as a result of hit-and-run accidents.

There were 5,136 claims made on the fund during the past year, an increase of 1,090 from 1964. The fund made 2,468 settlements, involving a total of just under $3.5 million. This represented an increase of more than $0.5 million over 1964.

The accident claims fund is a most effective and succesful plan. It has been studied by jurisdictions elsewhere in North America, and the state of Michigan has recently adopted our plan, almost without change. The states of Illinois, Indiana and California are presently reviewing Ontario's legislation.

In transport as in other matters, the government of Ontario strives constantly to adapt or extend its services in order to meet the changing needs of our citizens and our economy. The Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study is an outstanding example.

In the mobile society of today, part of everyday life is simply getting from one place to another by some means of transportation. The residents of the Metropolitan Toronto region make a total of four million individual trips each weekday, and their daily travelling time for these trips is two million hours. This is one of the findings of the transportation study and it illustrates the magnitude of the challenge.

Transportation has a personal effect on the people of urban areas, on where and how they live; and it is a factor in the use of land and many other aspects of the overall development of local and regional economies.

Yet the challenge of today will be dwarfed by the challenge of tomorrow. The present population is three million in the region covered by this study, extending approximately from Oshawa to Hamilton and Guelph, and from Toronto to Barrie. By the year 2000 the population is expected to double, to six million.

A new kind of transportation planning is needed, taking into full account the social and economic changes that will result from continuing growth. The Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study was set up to provide for this kind of planning. The study is without precedent in Canada. It is making the detailed analysis that will give an informed basis for planning the transportation networks of growing urban areas.

During 1965 the work of the study went forward on many fronts, including progress toward the establishment of a trial commuter service from Dunbarton in the east to Burlington and Hamilton in the west. The Min-

ister of Highways has set next year, 1967, for the inauguration of this service.

In recent months the study has produced four reports of a technical or basic nature. These are the transcript of public hearings held during 1965; the results of the thousands of home interviews to ascertain facts and opinions on transportation and related matters; an outline of the various administrative and fiscal arrangements that now exist for all forms of transportation in the area; and an analysis of the factors that influence individuals in their choice of methods of transportation.

The magnitude and complexity of the study have made it desirable to plan a series of final reports, dealing in progression with the main components. The first of these final reports has now been completed. It gives a comprehensive picture of growth and travel in the region, and it shows how social and economic factors determine the pattern of demand for transportation services.

The next report, to be completed in the latter part of 1966, will outline regional development and the anticipated growth and changes of the future.

The tentative conclusions of the study as a whole will be presented early in 1967. These conclusions obviously cannot be final, since the results of the trial commuter service will not yet be available, but they will provide the base from which we can move into future planning with confidence.

The study has now reached the stage where it is appropriate to separate the study itself from the steps that result from it, and also to extend the study's executive committee in order to gain the fullest consideration of economic factors. Accordingly, the hon. Minister of Highways has assumed responsibility for government of Ontario transit, and at the same time he will continue to be a member of the executive committee of the study. I have been appointed to succeed him as Minister of Transport. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has become vice-chairman. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development has been added to the committee, and, of course, the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto continues to be an active and valuable member.

We acknowledge the assistance and advice that have been provided in the course of this study by the departments and agencies of this government; and we express particular gratitude for the co-operation of the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the municipal governments of the region.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to report on important changes in the administration of The Department of Transport that occurred in the past year. These changes resulted from the retirement of three very able senior officials: Mr. W. Morris Earl, registrar of motor vehicles; Mr. Arthur H. Rowan, director of the driver control branch; and Mr. Gordon Duncan, director of the motor vehicle licence branch. Their government service totalled 107 years. I know the House will join me in expressing sincere appreciation to Mr. Earl, Mr. Rowan and Mr. Duncan for their valuable contributions to the administration and progress of The Department of Transport.

Mr. V. M. McCabe has been appointed director of the driver control branch, and Mr. David Boyd is the new director of the motor vehicle licence branch.

A major realignment of senior responsibilities followed the retirement of Mr. Earl. The Deputy Minister, Mr. A. G. MacNab, has assumed the additional title of registrar of motor vehicles. The deputy registrar of motor vehicles, Mr. F. J. Pillgrem, became responsible for the six "operations" branches of the department; and Mr. R. H. Humphries was appointed to the new position of executive director of services, responsible for the seven "service" branches. This realignment takes into account the changes and expansion of duties in The Department of Transport since its creation in 1957. It provides for the most efficient control and administration as the department continues to develop in the years ahead.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, the traffic laws of this province are typical of the horse-and-buggy thinking that I think is pretty well depicted by the landeau which drives the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor up to the House each year.

I must apologize to the House; this may talk the clock out. I am sorry to inflict myself upon you this long. Since the 40-minute law is not in effect—

An hon. member: Take it as read.

Mr. Sargent: We could take it as read, but too many things are being taken as read by this government. As usual, the genial Minister of Transport gets up and tells us what a fine job they are doing, when the figures show that this is one of the saddest departments in the administration. The slaughter on the highways of this province is far worse, Mr. Chairman, than all the wars since 1900.

Basing the story on the numbers of Canadians killed in war and killed in traffic, the thousands who are wounded and the millions of dollars that are lost, this toll continues to rise. The hon. Minister defends his action as being modern and up to other administrations across America. The toll keeps rising each week; last weekend about 100 people in this country lost their lives, and some 3,000 people were injured. Add to this the toll of $500 million in property damage, and this raises the question, if we in Ontario can afford the loss of life and damage to property that is greater than in any war in history. Under this department, under this genial, nice Minister, we have the lives of people being snuffed out through inefficiency —in many cases, gross stupidity—of putting into effect laws that are in operation in other jurisdictions.

We must be realistic enough to realize that the efforts of some of the members who sit on the Treasury benches opposite are commendable, not highly commendable, but sufficient to make them stand out from the others in the government.

I must say, sir, that there are others whose efforts are so meagre that one wonders why they were chosen to sit on the Treasury benches in the first place. But the sins of omission committed by the hon. Minister of Transport during the past years make him a prime candidate for the latter category. In fact, his failure to come to grips with the whole question of traffic safety and automobile insurance is no less than criminal. In spite of his boasting, Ontario has become a mouse among men in the total North American effort to reduce automobile accidents.

I suggest that the bottleneck in this department—I have had a lot to do with bottles in my time—is at the top, in the neck. Here we have a vibrant economy with 2.5 million cars in transit and we have the horse-and-buggy approach that we have had to witness in the past few years in this province. While President Johnson, in announcing a $400-million safety programme declared that traffic safety will be given the highest priority after the war in Vietnam, our hon. Minister of Transport sits unmoved and in silence. President Johnson was simply reacting to the resentment of an aroused public who hear that automobile accidents are killing ten times as many Americans as in the war in Vietnam—nearly 1,000 against 100 each week.

The New York government launches a $4 million programme to build and test ten prototype safety cars—and many thanks to our friend on the left, the hon. member for Yorkview, we had him take the leadership to bring these people here to show us what could be done in saving lives.

We are told, Mr. Chairman, that 45 per cent of the people who die in fatal traffic accidents could have been saved through a safety car programme; yet this hon. Minister told the House that it was interesting to see this programme by the distinguished senator, but this province would not give any financial help towards this programme.

The hon. Minister states that Ontario would study any results that might come out of the New York project after it is completed, in spite of the fact that the state officials in charge of the programme made it known that they would welcome Ontario's participation, financial and otherwise.

So I want to say that you do not represent the thinking of the people of Ontario when you are so niggardly with money in saving the lives of people. The New York project, which the hon. Minister of Transport allowed that Ontario would study after it is completed, if there are any results, is a fantastic challenge to the auto industry on the part of a pre-eminently respectable political jurisdiction. In short, the New York state government is going into the automobile manufacturing business. It is going to build a safety car, loaded with 134 safety features not found on current Detroit models. Its creators claim that the safety car is revolutionary in concept and could cut road deaths and injuries by more than half, but you say no dice; we do not want any part of it. This would mean the saving of more than 500 lives in America each week.

The Toronto *Daily Star* reports that an engineering report recently released on the project revealed that such a car would be feasible to design and build, practical to use, comfortable to ride in, attractive in appearance, and at least as economical in a daily operating cost as today's conventional automobile.

This, then, is the project with which the Ontario government chooses not to be associated, nor to lend any moral support. I do think if the hon. Minister, if this government, had been aware of the need to do this and had not had to take direction from the New Democratic Party, possibly they would have gone along on the project. But they hated to be shown where they were so grossly wrong.

The people of Ontario have a right to a more enlightened representation than they have at present in matters of such urgent

concern as traffic safety. This may be a very dull subject, but it affects the lives of every person in this room and all our constituents. While the blood drawn each year by the 2.5 million cars in Ontario resembles that of a full-scale war, this government makes only feeble, half-uttered attempts to cut down the toll.

Only this past week the hon. Minister brought in some far-reaching legislation which was nothing but permissive legislation, nothing with any teeth in it. Let us look at the figures that the hon. Minister of Transport should be ashamed to read into the record. And to save the time of the House, I will not go into these figures, but they are lengthy and glaring in the great increase of deaths in many areas of transport. The most condemning statistic of all, particularly in view of the Minister's apathy towards American efforts to reduce accidents is that the accident rate in this province is much higher than that in the United States, and no one in this province can be proud of that. And what are we doing about it? The favourite tool of this government is to launch an expensive advertising programme, aimed at scaring drivers into driving carefully.

We have been asked to approve $325,000 this year in scare money. This department will take it and throw up gory billboards, signs around the province, in a campaign designed to frighten us into driving carefully.

Recent studies have shown that the millions spent on these campaigns are largely wasted. What value is there in erecting signs with the vague injunction to slow down, when most fatal accidents occur at speeds under 50 miles an hour? It is a fact that the majority of accidents happen under 50 miles an hour, and yet the pitch is, slow down.

Another approach to the problem of traffic safety is that which the medical profession uses when attacking an infectious disease. In studying such diseases three factors are considered—host, agent and environment, and such an approach to traffic safety would consider the driver, the vehicle and the road. Indeed, this is the theme of new traffic safety codes to be established by the federal government.

Judging from road accident mortality rates from other highly motorized countries, it would appear that the treating of traffic accidents as an infectious disease is not a sensational approach. According to figures in terms of 100 million vehicle miles, the death rate in Great Britain recently stood at 8.9; in West Germany, 14.7; in the United States, 5.6. So this particular disease is highly virulent in the more industrially advanced countries.

Now, the driver. It has only been natural that in the past most efforts towards traffic safety have been directed towards the driver. After all, he is at the wheel of the car and is the only intelligent factor in the situation. And one suspects that the automobile industry has more than encouraged this natural inclination.

President Ron Todgham, of the Chrysler Corporation of Canada, is reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* to have said that many of the new car critics are only interested in getting their names in newspapers, or appearing on TV documentary programmes. He went on to say: "Who ever heard of Howard Grafferty until he began his attack on automobiles several months ago?" According to Mr. Todgham, if one attacks the automobile industry and is not a prominent national figure, one's motives are very much suspect.

This same gentleman also suggested that safety efforts directed toward improved driver training and licensing have the best effect. Not a word did he say about a safer car.

There is much to be said about driver selection. The hon. Minister tonight mentioned that he has a compulsory inspection programme in this province. How much of it is compulsory? For how many people is it compulsory? In other jurisdictions we have complete compulsion for a driver inspection, but in this jurisdiction he is doing a spot check, he says, in 80 setups across the province.

In driver training it would seem almost impossible to eliminate inadequate drivers from the road and possibly all drivers can be trained to be good drivers. This is a favourite approach of the safety establishment. This particular establishment comprises automobile manufacturers and safety councils and leagues. Safety associations receive a good portion of their annual budget from the automobile and allied industries.

The Ontario safety league is attempting to cure the problem of traffic safety in this manner through the pro drivers' course. This programme differs from all other courses offered by the league to the motor fleet people, the armed services, high schools and commercial driving schools, in that it deals directly with the public. This league is quite proud that the insurance industry recognizes the value of this training by giving premium discounts to graduates.

Undoubtedly, drivers trained in handling skids could prevent many bad weather accidents. However, the type of person who

takes driver training may be the type less likely to have accidents in the first place. This approach taken exclusively is rather like asking the public to avoid a typhoid epidemic by boiling their own water and then offering courses in water boiling.

The second factor to be considered is the road. Here is a much less complex variable than the driver. Accident facts in 1962 revealed that 67.8 per cent of all traffic accidents in the year took place on road surfaces which were dry. In that same year 1,181 of the 1,222 fatal accidents happened where road conditions were estimated as good.

You will wonder what this has to do with my pleas for a dynamic approach to this whole matter. I will show later. In 1955, the report of the select committee on highway safety was presented to this Legislature. It is appalling that very few of the recommendations set forth in this report of the select committee have been put into effect by this department.

What do we have to do when a committee set up by the government makes recommendations and the hon. Minister cannot even get a report, that should have been on his desk before this session started, on a review of the highway traffic hearings across the province?

The hon. member for Grey South asked the hon. Minister at the start of the session where the report was; we have heard no more about it.

Coming to the vehicle the Minister talked so much about—the car—at least with the vehicle one is not faced with the almost infinite number of variables made up of all the individual drivers of all the individual roads. There are improvements to be made in the cars themselves, and they can be effected by a handful of automobile manufacturers.

After the driver comes the road—or even the mechanically defective car. For instance, the Chevrolet Corvair, 1960-63 models, made infamous by Ralph Nader in his book, "Unsafe at any speed." He says:

> It is the impact of the occupant in the car against the interior of the car which is the usual cause of the injury.
>
> Perhaps it is the distinction between the defects in cars which cause accidents as opposed to the defects which cause injuries that has led to the relative neglect of the vehicle as a factor in traffic safety.

Therefore, we should consider the vehicle from these two relatively distinct approaches —accident prevention and crash worthiness.

The national safety council reported in January, 1966 that over 13 per cent of three million cars failed a voluntary national vehicle safety check in 1965. Such essential items as faulty lights, hazardous brakes, exhaust systems, tires and windshield wipers, in that order, were most often found to be defective.

Thomas R. Reid, the chairman of the auto industries highway safety committee and the Ford Motor Company's director of civic and government affairs, called this a boon to motorists living in states not requiring motor-vehicle inspection by law, but cautioned that voluntary safety checks, which we are doing here, is no substitute for official motor-vehicle inspection.

In this field of compulsory inspection, Mr. Chairman, the recent announcement that Manitoba intends to introduce compulsory inspection of motor vehicles led the *Globe and Mail* to editorialize:

> The inspection system will be patterned on that of Vancouver, which requires that all motorists present their vehicles for inspection every six months. Those who pass have stickers affixed to their windshield and those with defective vehicles are instructed to have repairs made within a reasonable limit of time, and to present them for a second inspection.
>
> Evaders are summoned to court, fined and ruled off the road until they can produce a vehicle in a safe condition.
>
> It is further pointed out that this system not only works and that it removes a dangerous vehicle from the highways and enforces a high level of mechanical safety in all vehicles, but it has won the support of most motorists, many of whom drop in for unscheduled inspections just to make sure that the repairs recommended by their garages are indeed necessary.

If Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, which has neither the concentration of vehicles nor the riches of Ontario feels that it must afford this safety service, surely it ought to be seriously considered by the hon. Minister.

In Ontario, a car is considered legally safe if it has two headlights, one tail light, two sets of brakes, safety glass—which is not yet defined—windshield wipers and a rear-view mirror. There is your yardstick for dynamic Ontario, driving the horse and buggy.

Now let us get into tires. Any inspection system would include a tire check as one of the essential items in accident prevention. The hon. Minister of Transport is reported

as saying in April of this year that he is waiting for the results of a study on tires being conducted by the American association of motor vehicle administrators, and that The Department of Transport in Ontario had taken an active part in the study. Yet Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin recently put in the congressional record what he called the "really conclusive testimony on the American tire scandal." The senator did this after a top General Motors engineer testified that the company makes no attempt to determine the maximum carrying capacity of tires.

The same senator summed up this and other expert evidence given the Senate commerce committee on four points. Many new cars have overloaded tires when all seats in the cars are filled; the manufacturers of these cars expect them to rupture if driven in an overloaded condition; no determination of their load-carrying capacity is made when these tires are fitted to the car, and the consumer has no way of finding out what weight he may carry without overloading; and quality labels on tires such as deluxe, premium and first line, are meaningless.

A spokesman for the Canadian tire manufacturers was quoted in the Toronto *Telegram* recently as saying that all tires sold in this country meet safety standards set by rigid testing. I doubt if there is any control over that, because last year in the House I brought to the hon. Minister's attention the tire commissioner's legislation in New York state, where it is law that tires must be passed by a government commissioner. Every tire in the state must be approved.

Perhaps the core of the problem is that while the tire manufacturers say that tires sold meet safety regulations set by rigid testing, their specific aim is to sell as many tires as possible, and not to see that their tires are not put under undue stress.

I want to describe to the House an incident—in fact, a series of incidents—which prove that the claims of Ontario tire manufacturers are just a lot of hot air and that there is no control by this government.

These incidents occurred during the past month and a half in Ontario and Quebec and involve a man to whom I shall refer, for the purposes of concealing his identity, as Mr. Jones. This is a documented series of events.

Mr. Jones drives a leased car. Early in April he drove his vehicle to the lease company garage for a new set of tires. The car was fitted with five rayon 815 x 15 two-ply tires with four-ply rating.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): A bunch of cheapskates.

Mr. Sargent: I know. Do not talk to us about driving cheap cars, when you hon. Ministers drive cars with stereo in them. You have got air conditioning, you have got everything that goes with a car. You do not know what it is like to drive with a cheap tire.

Now, I checked with the tire company the other day, and this tire cost $40.70 each. Within two weeks, Mr. Jones had a blowout in one of the new tires, while he was driving on Highway 401 at Keele street. One week later, Mr. Chairman—

An hon. member: How fast was he going?

Mr. Sargent: It does not matter. Another tire blew out while he was travelling on the Queen Elizabeth Way and two weeks after that, while Mr. Jones was on a business trip to St. John's Quebec, a tire suddenly ripped right off the rim.

Now, he was returning to Montreal a few days later, when he heard a dull banging under the front fenders of his car, and after stopping to investigate, he discovered that the tread was breaking away from the tire casing and being thrown up into the fender and air was escaping slowly from the tire.

I am sending this tire over to the hon. Minister. While it is going over there, I will tell you about it. Let the hon. Minister examine that.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): I could use that tire on my car.

Mr. Sargent: Now, I want to add, Mr. Minister, that the same afternoon—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Somebody told me that he had it there.

Mr. Sargent: The same afternoon, Mr. Jones had yet another blowout, after driving down to Montreal.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: How did he arrive on one tire?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): It runs on one tire like the Liberal Party.

Mr. Sargent: Now, let me explain this to you. Mr. Jones is a travelling salesman and since 1958 he has driven an average of 40,000 miles a year. Until this year, over all those miles, Mr. Jones had only one blowout, yet over a period of about five weeks, Mr.

Jones had three blowouts, and two other major incidents that could have been tragic accidents, due to seriously defective tires.

Now, I would tell you, there are some of my friends here who fly an airplane—it is better to have your propellor stop in mid-air, your engine cut, it is safer to have your engine cut in mid-air, in today's flying, than it is to have a blowout in a tire.

Mr. Chairman: Depends where you are.

Mr. Sargent: The Chairman is right, it depends where you are. You have at least a chance to come out alive in a plane, you can glide her down if your engine cuts. Now, getting back to the basic here, it is my understanding that the Toronto manufacturer of those tires was using an ineffective cement to weld the thread to the casing. For a period of about one month, or a month-and-a-half before the flaw was discovered, the cement allowed tiny bubbles to form between the casing and the tread. When the tire hit a bump in the road, the bubble would grow larger and larger and eventually blowout.

Now, to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, the tire manufacturer made no effort to call back the hundreds, perhaps thousands of tires, that were sold during that period. What is more shocking, Mr. Chairman, is the fruitless attempts — this is the payoff — by Mr. Jones to get some kind of direction from Queen's Park, in this matter, upon his return to Toronto.

He remained in Montreal until the lease company replaced the tires on his car. Mr. Jones called The Department of Transport and was advised to call the Attorney General's department. The Attorney General's department referred him back to The Department of Transport which, in turn, had him transferred to the traffic safety division of the Ontario provincial police.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: They certainly did—

Mr. Sargent: They sure did. An officer there, equally baffled, had him call the Ontario rubber association. The tragedy of this situation is that The Department of Transport, the Attorney General's department, the Ontario provincial police, are all geared to handle accidents, post facto, and they are completely baffled by a hazard such as this.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You did not gild the lily a little, did you?

Mr. Sargent: Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 798 of last year's *Hansard*, I related to the hon. Minister, in New York one measure provided by the new legislation going in down there, is that no tire that has been manufactured after January 1, 1967, shall be sold in that state unless it is of the type approved by the motor vehicles commissioner.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: After January 1, 1967?

Mr. Sargent: That gives you another chance to appoint another department head here.

This bill requires the commission to make public various tire and rim tire sizes and strength readings for identification purposes. In addition, the commissioner would make public the maximum load for each tire, and the requirements for the original condition; blowout resistance, including the ability to resist carcass breakage and continuous high speed running.

There is a second bill down there, Mr. Minister, if you are interested, going through in this regard. It stipulates that on and after January 1, 1969, no tire that has been retreaded after that date shall be sold, unless it has been approved by the commissioner. In each instance the commissioner would publish regulations for the proper practice to be used in retreading, including resistance to blowout and conspicuous marking, and so on.

This is what is happening in other jurisdictions. Mr. Chairman, we have heard recently about the recalling of cars by the automotive dealers involving 8.7 million cars of the 47 million turned out in the United States in the last six years. Scores of recalls, involving a missing nut on the steering wheel, defective brake parts, faulty seat belts, hoods that popped up without warning, are among the safety hazards.

Chrysler of Canada announced recently that its dealers are recalling about 11,000 cars for inspection of their front suspension system. General Motors said that it will fix sticking accelerators in 200,000 Canadian-made 1964 and 1965 Chevrolets and Chevelles.

Unfortunately Canada's auto makers have never tallied the number of defective cars which have come off the assembly line and compared them with the total production, but spokesmen say that they expect their situation would parallel that of the United States. As we know, Mr. Chairman, one in five of all cars manufactured in the last six years had mechanical defects built in.

Now, overloaded tires and mechanical defects built in, and resulting from wear, are just two aspects of the defects in cars which cause accidents as opposed to defects which

cause injuries. The defects which cause injuries can largely be eliminated through the design of a safety car.

Why does the government not have the same responsibility for setting safety standards for all motor vehicles as it does for airplanes, ships and trains? Now, this is the crux. You have safety inspectors in industry but here we have the manufacturers of these millions of cars selling weapons of death to our people. You could make it mandatory law that they could not be sold in this province unless they were equipped with the things that would protect our people.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. Sargent: A bunch of new Ministers would be a good idea.

An hon. member: Good boy, Eddie, you are right on the bit!

Mr. Walker: Let us get back to those ships and trains.

Mr. Sargent: Even though accident-producing characteristics of automobiles receive little enough attention, the injury-producing factors have almost been ignored. It is the so-called second accident I referred to which always produces the injuries, After all, if one is going to fall 40 feet, one would prefer to fall on a soft surface than on a hard core. The Cornell aeronautical laboratory, which became heir to the original Cornell auto safety programme, lists three general requirements for collision protection in a vehicle.

One is sound, outer shell structure which will retain its structural integrity under impact and absorb as much energy as possible, without allowing undue penetration of a striking object into the passenger compartment.

2. Elimination from the interior surfaces of the shell of any hard, sharp projections or edges and the prevention of vehicle components such as steering columns which can spear you to death, from penetrating into the compartment, and recessed door handles and knobs.

3. The provision of passenger restraint systems not necessarily restricted to seat belt devices, to prevent or minimize relative body motion and abrupt contact with the interior of the automobile.

Now these Cornell criteria were formulated on the basis of more than 70,000 accident cases. The province of Ontario should participate, Mr. Chairman, in the New York state safety car project. The federal government should be urged in the strongest terms to participate in the same project.

When New York Senator Speno was here, he appeared before the Ontario Legislature standing committee on highways and tourism to explain his state's safety car project and to ask for participation from Ontario in this project, financially or in live research. The senator suggested that some of the manufacture of the prototype car could be done in Canada and mentioned the now idle plant of Studebaker in Hamilton. But the hon. Minister of Transport told the House after the senator's visit that assistance had been offered, but not financially.

The Canadian federal government specifications board which is in charge of establishing a federal automobile code, is inviting the provincial governments and interested industrial, professional, technical and safety research organizations, to assist in drawing up the code. A meeting is scheduled in Ottawa in June with all interested parties attending, and strong representations have been made to them to have specifications all-embracing and the resulting standards mandatory.

Since the federal government purchased 2,458 vehicles last year—and I think that there are possibly 1,500 vehicles in this province—the adoption of a federal safety code would hopefully have the same effect on the GSA standards in the United States.

There is no federal government agency charged specifically with the responsibility of inspection of cars for safety and a representation should be made, Mr. Chairman, to have such an agency established and thereby incorporate a national safety inspection system. At the same time, Ontario should take the lead established by Manitoba and British Columbia to establish compulsory inspection of motor vehicles. Even though compulsory mechanical inspections have been increased from 32 to 80 this year, I understand the hon. Minister to have said that the spot check approach is not enough. No car should remain in service unless it meets the strictest specifications to safety design and construction, as has been done—as I said before—in airplanes and ships.

Highway safety councils and safety leagues appear to do a good job in promoting better drivers and safer roads, but do nothing about the problem of safer cars. This is probably the result of being part of the safety establishment. Safer roads and better-trained

drivers are provincial responsibilities and Ontario should continue to make grants to existing councils and leagues while at the same time the Ontario government should encourage such courses as the Ontario safety league pro-drivers' course.

Now, we have talked basically about the car and the lack of safety-consciousness of this department on all the component parts—tires. But there are a lot of things that go along with it to show the continued lack of being "with it" by this department. I would suggest that one thing is the niggardly support for the Ontario safety league by this government. They gave $15,000 in 1956 and every year since then. With the increased population they still go along in the same old rut. They are spending $325,000 in handouts to their friends in the agency business, but they do not put it in the right slot.

Things that go along with this lack of being with it, is the method of apprehending speeders. I have a quote here from the Toronto *Telegram* and the headline is, "summons the speeder" and the by-line is "by Chief Mackey."

> Motorcycles and cruisers are almost useless for stopping drivers who have violated traffic laws, Metro Chief James Mackey said today. Because of the hazard created in stopping on a parkway or expressway, the officer has to take his life in his hands. Chief Mackey asks that the police be allowed to summons drivers by taking licence numbers as they could before the introduction of the provincial point system. Directing his complaint to Fred Pillgrem of The Department of Transport during a panel session, Chief Mackey said the government must soon recognize the seriousness of the situation. "I am not talking," he said, "about the ordinary offender but of the people who go 35 or 40 miles per hour over the limit."

This comes home to many of us when we see lives needlessly snuffed out by police chases of teenagers by this antiquated system of having to apprehend the person before you can give him a ticket. I think this is one of the things that we must move along in in this department.

One thing that is needed in this province is the universality of road signs. There is a statement here by a knowledgeable person, who says:

> In the course of the years, I have travelled through most of the North American continent; I am still very much surprised that in 1965 there is so little co-ordination between the provinces in the matter of road travelling indications. On most highways, especially close to larger cities, one actually needs a navigator to drive a car through the maze of signs and posters, many of them being useless. Fortunately, roads are being built at a tremendous rate, but unfortunately mapmakers cannot seem to be able to keep up, resulting in a lot of confusion at many main intersections.

This, I believe, the Minister is aware of. Without developing the many areas in which we could make a great stride here, I think the Minister knows of the need for it. But nothing is happening on the scale it should be.

What I am concerned about is that government should be for people. But the offices of this department, insofar as issuing licences to people are concerned, is done at the convenience of the staff of the department.

This is a letter from James Ronson to Robert Nixon, MPP.

> I would like to forward this letter to the appropriate Shadow Cabinet Minister for The Department of Transport:
>
> Enclosed is a letter from The Department of Transport which I received as a reply to my complaint about the opening hours of examination centres. I draw to your attention the sentences which I underline to you. When a workman wants to obtain an operator's licence he must leave his job for a considerable length of time. If the test is failed, he must leave work for the number of times required to get the licence. If a workman's wife or child wishes to get an operator's licence, the workman must leave work. The wife will leave work if she is not a housewife, or the child will leave school if he or she goes to school. The situation is a mess. The enclosed letter talks of the administrative problem. I say that these are only conservative problems. I feel that the examiners will work on Saturdays just as do many types of employees, like firefighting experts in The Department of Lands and Forests or police of the Ontario provincial police department.

I think this man has a just complaint. We have to get a licence at the pleasure of the man who is issuing the licence. On weekends in my area, when people come into town from the surrounding country, they cannot get it on Saturdays from this department. I think it is time it was recognized that

people are important and the government's job is to serve people, not itself. I would hope the Minister will take this under consideration because I have a lot more material on that one subject and it is very important.

A letter comes from a man who says: "I drive 45,000 miles a year, and twice a year to California. All you have to do is cross the border into Michigan and you do not see a 50 mile per hour or 60 mile per hour sign until you return. I did a check on the highway death rate in many states with much higher speed limits and the results are as follows: For two-lane and four-lane highways: Two-lane highways in Nebraska: 65; Kansas, 70; Iowa, 70; Colorado, 70; Michigan, 65; Missouri, 70; Illinois, 65; Ontario, 50-60. Four-lane highways—Nebraska, 75; Kansas, 70-80; Iowa, 75; Colorado, 70; Michigan, 70; Missouri, 75; Illinois, 70; Ontario, 50-60. The 1963 death rate—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): I think this would be an opportune time for the committee to rise. It has been my understanding from the outset that this address would probably take 40 minutes, but it is obviously going to take much longer. Does the hon. member for Grey North have much more material?

Mr. Sargent: I can finish in 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman, or I could finish tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That will be fine.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Transport and should there be time we might have Budget debate as well.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.50 o'clock, p.m.

No. 121

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 27, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 27, 1966

Introducing Miss Ruth McKinney, Ontario dairy princess, Mr. Stewart 3927

Parks Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, first reading 3927

Housing Development Act, bill to amend, Mr. Randall, first reading 3927

Question of Mr. Rowntree re CNIB dispute, Mr. Bryden 3928

Tabling report, Mr. Haskett 3928

Question of Mr. Simonett re Timagami Boat Line, Mr. MacDonald 3928

Question of Mr. Roberts re Big Chute marine railway, Mr. MacDonald 3929

Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko 3929

Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Rowntree 3929

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, continued 3931

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Ben 3939

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Ben, agreed to 3951

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3951

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Adelaide Hoodless public school, Hamilton; and in the west gallery, Lincoln Avenue public school, Pickering.

In the Speaker's gallery, I wish to welcome Controller Helen Weber, of the Ottawa city council.

Would the Minister of Agriculture kindly introduce his guest?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is our good fortune this morning to have in our chamber, the Ontario dairy princess, Miss Ruth McKinney, of Peel county.

For some years now, the milk producers' co-ordinating board in the province of Ontario has carried out, in conjunction with The Department of Agriculture and others, in association with the Canadian national exhibition, a dairy princess competition each year. Last year, out of a competition representing all of the province of Ontario and the various counties and districts, Miss McKinney was successful in being acclaimed the province of Ontario dairy princess, and has been associated with the dairy industry through the Ontario food council this year.

I am sure hon. members would appreciate the fact that with her charm and grace which she brings to the job with such natural dignity, she has meant a great deal to the improvement of relations between urban and rural people, more particularly in focusing attention on the dairy industry of the province of Ontario, the most important segment of Ontario agriculture.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PARKS ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonnett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Parks Assistance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, if I might give a short explanation, the maximum total assistance for the acquisition and development of any one park is increased from $50,000, or 50 per cent of the cost, whichever is the lesser, to $100,000 or 50 per cent of the cost, whichever is the lesser, and a limit of $25,000, or 50 per cent of the cost, whichever is the lesser, is applied to the acquisition of land.

THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACT

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Housing Development Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, my colleague the hon. Minister of University Affairs, on April 6 last, advised the hon. members of a new plan to provide additional residential accommodation for university students through the facilities of the Ontario housing corporation.

As hon. members will recall, my colleague referred to the present programme being carried out by the universities and indicated that the new programme will supplement, not replace, that programme. He went on to say that the programme would get underway as soon as the organization to administer it can be established.

During our discussions with the Hon. John R. Nicholson, the federal Minister responsible for central mortgage and housing corporation, he stated that he was most anxious to facilitate the proposed programme in every possible way. Accordingly, it was suggested

that rather than wait for the amendment to The National Housing Act to permit the Ontario housing corporation to undertake the programme, a subsidiary corporation should be formed to comply with The National Housing Act requirements, which confines financial assistance to a university, a co-operative association or a charitable corporation.

I am therefore presenting for the approval of the hon. members a minor amendment to The Housing Development Act which will permit the creation of a corporation for the purpose of developing student accommodation. This corporation will have the same board of directors as the Ontario housing corporation and the same staff, other than the additional staff necessitated by the increased work load.

A further small amendment to The Housing Development Act is proposed to provide funds for the current fiscal year. In subsequent years, funds will be subjected to the approval of the Legislature in the normal manner.

Since my colleague's announcement, a number of universities have expressed their interest; of course, they are anxious to see this programme get under way almost immediately. This we will do as soon as the necessary organization has been established.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour if he would consider the appointment of a mediator to assist in settling the current dispute at the Canadian national institute for the blind?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation which prevails in connection with the institute and those who are associated with it in the services which it offers. It is a situation which, I think, draws the sympathy of us all. It is an unusual employee relationship, in all of the circumstances; it is also a question as to the desirability of intervention if it is not wanted.

I am prepared to offer the facilities of our department. In any event, I have kept in touch with the matter since it began, and I am prepared to assign somebody to look into the matter.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a report of a committee known as the automobile insurance technical committee, established in The Department of Transport at the request of the executive committee, to give further study to certain aspects of the residual recommendations of the select committee of the Legislature on automobile insurance.

At the commencement of the report will be found a concise summary of the matters considered and the results of the committee's deliberations.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister would permit a question?

I notice in the report that the terms of reference are dated in February, 1964. Can the hon. Minister tell us why he has kept the setting-up of this committee a secret for over two years?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, there was no secret of the committee being set up. In fact, it was announced in the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question with reference to this? The secrecy, or otherwise, of the committee is not what attracts my attention, it is the fact that the report is dated November, 1965, and we get it the day after the estimates are introduced, when we have to debate it. What is the explanation for five or six months of delay in tabling it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, this can be dealt with when my estimates come forward if the House so wishes. It was a report to the Minister, not to the House. I did the House and the hon. members the courtesy of tabling the report.

Mr. Singer: I would like to get the *Hansard* reference—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the point is simply that if he is going to give us the courtesy of giving it to us, let us have it so we have a chance to study it in preparation for the estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member proceed with his questions?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question asked by the hon. member for York South re the Timagami Boat Line. His question was as follows: "When the Ontario northland boat lines at Timagami were sold by the ONR to the Shell oil company, was there any obligation on the new owner to maintain existing services?" The answer is: As final negotiations concerning this sale have not as yet been completed with Shell Canada Limited, the

Ontario northland transportation commission is unable to state specifically services that will be provided by the purchasers.

However, since Shell Canada Limited is operating these boat lines on behalf of the commission until our negotiations are finalized, the commission has on file a letter signed by an official of Shell Canada Limited, which states in part:

> For at least the summer season of 1966 we propose to carry on, either on our behalf or through our licensee, a boat line business on Lake Timagami for the carrying of passengers, freight, express and mail.

They also advise me that the commissioners have arranged a meeting with the Timagami chamber of commerce on Friday, June 3, to discuss the service which the local people feel would be adequate.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question, this one for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Will the government give favourable consideration to representations which have been made to it by the federation of anglers and hunters to restore the marine railway at Big Chute connecting Lake Simcoe with Georgian bay and the Great Lakes, instead of the proposed locks which would permit access of lamprey eels into Lake Simcoe with serious consequences to the recreation and tourist industry in that area?

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, framed in a way that a conclusion which I think is erroneous is reached in the question, I would like to point out that the federal-provincial committee on Ontario fisheries has been studying this problem for some time. They have come up with two answers. One would be the rehabilitation and modernizing of the old marine railway at Big Chute which I went across many years ago in a canoe, so I know a little of its location. I think it is in about the same condition as it was then, as far as size goes. The alternative is the creation or building of a locking system which would permit boats to go through in a more leisurely and freer manner, although actually it is possible to put a marine railway in that would be able to take, I understand, any tonnage that can get through the general water system in that area.

However, this locking system would have attached, if that were adopted, what is known as a hot bath, the heating of water in the system through which boats—and I presume the sailors on them and any lamprey —would have to pass to get into the Lake Simcoe area. The water would be kept at such a heat, apparently, that the boats and the sailors might get through but the lamprey would not be able to!

The cost, I understand, is quite large. The scientists believe it is quite possible to do it. The federation of anglers and hunters would prefer to take no chances, to have the marine railway; and, for the purpose of finality as far as I am concerned personally, I would adopt the view of the anglers and hunters.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the annual report of the commissioner of agricultural loans for the year ended March 31, 1965.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I wish to table the detailed answers to two questions for the government which are outstanding, from the hon. member for Bruce and the hon. leader of the Opposition.

The hon. Minister of Labour tabled answers to questions as follows:

> 1. *Mr. A. E. Thompson*: In view of of the estimate by Miss McLellan, new director of recruitment for the Ontario civil service commission, that the government could use 100 to 200 social workers a year, will the government reconsider its decision not to provide grants for the development of a school of social work at the Waterloo Lutheran University?

Answer by the hon. Prime Minister:

> On May 19, 1966, the Hon. W. G. Davis, Minister of University Affairs, issued a statement concerning the expansion of facilities and the development of new programmes for the education of social workers in Ontario. That statement read as follows:
>
> "Over the past year The Department of University Affairs in conjunction with The Department of Public Welfare, has given intensive study to the educational facilities for training social workers. In this task, they have had the services and advice of Professor John Morgan of the school of social work of the University of Toronto, who has given recent study to the new developments in the education of personnel in this field in Great Britain and the United States.
>
> "Professor Morgan has held discussions with officials of a number of institutions in

the province, and has given the two departments the benefit of his experience in this whole area. The committee on university affairs has also considered the problems involved.

"In the light of demands for workers not only to meet present requirements but also to provide for the future, when new legislation will accentuate the need, it is proposed to meet the problem in three ways.

"First, the number of graduates to staff senior administrative posts, to provide teachers and to serve as directors in local communities, will have to be substantially increased. It is proposed to achieve this by the development of a graduate school of social work at the University of Windsor. Planning for this new school will begin immediately with the objective of initiating the new graduate programme at the earliest possible date.

"Second, at the same time that such planning takes place, the University of Windsor will become the first of our universities to develop an undegraduate programme in the social work field. This will begin in September of 1966 and will lead to a Bachelor of Arts degree with direct orientation to social work through courses in sociology, psychology, and related social sciences.

"As part of that undergraduate programme, provision will be made for students enrolled to take social work courses during summer sessions to supplement the work of the regular sessions. Field work, by assignment to local agencies, will also be undertaken during these summer periods or upon completion of the undergraduate degree.

"Thus, at Windsor, new programmes will be initiated at two levels. It is expected that the new graduate school, in addition to those already in operation, will meet the requirements for workers of this level of training for the present time, while the new undergraduate programme will attract many additional persons, of considerable competence, to the field. The University of Windsor has been assured of financial assistance from the province to permit it to proceed with these programmes.

"Several other universities have expressed a desire to develop undergraduate programmes, of the type described, leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree. These can be developed without large capital outlays because they involve in most cases the addition of a minimum number of staff to expand and develop an orientation in the social sciences along the lines immediately contemplated by the University of Windsor. I emphasize that decisions in these matters rest with the individual institutions but several have already indicated their intentions to proceed.

"The other universities will not, however, be encouraged to develop graduate programmes at this time. It may be that circumstances in the future will justify additional graduate schools and, if so, those with undergraduate programmes will be in a position to proceed with a minimum of delay.

"In addition to these developments within our universities, a third type of programme is envisaged for the colleges of applied arts and technology. Already there is a two-year diploma course at the Ryerson polytechnical institute. Discussions have been held with Dr. Howard H. Kerr, chairman of the Ontario council of regents for colleges of applied arts and technology, and it has been agreed that as the new colleges are established they will give consideration to the introduction of diploma courses in areas where circumstances permit.

"There will, then, be three types of programmes—first, that leading to a graduate degree and following a pattern similar to that already established in this province; second, that leading to an undergraduate degree with special emphasis in the social sciences and with specific preparation for social work; and, third, that leading to a diploma.

"It is confidently expected that these programmes will lead to an alleviation of the problem of finding workers in this field, which can be so rewarding in terms of the contribution it makes to the lives of so many of our people."

Any such proposal as that advanced in the hon. member's question would violate the established principle of non-payment of grants to denominationally controlled universities of which Waterloo Lutheran University officials are well aware.

2. Mr. R. M. Whicher: As there were only 155 weekdays in the fiscal year, 1964-65, on which the Legislature was not sitting, would the hon. Prime Minister explain to the House how the government arrived at the allowances paid to the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), for his services to the Ontario water resources commission, of $10,175 plus $2,059.39 travel expenses?

Answer by the hon. Prime Minister:

By virtue of the provisions of The Legislative Assembly Act, and other legislative enactments, members of the Legislature are entitled to be appointed to boards and commissions, and to receive proper remunerations therefor, whether or not the Legislature is in session. As such, therefore, by custom and usage they are not regarded as eligible to be designated to sit on select committees of the Legislature for which committee fees are payable, which is the privilege of other members of the House. The work of the Ontario water resources commission is not simply a weekday proposition. It is of tremendous importance to the people of Ontario as a calendar-year undertaking of magnitude and necessity in the growth and development of the province. Members of the commission are paid a per diem rate or, if a full day is not worked, for the hours of service rendered.

In respect to the specific inquiry concerning the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin, the public accounts reflect the amount paid for the days and hours the member worked, with no allowance for overtime, the fees—on recommendation of the commission to the government—having been set by the Lieutenant-Governor in council under the provisions of section 9 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act. Allowable expenses are outlays incurred while discharging his duties as a member of the commission and are as permitted under rules and regulations which govern all such expenditures.

Accounts for fees and expenses are submitted to the commission on a monthly basis and, before payment by the Treasury department, are required to be approved by the chairman of the commission, checked by the commission's controller, and audited by the provincial auditor.

The record of payment for days worked and expenses incurred during the fiscal year 1964-65 was previously furnished. Details are shown below:

Year	Month	Days Worked	Expenses
1964	April	11	42.65
	May	9	115.60
	June	17	251.28
	July	18	216.45
	August	11½	172.37
	September	18	241.95
	October	19½	278.81
	November	17	267.02
	December	14½	195.93
1965	January	16½	148.26
	February	17	75.91
	March	16	53.16

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 30th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
(continued)

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, in finalizing my remarks on the estimates of this department, it is too bad on such a lovely morning that we have to try to take apart such a fine group of men, but the barnacles of corruption over the years are bound to appear. In finalizing my remarks, I hope when we leave the chamber we will be thinking in terms of a better Department of Transport.

Last night, when the House adjourned, I was talking about a letter I had received from a man who has done a lot of travelling and I will read it to the House:

> I drive 45,000 miles a year, twice a year to California. All you have to do is cross the border into Michigan and you do not see a 50-mile-per-hour or 60-mile-per-hour sign until you return to Canada. I did a check on the highway death rate in many states with much higher speed limits with the result as follows:

And he talks about the two-lane speed limits through the different states and shows the death rates by comparing them.

> In Nebraska, 65; Kansas, 70; Iowa, 70; Colorado, 70; Michigan, 65; Missouri, 70; Illinois, 65; Ontario, 50-60. In the four-lane highways, 75 in Nebraska; Kansas, 70-80; Iowa, 75; Colorado, 70; Michigan, 70; Missouri, 75; Illinois, 70; Ontario 50-60. The 1963 death rates per 100 million miles: In Nebraska, 4.6; Kansas, 5.2; Iowa, 5.3; Colorado, 5.6; Michigan, 5.3; Missouri, 5.5; Illinois, 5.8; and Ontario, 7.

So we see, Mr. Chairman, there is a direct relation showing that the slow speed is not the answer to the death rate. I think it is high time that this government took cognizance of the fact that on the thruways, and on the big highways we are building now across our province, we must gear ourselves to modern-day driving.

Further, Mr. Chairman, in this department,

to uncover the infiltration by friends of the Prime Minister into almost every department of government acting on behalf of special interests, I reveal to the House the following press release dated September, 1965, which was during the Ontario truckers' strike, showing in a small manner the extent of influence peddling by this government in The Department of Transport. I quote from the Hamilton *Spectator*, September 17, 1965. The headline: ONTARIO TRUCKERS RILED:

> There is a situation here which could develop into a nasty affair. It concerns approval by the highway transport board of a certificate to a U.S. trucking firm to carry general freight into certain key Ontario centres. If the licence actually is issued by the Minister of Transport, Hon. Irwin Haskett, the company, Trans-American Freight Lines Incorporated of Detroit will be the first U.S. trucker to be licensed for general freight into Canada. The application before the board was strongly opposed by the Ontario truckers and its decision to issue a certificate bred a storm of protest.
>
> Among the claims being made are that the licence would simply mean that the U.S. company would be taking business away from the Canadian firms, that it would not be adding any new business, would not be paying Canadian corporation tax, and that most of its fuel and maintenance purchases would be made in the U.S.A.
>
> Some Ontario companies have made heavy capital investments to carry this business, which the big U.S. company is trying to take over, and there is no reciprocal authority for Canadian truckers to operate on general freight in the U.S. and no prospect of any. The opponents have 50 days to appeal the board's decision to the Cabinet and they undoubtedly will make this appeal.
>
> The potential nastiness, however, does not arise from the facts of the situation. Rather, it comes about because the counsel for the Trans-American in this application had been politically a very prominent Progressive-Conservative, R. H. Rohmer, QC. Mr. Rohmer, a dapper young Toonto lawyer, is what is commonly termed the "hatchet man" or "troubleshooter" of the provincial PC Party.
>
> He is quite unofficial but nevertheless a power. He works behind the scenes on delicate situations and in seeing that certain interests who want a voice at court have that voice.

The next headline is "Near Robarts"—a lot of fellows are near Robarts these days. That was unquote.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): You never will be.

Mr. Sargent: I never will; I agree with the hon. member.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: To continue:

> You see him frequently around the outskirts of Premier John Robarts' office and it is generally assumed that he has ready access to the ear of the Premier.

These are the quotations of a newspaperman that you fellows cannot buy.

> Now the association of such a man with an application as highly controversial as this is bound to cause suspicion, particularly if the Cabinet turns down an appeal. This suspicion may be quite unwarranted. The highway board may be absolutely objective and impartial in its findings but it is a fact, one of the disagreeable facts of life here, that lawyers who are committed politically do appear to carry on an extraordinary amount of their practice before government boards such as this.
>
> Mr. Rohmer is frequently before the highway transport board. His predecessor in his unofficial post was Mr. E. A. Goodman, QC, named Wednesday to head the PC campaign committee in the federal election. Mr. Goodman has long been a frequent top counsel before this board and he also has practised very extensively before the liquor licence board.
>
> Whether everything is straight as a die, this, of course, at the very least looks bad. It appears as though the backroom boys of politics are peddling influence and it is offensive to the principle that in public life everything should not only be above reproach but also should appear to be above reproach. Whether it is something that can be changed, however, is questionable.
>
> Men like Mr. Rohmer and Mr. Goodman are essential to politics. There are behind the scenes jobs to be done and certain abilities are required of the men who do them. It is quite possible that they would not come forward if there were not areas in which they could find compensation.

Mr. Chairman, in checking out this department we understand that millions of dollars

worth of trucks were sold to manufacturing firms by strikebound trucking firms during the strike. Trucks were selling for the amount of $1.

We have asked the government how many transfers were involved from the companies that were strikebound; no answer. Now, understanding that the sales tax is predicated on the selling price, I would suggest that this is a fact: That this government lost millions of dollars and many hundreds of thousands of dollars in sales tax if these vehicles were sold at the selling price of $1.

This is in the area of the highway transport board and the trucking industry.

Now most important to the people of this province who drive a car is the area of insurance and, Mr. Chairman, there is growing arrogance by the insurance companies in being so selective in what risks they will take, setting themselves up as judge and jury as to who should be driving a car under the assigned risk plan or furnishing the proof of financial responsibility; turning down people from all walks of life.

Every one of you has had this put to you many times: "Why can I not get insurance?" The powers of these companies turning down people from all walks of life for no apparent reason at all, refusing to give coverage, causes me to make this observation, which I thought I never would bring myself to make, being a free enterpriser, a capitalist in my own heart.

Unless these insurance companies are brought into line—and you all must know this—and told that they must serve the public, doing the job or jobs that they are granted charters to do and, what is equally important, at fair and reasonable rates, this party is prepared to recommend that unless this government takes steps to force them to fall in line, that their charters be cancelled and that automobile insurance be issued by the government on the purchase of automobile plates.

We have the feeling that this government is beholden to the insurance companies as well as to the liquor interests; these monopolies have the government in their respective pockets. But we will be damned, Mr. Chairman, if democracy should cease to function and if these groups should be allowed to fleece the public any longer, regardless of how big an election pot you get from these people. The public is getting fed up with this "Honest John" approach and with the smug complacency and deceit; such as saying that the liquor licence board of Ontario does not interpret a director of Labatts as having a financial interest in licensed quarters—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I am going to suggest to the member for Grey North that it is his job now as the lead-off speaker for the Liberal Party to deal with The Department of Transport estimates—

Mr. Sargent: I am trying my best, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: —and I would ask him to confine his remarks to reviewing The Department of Transport.

Mr. Sargent: I am saying that there is collusion in the handling of insurance and in the handling of liquor and Mr. William T. Nugent, a member of the liquor licence board—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Liquor is not before the House. I am going to once again remind the member that he will have to stay with The Department of Transport at this time and if he refuses to do so, I will have to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, all this kind of tampering—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Spokesman for the Liberal Party in the year 1966!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The member for Grey North has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, black is black and not grey, and the most precious thing we have in the democratic system are the laws we have built up in this province. It is not admirable if those who are in power attempt to tamper with these laws. Therefore, on behalf of the motoring public who have for many years been browbeaten by these insurance companies, we say to them: "Get into line!"

It is up to the hon. Minister to say to these people: "Get into line! Get into line and serve the public properly or you will be out of business." And that is the hon. Minister's job to tell them under the charters they hold.

Mr. Chairman, in this report of the select committee on highway safety, 1955—11 years ago—there were some 70 submissions by the select committee on highway safety. The House will recall in the last election in 1963, the hon. Prime Minister and his cohorts went

on the air and they checked down about 22 points and they said: "Done! Done! Done!" And we all know the hypocrisy and the deceit in the whole programme, the millions of dollars spent to tell the people of Ontario that these things were done when they were not done.

Now I can go through this book and show you 42 recommendations, not done since 1955, by a committee set up by this House. This hon. Minister has not seen fit to implement them, and I could take the time of this House to read 42 recommendations we should have in highway safety that—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Does the hon. member want me to read them? I do not think that I should.

Mr. Henderson: Read them.

Mr. Sargent: There are many other good speakers coming along on this too.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Did you say other good speakers?

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, I take that back.

It is amazing to note, Mr. Chairman, that in the motorcycle field in Europe, anyone who has travelled abroad will see the thousands and thousands that are on the continent, and the growing trend there is in this country in motorcycle travel.

I understand there is no licence test required, or no facilities in this province for motorcycle licensing. So we are not geared for today or for tomorrow, and I suggest that you are permitting people to commit suicide by your looking out the window, as it were, in this field. The report of this committee, "Accident Facts, 1965," shows that we have an increase of 340 per cent in fatalities in motorcycle travel. I think it is one area, Mr. Minister, in which this government should take immediate steps to implement some very strong change of laws.

Much has been said in the paper about the plans of this government—in the paper this morning, about driver training programmes. Again the government is doing a spot job on this, not an overall coverage of the need. I think progressively there is an area for consideration that our youngsters coming up be given areas of dragstrip operations to be placed about the province whereby they can go and drive 100 miles per hour if they want under controlled conditions. Letting them let off steam, as it were, in dragstrip test areas is one thing the government might consider.

Mr. Chairman, much has been submitted to the government in the form of resolutions. The following resolution was adopted by the Windsor city council at its meeting held on November 29, 1965:

> Whereas it has been demonstrated that reflective licence plates on motor vehicles have effected a reduction in traffic accidents at night; and whereas reflective plates are an aid to law enforcement agencies; and whereas the Northwest Territories and Newfoundland will adopt such plates next year; and whereas most American states have such plates at present, or will have them by 1966—

I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that a resolution of this kind should be brought into being in this province by this department.

I have spoken longer than I said I would but I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Longer than necessary.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you George—that respecting the late great Pope John, in four years of his papacy he effected more revolutionary changes in the Catholic church than had happened in 400 years in the history of that great church. And I think it not too forlorn to hope that this Minister will pull up his socks and do a more modern job for Ontario and transport.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all members of the House will agree that the Minister is a most affable and kindly gentleman, and one feels that you must have a streak of meanness to heap the criticism upon him that one might surely deserve in the administration of a department. There is a saying that if you wish to avoid criticism, then do nothing and say nothing, and it seems to me that this is the position the hon. Minister has taken in introducing his estimates this year. No subject has received more attention in North America in the last few months than that of car safety, and I feel that the way the Minister has disposed of the problem of accident causes and car safety in his annual report and in his introductory remarks yesterday, is an affront to this House and to the people of Ontario.

The hon. Minister is either unimaginative, without ambition, or is showing the utmost disregard to the ever-increasing number of deaths and injuries and the relative unaccountable costs in property damage and

medical costs. The Minister certainly cannot dispel the expert research and engineering that has taken place in the past few years, with conclusions that we can reduce the deaths from injury by 50 per cent if we apply safety devices in car equipment and safety construction. Certainly, I hope the hon. Minister will be more forthright as we deal with the specifics of his estimates.

It is tragic that a department concerned with traffic and car safety is in the hands of a Minister who repeatedly and consistently ridicules and minimizes the dangers of driving. I use the word tragic, Mr. Chairman, because many lives are lost year after year; lives that could be saved if only the Minister of Transport took the effort to acquaint himself with modern research and modern scientific methods to cope with driver education, car safety and related subjects.

Because of the increasing numbers of cars on our highways and the resulting increase in traffic fatalities, a great deal of attention has been devoted to coping with the modern problem. My colleague, the hon. member for Yorkview, has dealt at length with the subject of car safety and the steps Ontario might take to ensure the manufacture of safer vehicles. Unfortunately, the hon. Minister does not appear to share my colleague's interest in that subject, and it may have to be left to other members of the government front bench to carry the ball.

Some attention has been paid to drivers, but on the whole it has been the wrong kind of attention. In this deadly game of car against car, driver against driver, something has to give. Unfortunately, it has been the weakest link in the chain that has given—human life. Every year at the Christmas season we see posters of smashed-up cars with bodies strewn all over the place, and the warning, "If you drink, don't drive." It has been generally acknowledged that scare techniques are not effective. Repetition year after year has taken the sting out of them. People have become indifferent and common reaction is, "This may happen to the other fellow but I know when I have had enough."

The appeal through pain, fear and guilt obviously has not worked, and the time has come when stronger measures must be taken against the drinking driver. Breathalyzer tests for drivers who appear intoxicated should be mandatory, to be followed by automatic licence suspension if the tests are positive. This may sound like strong medicine, but a driver of a car, in my opinion, is in possession of a potentially lethal weapon, and often it is not the impaired driver who is injured but a pedestrian or the other driver who has been hit.

There is another kind of impaired driver on the roads: A truck driver who suffers from fatigue due to lack of sleep. A truck driver who is well rested and works within a normal schedule is probably the safest driver on our highways today. Unfortunately, many drivers, particularly the owner-operators, go far beyond the accepted safety limits. The result is fatigue, highway hypnosis and an ever-increasing use of drugs in order to stay awake. Pep pills come in a wide variety of sizes, shapes and colours and keep a person going for hours, or even days, without a rest. But they impair judgment, create reckless behaviour and can produce hallucinations or blackouts while driving at high speeds.

There are steps The Department of Transport can take to prevent these abuses:

1. Lower the weekly work maximum to 50 hours, and I put emphasis on work maximum. That would be from the time he starts work, not the time he drives. The work maximum should be reduced by legislation. Introduce a daily maximum of 10 hours of work, or a daily maximum of 400 miles. This, of course, again would have to be judged and based on the type of area in which he was driving, to come to a satisfactory decision.

3. Enforce the regulations that a log book be kept by all truck drivers, which is available to police for inspection on the highways at all times.

4. Require an annual examination by a physician and a certificate attesting to the driver's physical fitness.

5. Make it an offence for pep pills to be in the possession of a driver while on duty.

If The Department of Transport were to introduce and enforce these regulations, it would go a long way towards ensuring a greater degree of highway safety.

Most traffic experts agree that arbitrary speed limits are not conducive to safe driving, yet the hon. Minister continues to equate the two. Earlier this month, the Ontario traffic conference was told that the maximum permissible speed should be that speed at which a reasonable motorist can safely control his car. A speeding driver is not necessarily a bad driver, or an irresponsible driver, or a killer driver. He is merely driving faster than the arbitrarily set speed limits. If a speeding driver is good at driving, has good reflexes, is sober and drives a car that possesses excellent brakes, then he could very

well be a better and safer driver than the much vaunted little old lady who ambles along at 20 miles under the speed limit.

I raised this question last year during the Minister's estimates, and I related it to the situation on the Queen Elizabeth highway between Hamilton and Toronto. I stated that the speed limit as posted did not mean anything any more, that the normal speed was between 68 and 75 miles an hour and the hon. Minister nodded in agreement, that this had become the normal pace that had been established on that highway, through habits of people driving it day in and day out, and I must say it still exists, and it, of course, makes a mockery of the posted speed limit.

I think we have to take a real look at posted speed limits, now that we are developing into three-lane highways on the Queen E. Dealing specifically with that area, we may have to post a differential in speed limits on the three lanes. Of course we have to separate, I feel, the Queen Elizabeth highway from Hamilton to Toronto from other freeways in the province, when we start talking about traffic control and highway speed. I think there is quite a difference, because of the congestion and the ever-increasing use of this particular strip.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that speeding is not dangerous. It is a relative term. Driving at 90 miles an hour, on a lightly travelled, double-lane highway in dry weather, and with good visibility, is not speeding. It is driving fast, no more, no less. But if a man who has just downed five beers in short session drives an unsafe car, travels at 50 miles an hour on a narrow, winding city street, where children play on sidewalks, that is speeding. His chances are pretty good that he will hit somebody who underestimates his speed, or his condition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just digress from the provincial scene to the municipalities that become quite concerned about the ever-increasing number of pedestrian accidents. In the city of Hamilton, their record is higher this year than it has ever been. You cannot pick up the paper any night without reading that two or three children have been knocked down and injured on the city streets. I do not know what influence the hon. Minister of Transport has with traffic officials in the municipalities, but I feel there has to be some interest taken. Thirty miles an hour, in my opinion, on some city streets is too fast. Streets where cars are parked on one side or on both sides, where children are playing, 30 miles an hour is too fast and a driver cannot stop quickly enough when children dart from sidewalks, or between cars.

Now, it is all right to say that the parents have some responsibility, and must keep their children locked up. I still think that when the driver in control of the car leaves main arteries to go down city streets, he has to exercise a greater degree of control and attention to that particular problem of children.

I have received a very interesting letter on this subject of highway speeds, Mr. Chairman, from a 32-year-old Toronto man. His comments speak for themselves, and I quote:

> I have just returned from a motor trip across the continent to the west coast. In the 32 years of my life I have driven in every one of the 48 American states and have been across Canada four different times. I am writing this letter to protest the unnecessary slow speed limits posted in Ontario. It is against the law in Ontario to drive at a sane, sensible speed on an open highway.

Now, I just digress here, Mr. Chairman, because he might have been one that likes to obey traffic laws and felt that when the other traffic was exceeding the traffic laws, that something was completely wrong. I go on:

> When you leave Ontario and head southwest into the United States you get into the following speed limits:

and he sets them out.

> There is Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Oklahoma that have a 65 miles per hour speed limit on two lanes, and a 70 miles per hour speed limit on four lanes.
>
> Oklahoma has a 65 miles per hour speed limit on two lanes and 70 miles on four lanes.
>
> New Mexico, 70 miles per hour on a two-lane and the same speed limit on the four lanes.
>
> Utah has the same on both the two-lane and the four-lane, of 70 miles per hour.
>
> Nebraska has a speed limit of 60 miles per hour on the two-lane and 70 miles per hour on the four-lane.
>
> Iowa has 70 miles per hour speed limit on two-lane and 75 miles per hour on four-lane.
>
> South Dakota, 70 miles on two-lane, 75 on the four-lane.
>
> North Dakota, 70 miles on two-lane, and 75 miles per hour on four-lane.
>
> Kansas, 70 miles per hour on two-lane and 75 miles per hour on four-lane.

These, Mr. Chairman, are just a few states, and we understand the death and accident

rate in many of the above states is much lower than in Ontario.

> We have a point demerit system in Ontario which has done really nothing to decrease accidents. The Ontario government caters to the slow driver by posting a speed limit ten to 15 miles per hour under what it is considered safe to drive. This is the cause of many accidents, because the motorist has his mind on other things than his driving. Millions of American drivers are free to drive at the same sensible speed on the open road, can you give me an answer why Ontario motorists should obey outdated speed limits when our highways are just as good as any American highway?

I think this kind of approach has been now recognized by some of the traffic experts, both in the province and in the hon. Minister's department and I hope that we will see some enlightenment in the future.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, by orthodox standards, this man would probably be considered a speed hog. But he is making the same argument in less sophisticated language that many traffic experts are making today.

Another area almost completely neglected is accident research. This makes sense for a department of transport to set up teams of experts who would rush out to the scene of a serious accident and study the circumstances of the accident. Such a team would have to make a detailed investigation, to learn all the facts as to why the accident occurred, were there any mechanical weaknesses in the vehicles involved, or failure of parts? Once in possession of such systematically compounded facts, department officials could feed the results into a computer and come up with meaningful statistics that in turn would generate action.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, and bring it to the attention of the hon. Minister, so he might be aware, I read from the Canadian Press report in the Hamilton *Spectator* last night that the federal government is studying a proposal to establish a national highway research centre and I hope that the hon. Minister will make some comment on this report later on.

Still another field where prompt action would produce immediate results is that of compulsory vehicle inspection, yet the hon. Minister has been quoted as saying:

> Compulsory safety testing of motor vehicles would not reduce accidents substantially enough to make it worthwhile.

Now this, surely, is one of the most irresponsible statements ever to be made by a Minister of the Crown. What constitutes "worthwhile" to the hon. Minister? Is it worth while to spend a few thousand dollars to save the life of a child or perhaps a dozen children's lives? How does the Minister equate the lives and safety of Ontario citizens with dollars and cents? What value does he place on human life?

Certainly the hon. Minister is aware and his department is aware that there are thousands of accidents and the causes are unknown. But there are thousands that we are aware of—where we have reports of truck wheels coming off. One, not long ago, came off and ended up on top of a passenger car. We have reports of trailers coming uncoupled as they are travelling down the highway, causing serious accidents. These things we have to realize. What proof does the Minister have for his statement on compulsory vehicle inspection? Has he studied, for example, the statistics from British Columbia, from before and after that province produced compulsory vehicle testing every six months in Vancouver?

Let me turn briefly to car safety and the hon. Minister's espousal of free enterprise in this field. Mr. Chairman, the Opposition often, in criticizing Ministers of the Crown in relation to the operation of their departments, particularly in the fields of Health and Public Welfare, come to a point where they say: "Well, that is the opinion of the member but our philosophies are different. I am not for a socialistic philosophy; I have a different outlook on things."

I would not want to think that the hon. Minister is applying a Conservative philosophy to this whole question of car safety and accident causes.

On a CBC "Newsmagazine" broadcast on August 10, 1965, the Minister stated:

> We in Ontario believe in free enterprise and I agree that you should give the manufacturers in an area such as this industry, which is highly competitive, as large a measure of freedom as is proper. Let them choose to give the people what the people want, up to a point. Then the place comes where we reach a position where it is necessary in the public interest that things should be legislated and I give you instances of this in the matter of brakes, in windshield glass, in direction indicators. In matters of that kind, we have not hesitated to legislate where it was in the public interest to do so.
>
> We in Ontario have got along very well with a combination of free enterprise and

> and government legislation. It is going forward very well today and I expect in the future that we will continue on this dual programme of letting enterprise have such freedom as possible and using legislation in the public interest where that is necessary.

Later on, the hon. Minister said:

> In the final analysis, vehicle safety rests primarily and basically with the driver of the car, and we will have better safety on our highways when more of the drivers learn to drive at all times with deliberate care, caution and common sense.

No one disagrees with the latter part of the Minister's statement, but somebody has to regulate and take some action when lives are at stake. Certainly, the figures that the Minister gave us yesterday anticipating the increase in the use of cars and trucks suggests that the situation is becoming very serious in the province of Ontario.

I attended the meeting of the standing committee of highways, transport and tourism and hon. members will recollect that when we listened to Senator Speno from New York he certainly breathed a breath of fresh air into this province with the address he gave us. When he condemned the manufacturers association for using style and the profit motive as their whole attitude toward the production of cars and said it was about time that someone took a stronger stand against them, the hon. Minister nodded in a sort of reluctant agreement. But certainly it was a breath of fresh air in our approach to making the people who are responsible for the construction of automobiles co-operate and pay some attention to what experts have found to be necessary.

The manufacturers have indeed chosen to give the people what they thought the people wanted—unsafe cars, highly priced concoctions of steel and chrome and imitation leather that tend to fall apart after a few years.

On May 24, the hon. Minister introduced an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act, which will empower the department to require car manufacturers to install safety devices. But even this is only a half-hearted attempt, because the Minister immediately assures the manufacturers that if they comply with the few requests he has made, no regulations will be necessary.

I noticed right after that a statement from the tire manufacturers association which said that they would be very happy for the government to establishment standards. Whether this statement now is going to retard the need for any legislation in this regard, I do not know. But I certainly hope that the hon. Minister will go ahead with his legislation and let us make sure that that basic fundamental device on an automobile—the tire—is going to be safe for the people of this province.

The Toronto *Daily Star,* Mr. Chairman, in an editorial on May 25, very aptly expresses the misgivings which many of us feel, and I quote:

> Unfortunately, it appears that while the government may be taking wide powers of regulation in theory, it will use them, in practice, in only a very limited and tentative fashion.
>
> Transport Minister Haskett is reported discussing with motor manufacturers the possibility of installing four-way flashers —to provide better illumination for stopped cars at night—and split braking systems on new cars. These are useful improvements, but they fall far short of the extensive changes in car design which engineers consider necessary if the toll of death and serious injuries is to be reduced.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister clings to his outdated and doctrinaire views that private enterprise will come through without government intervention and build a safe car. Unfortunately, many more lives will be lost in traffic accidents because of this attitude.

Even with safer cars and safer roads, the dominant factor in the death toll on the roads is still the driver. I want to end with a quote from the British weekly, the *New Statesman,* in which Gerald Leach wrote last year:

> If we are really to cut the murder on the roads we must turn the man at the wheel from a tiger into a mouse, a zoom-away, get-away god into a get-there square, a knight on horseback exulting in power, freedom, competition, daring and danger, into a safe, docile, disciplined engine driver. In other words, we must attain the impossible.

Certainly we do not expect the hon. Minister to correct the problem of highway accidents in a short period, but at least we expect that his attitude would be one that he recognizes fully the potential increase in highway deaths and injuries and the cost of property damage and the medical costs involved, that something has to be done and be done as soon as we can get together and show the co-operation necessary.

The hon. Minister has to tell us what he is going to do about mandatory car inspection. We want to know what his position is in regard to mandatory high school teenage

car training programmes. We realize that 19 per cent of our permit carriers are between the ages of 16 and 24 and yet they are involved in 30 per cent of the accidents in this province.

I think that it would be wise to change the permissive attitude of the department in allowing high school programmes to be developed, and set up a mandatory programme as an experiment, if we may, across the province, where the teenager may pay a fee for the course and get a refund if he completes the course of training so that it could apply to any youngster in the community, not just those in school. Because we have many who are dropouts from school who may become taxi drivers, or salesmen on the road driving cars, or driving a truck on the highways, this kind of training would be the most beneficial.

We want to know what co-ordination and co-operation the Minister has had with the law enforcement in the province. Does he think there are enough policemen patrolling our highways to bring about the control that is necessary? I do not know myself; in fact, I am somewhat disappointed at times when I drive from Hamilton to Toronto or vice versa, and do not see a cruiser car.

We have to find out how the policeman is expected to cope with violations on the highway; what is he expected to do on a three-lane highway when they are running almost bumper-to-bumper and some fool is lane-hopping and tailgating all the way down the highway?

I have noticed in a strip from Highway 27 to the Humber, that one would lane-hop from one side to the other five times before he reaches the Humber bridge, just to get there a little quicker. But how do we expect the policemen to apprehend this kind of a driver? We have to devise some system of pulling these people aside so that we can reduce the reckless driving on the highways.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I will leave my questioning and further comments until the specific items in the estimates.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, when I was last addressing the House on the Budget debate, I had recommended that The Department of Reform Institutions be replaced by a new department responsible for the investigation of criminal offences, the apprehension and the trial of the accused, including presentence reports, the conviction and sentencing of the accused based on the knowledge that the convicting magistrates would have of not only the offence, but the time required to bring about rehabilitation of the accused, and the incarceration, subsequent reformation and rehabilitation.

I pointed out that if this province can afford to spend over $24 million on reform institutions to belatedly handle the effects of what it has neglected, why can it not, or why cannot we, who are responsible for the allocation of tax moneys, provide the citizen with a better and more secure investment of his tax dollar? I pointed out that in all sincerity we cannot blame this government for the thousands who trek through our reform institutions, some with great regularity. But we could blame this government for failing to meet the challenge that they present.

I firmly believe that everyone sitting in this House will agree that (1) our teachers need to be better acquainted with the earlier patterns of delinquency; (2) our guidance corps must be expanded to counsel those who are disturbed; (3) our school programmes must be designed to attract and hold the interest of the children until they can be molded into well-rounded individuals by the best teaching cadre we can afford; (4) our social agencies must be given greater responsibilities and they must become builders in shaping our youth and helping them to adjust to what may be an unhappy home environment.

We must organize all these efforts towards protection and counselling to steer our young on a path clear of courts. Once exposed to juvenile court, a boy or girl bears a lifetime stigma. Who counsels our misdirected youth then? Only those with whom we have originally tried to keep our youth from associating. It is a self-perpetuating evil, a

vicious circle that feeds on itself and on the promise of youth. We must employ more effective methods to interrupt the cycle of offence and punishment. We must do something drastic to break the chain of crime.

Parental influence leading to delinquency by juveniles must be better understood and every method and effort utilized to counteract the influence of the brute parent and the unhappy home.

I had intended to pursue this question of juvenile delinquency in much greater detail but I shall have opportunity to do so in the estimates of the hon. Attorney General. I would like now, if I may, to proceed to a topic much closer to the members in this House, and to use as an example, I will draw reference to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

The Department of Highways of Ontario makes statutory grants annually to municipalities through their municipal branch in the amount of $117,900,000, for road construction and maintenance. The roads department of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto from 1954 to 1964, inclusive, has had a gross expenditure of some $276,994,000. That is almost $277 million on which they have received statutory grants in the province of Ontario, on a 50 per cent subsidy basis, of some $124 million. The foregoing expenditure would class the Metro roads department as second only to The Department of Highways in the highway construction and maintenance field in Ontario.

Are the municipalities, whether city, town, country or commission, geared to handle such large expenditures as efficiently as The Department of Highways itself? Is even the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto competent to handle such large sums for road-building?

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask for the indulgence of this House, because we were informed last night that we would be proceeding with The Department of Transport estimates and if there was any time left over we would then proceed with the Budget debate. We were informed about 15 minutes ago that we would be proceeding with the Budget debate and I find myself having to grope through all the material I picked up off the desk. To find the material, one has to grope here because the government continually keeps you in the dark as to what is going to happen. I do not have my figures here.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Who is wasting the time of the House now?

Mr. Ben: Oh, this government is wasting the time of this House! I just pointed out, last night the last thing the House leader said was that we would be continuing with The Department of Transport estimates, and if there was any time left over we would go on to the Budget debate; and this morning they discontinue the estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Order! This is not the period for questions and answers; this is the time for debate.

Mr. Ben: It is time for debate, I would just like to draw—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): I indicated last night that the Budget debate would be called, and before calling it I spoke to the leaders of all parties with respect to this matter. I would think that the hon. member would want to get on with this long harangue of his.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps the hon. Minister will find this harangue of interest to him. It will show how they are frivolously wasting the taxpayers' money, permitting incompetence to exist in this province. It is going to be an indictment of the Minister's government. So I will be most pleased to continue on with this harangue.

As I pointed out, the province has annually been laying out sums of $118 million for road construction and maintenance on a 50 per cent basis. What happens to this money is what I am now going to show to the House.

If anyone in the House has ever examined the general conditions of a standard Metro road contract, they will agree that they are badly in need of revision to bring them up to date and up to par with those of The Department of Highways. This is an admission even Metro roads department is prepared to make. There is no prequalification of contractors, such as The Department of Highways has established. The lowest tender is always accepted, whether the contractor is capable of doing the work or not. This situation leads to additional cost in claims, delays and extra supervision.

The liquidated damages clause is inadequate and rarely enforced. The pattern for the past 10 years by the contractors is to bid the job low and then proceed to build up the claim for extras and delays. The commissioner of roads is the sole authority relative to all claims arising out of the contracted work. There is no claims board such as exists in The Department of Highways to

handle claims on a fair and equitable basis. The same commissioner, although he may not spend under normal circumstances more than $1,000 without the express approval of council, may on contracted work spend additional hundreds of thousands of dollars with no one's approval.

It is commonly acknowledged throughout the contracting business that Metro Toronto's road department contracts are an easy mark for extras. I hope I shall demonstrate this to the complete satisfaction of every member of this House before I am through. If, as I propose to show, the Metropolitan Toronto department of roads is not equipped to handle such large grants from the province, one would and should question the efficiency of other municipalities throughout the province. The staff of the Metro roads department is inadequate and inefficient in every facet of its operation. Consulting engineers are used extensively on a selection basis, approved by Metro council, for the design, supervision and construction of practically all of its projects, even a small road-widening job. Every structure is designed by consulting engineers.

New agreements with these consulting firms cost the taxpayer more money. The pre-engineering is paid for at 200 per cent of the total cost. Design and supervision is paid on a fee basis established by the association of professional engineers for the province of Ontario and is applicable as a percentage of the cost of the contract plus extras.

The on-site staff provided by the consulting engineers is paid for on a 200 per cent of total cost basis. The metropolitan roads department should have sufficient staff to design and supervise the construction of the smaller projects, which would give the taxpayers value for their money. Such a department is in existence in the city of Toronto. The city of Toronto has its own engineering department, which designs and supervises the construction of all its road works.

Land or title surveys are contracted out to Ontario land surveyors in private practice on a selection basis approved by Metro council. Although there are six Ontario land surveyors on the staff, one of whom is the chief surveyor, none are in the field with the party to do title surveys. The cost of these services by private Ontario land surveyors is based on a minimum fee established by the association of Ontario land surveyors. This cost could be greatly reduced to the taxpayers' advantage if a portion, if not all, of these necessary surveys was undertaken by Metro's own staff. Not only would this bring the efficiency of this department up to that of The Department of Highways, but it would also keep the existing drafting staff occupied.

By contrast, the city of Toronto, which admittedly is not in the business of building expressways, has not hired a private Ontario land surveyor for over eight years, and now does all its own engineering. They also bid on and construct many of their own roads as a method of keeping tender prices down.

The maintenance division of Metro's roads department is badly in need of reorganization. The staff and equipment is at a minimum, whereas the volume of maintenance work is increasing as the new facilities are put into operation. The majority of maintenance operations are contracted with extensive use of rented trucks and equipment. Cut repairs, patching, resurfacing, shoulder maintenance, intersection improvements, are contracted. Cleaning and painting flex beam guardrails are even contracted, as is street cleaning, and so on.

With reference to the use of rented equipment, may I just give some examples where not only the Ontario taxpayers' money is going needlessly, but in addition to the general levy, which comes to the province of Ontario, the citizens of Metro have an additional burden to bear because of this rental equipment.

I wonder if the hon. Minister of Highways is aware of some of the inefficiencies that go on with regard to the rental of equipment by the Metropolitan Toronto roads department? As one example of the foregoing, going back to 1962, the following restricted purchase order has been issued annually to the same firm to cover basically the rental of a one-man chain saw for use at one maintenance yard. I might point out that this chain saw is worth about $300.

On purchase order MT-53201 for 1962, for this chain saw, the rental fee paid was $1,960.32 for the $300 chain saw.

The same firm, in 1963, on another purchase order, was paid $1,874.90 for the rent of a $300 chain saw.

In 1964, although the order specified that it was not to exceed the cost of $750, the amount charged was $2,316.31 for the use of a one-man chain saw costing $300. In 1964, where the purchase order stipulated it was not to exceed $400, the amount paid was $1,738.76.

A purchase order issued December 6, 1965, which is actually for the 1966 year, for the

months of January, February and March, 1966, the amount paid was $395.71.

So from 1962 to the present, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto roads department has paid out $8,286 to rent a one-man chain saw which they could have purchased for $300. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that this government paid half of that rental fee—$4,143—for what?

The same thing applies to front-end loaders, which are also rented by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto roads department. In March, 1961, for their two yards, they rented two front-end loaders of different capacities. For 1961, for yard number two, $6,794.76 were spent in rental charges. In June of the same year, $15,489. In January of 1962, $15,708. I could continue reading these figures, including amounts of $13,000 and $19,000. At any rate, over a five-year period, for these two front-end loaders, the rental fee was $177,243.28. And who paid for that? This government paid 50 per cent of that as a subsidy; for what? To rent two $20,000 front-end loaders. This is where the money is going to, and members wonder why their taxes are going up.

I could go on into the use of their automobiles. They rent automobiles at the rate of $95 a month, which does not include servicing and maintenance. And who pays half of that? Again, this government pays half of that, so the poor taxpayers in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto not only have to throw away half of the figures I have mentioned, but in addition they have to pay taxes to make up this government's half. This is how well The Department of Transport and The Department of Municipal Affairs look after the affairs of the citizens of Metro Toronto and the city of Toronto.

In connection with winter maintenance, snow removal, ploughing and salting are contracted. The salt, supplied by the Metro corporation, at from $11 to $12 a ton, is spread by the contractor at the rate of $6 a ton. To quote one local contractor: "Boy, do we lay it on." They even lay it on when there is no snow; no wonder there are no fenders on local vehicles.

Grass cutting and roadside maintenance on the major arteries are carried out by the Metropolitan Toronto parks staff on a work order and it is organized to handle this task.

Property acquisition is a major reason why estimated costs of all major projects are exceeded. The lack of possesson of the necessary lands results in delays to contractors, and large claims result. The policy of The Department of Highways in expropriating and obtaining possession of the land ahead of construction saves the taxpayers' dollars, both from the standpoint of eliminating delays to contracted work and the increased value of the property at a later date. The right-of-way for the proposed King's Highway 404 from Steeles avenue—that is the north end of the Don Valley parkway to Newmarket—was acquired by The Department of Highways years ago at a reasonable cost. The policy of the metropolitan roads department is to expropriate and attempt to make settlement immediately prior to construction, leading to additional costs due to delays and claims by contractors, consultant supervisors, administrative overhead, numerous arbitrations, extension of contract to completion date—with no enforcement of liquidated damage clauses. All these contracts provide for $100-a-day penalty clauses for delays and I have only found one contract so far where they have taken any penalty.

Last, but not least, is the loss of use to the public which can hardly be calculated in dollars and cents. To use an example, some of these contracts, of which I am going to give you detail, were delayed for over a year. If only 10,000 passed over that stretch a day, or had loss of use—and they saved six minutes in each direction, or 12 minutes all told—that would be 2,000 man-hours lost each and every single day. Now what is it worth in the way of labour costs? I do not know; but, just putting it mildly, it is costing the highway users in the metropolitan areas tens of thousands of dollars each day that these highway openings are delayed.

The property necessary for the construction of the Don valley parkway from Sheppard to Steeles avenue, approximately two miles, has yet to be expropriated in the face of skyrocketing land values. This will not be acquired until after 1970, when The Department of Highways commences Highway 404 and the metropolitan corporation is committed to complete the parkway. Extensive co-operation and co-ordination between The Department of Highways and the Metro roads department, in an endeavour to complete the Don valley parkway from Lawrence avenue through the MacDonald-Cartier freeway interchange and north to Sheppard avenue interchange by November 15, 1966, will prove to be of no avail.

The lack of possession of properties in the Sheppard-Woodbine area, and in particular the land on which the Mulholland Cairn is situated, protected by an Act entitled, An Act respecting the Mulholland Cairn, passed dur-

ing the second session of the 20th Legislature, has resulted in an extensive claim for damages by the contractor because of the delay. It will be impossible to construct the north half of the Sheppard avenue underpass structure this year. Again the public suffers the loss of the use of that section of the parkway, from Highway 401 to a point north of Sheppard avenue from the intended completion date November 15, 1966, to some time in 1967.

Furthermore, no benefit will be derived during that period from the investment that The Department of Highways has made in the north half of the 401 interchange with the Don valley parkway.

So this stretch of the highway is being held up by whom? The government. Because they must bring in a bill to amend the Act respecting the Mulholland Cairn. The Mulholland Cairn was put up by representatives of the Mulholland family, who were pioneers in the area in question around Sheppard and Woodbine, and there is a stone cairn or monument marking the site where they settled. It is protected by the Act I have mentioned, and I regret to say that this government has been dragging in bringing forth the necessary bill to amend this Act so that this cairn may be situated at another site.

The site has been picked out but I am afraid that this government is still taking no action. In the meantime, damages are increasing from day to day because the contractor must charge the municipality for down time, that is when equipment is not used. The taxpayers have not got the use of the stretch of the road; Metro in the meantime, is paying carrying charges and interest rates on the money it has borrowed.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 80, which created a Metropolitan Toronto department of roads, should be amended to set this department up as a commission or authority, more responsible to the province of Ontario, which after all is paying half the bill. Such a commission or authority would have appropriate representation from this Legislature and from the various provincial departments to ensure an efficient organization, free from political influence, and capable of handling annual highway expenditures second only to The Department of Highways in Ontario.

In March of this year, Mr. Speaker, Metro Chairman Allen and the executive committee were made aware of the examples I am now going to relate to this House and chose to do nothing. They appear to be satisfied with the status quo and and are not prepared to make any improvements. They adopt the attitude that they must have confidence in their commissioner. I do not know how far that confidence must go but frankly it has gone too far to suit me.

Not only do I think that the responsibility for Metro roads should be taken out of their hands, I also believe there should be a judicial inquiry into the construction of the Frederick G. Gardiner expressway and the Don valley parkway in order to determine just how much of the taxpayers' money lies buried there. Here are some of my reasons for this judicial inquiry.

Before proceeding with these reasons I would just like to recite to this House the difference between contracted expenditures and final expenditures with reference to the Don valley parkway. I would point out how it always seems to be an overrunning cost. In speaking with the commissioner of works for the city of Toronto I found out that in most instances the final prices are less than the tendered prices. With the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, except with reference to very small contracts, there is an overrun.

Contract 17-57—price was $133,018.23. The actual cost was $140,289.50, for a total of 105 per cent of contract price. Contract 1-58, $1,-247,770, overran by 13 per cent. Contract 2-58, which was a small one of $474,000, only overran by one per cent. Among other small contracts of 1964, there was a contract for $37,920 and, believe it or not, that was the final price paid. In another small contract of $75,000, the total cost was only 96 per cent of that price; a contract for $30,000—the total price was 97 per cent of that price. But when we get into some larger sums, the figure is much different.

Contract R2-65, which was originally for $2,001,100, is now estimated to cost 120 per cent of that, or $2,391,000. Contract R1-59, which I shall be dealing with here, tendered at $2,136,000 and ended up costing $2,421,000, or 113 per cent of contract price. Contract R4-59 of $1,731,000 ended up costing 117 per cent of contract price, namely, $2,019,000. Contract R5 of 1960, a $717,000 contract ended up costing 124 per cent of contract price, $889,000. Contract R-24 of 1960, a $210,000 contract, ended up 118 per cent of contract. Contract R8-62 was also 118 per cent of contract price.

It is acknowledged that sometimes in these big contracts one may overrun up to ten per cent, but you will note that most of these contracts are going over ten per cent and I think that perhaps we should now find out why they are going over. In doing so, first of all, I might add, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Ministers involved, so that they

can follow it and because of the shortage of time, we were not able to prepare a précis; it is in the process of being prepared and we may have it for this House.

I have here, and downstairs, approximately ten contracts from the Metro roads department, also photostatic copies of all the correspondence with regard to those contracts, which passed not only between the metropolitan roads department but other people involved in those contracts and I will be referring extensively to those.

In the contracts which are standard contracts for the Metropolitan Toronto department of roads, general condition 31 of the contract document—alterations, extras, deletions in claims—states in part:

> In the event of any circumstances arising at any time which, in the contractor's opinion, would entitle him to additional compensation, and which are not fully provided for herein, he shall at once, on the discovery of such circumstances, notify the commissioner in writing, and shall state in his notification clearly and fully, what the circumstances are, and the additional sum or compensation he intends to demand therefor, or otherwise he shall have no claim in respect thereof.

I think that section is clear. If the contractor finds any circumstances which were not contemplated and which were not patent, then he must immediately notify the commissioner of roads in writing, fully describing the circumstances and the compensation he will claim.

Now the first contract that I will deal with is contract R4-59 for the east branch of the Don river to Eglinton interchange. It was awarded on June 19, 1959 to Robert McAlpine Limited. The price was $1,731,736, which was the lowest of ten tenders. The completion date for this contract was to have been August 31, 1960—which was 66 weeks. The final price was $2,019,152.40 or 116 per cent of tender, and the actual completion date was not August 31, 1960 but August 31, 1961.

Although this contract ran one year over the tendered completion date, not a penny of liquidated damages was asked for or paid to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. It means that the citizens of this province did not have the use of this stretch of the road for one year at Lord knows what cost to them and it means that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto was paying debenture charges on at least half of this amount, and that means, in all probability, that the province of Ontario was paying debenture charges on the remaining half.

At any rate, with money being borrowed now at approximately five and a half per cent, $110,000 of the taxpayers' money was paid out in debenture charges for a road that they could not use.

With reference to this contract R4-59, extra work order 1414 dated July 26, 1961—and I am going to be giving this House work order numbers and dates, because I am asking for a judicial inquiry and I want the evidence to be clear enough and concise enough that no one will have the nerve to attempt to reject it.

Extra work order 1414, dated July 26, 1961 read as follows:

> Payment on a lump sum basis for additional cost to remove unsuitable clay from cut at station 330 to 340.
>
> Total cost to remove 85,670 cubic yards of unsuitable clay from site, $65,339.31.
>
> Less contract bid price for item No. 4 unclassified excavation 85,670 cubic yards at 30 cents per cubic yard—$25,701.00.
>
> Additional cost—$39,638.31 lump sum.

Now what does the contract specify in relation to this type of unclassified excavation? The contract R4-59 under the caption "Special information to tenders" on page one has this to say:

> Unclassified excavation:
>
> All the provisions noted under "general specification for excavation" shall apply with the exception that the maximum dry weighted density in pounds per cubic foot, shall be determined by a modified AASHO standard density test, such modification to require the use of all material passing the three-quarter inch screen.

Page 4 contains the "general specifications for excavation" and under caption (a) we read:

> (a) Work:
>
> The contractor shall remove all earth, rock and other material required by the plans and place all satisfactory material in embankments or otherwise dispose of material in spoil areas. Top soil suitable for top soiling, including sod, within the road section, shall be removed before other excavation is commenced and stockpiled within the right-of-way, as directed.

And further:

> Unsuitable material shall be exacavated within the road section to the depth ordered.

On page 5, under disposal of excavated material, we find:

> All suitable materials from the excavation shall be placed in roadway embankments and elsewhere to the lines and grades shown on the plans. All unsuitable materials shall be placed in spoil banks provided by the contractor at his expense or at locations within the right-of-way as designated by the commissioner.

At page 13, under earth excavation—it is probably boring to some of the hon. members here but we will have to have this on the record and see if this government can avoid calling a judicial inquiry after we are through here.

I read from page 13, under the above heading:

> Earth excavation shall include excavation of all materials specified above except covered under drainage structures and structural excavation except as provided below for rock excavation and shall include so-called muck, hardpan and soft shale.

Unclassified excavation, on page 14 of the contract:

> Unclassified excavation shall include excavation and disposal of all material as specified under earth excavation and rock excavation.

On page 16 under the caption "Work":

> Under this item the contractor shall remove all materials in accordance with the general specifications for excavation and shall place all suitable materials in roadway embankment in the following manner.

And then it describes it. And I am reading these sections to you, Mr. Speaker, because I will establish that payments were made for claims which were covered in the original contract and that this government intentionally or unintentionally, wittingly or unwittingly, paid one half of those costs.

Again, referring to condition No. 3, contractor's undertaking, it reads as follows:

> It is understood and agreed that the contractor has by careful examination satisfied himself as to the nature and location of the work, the conformation of the ground, the character, quality and quantity of the material to be encountered, the character of equipment and facilities needed preliminary to and during the prosecution of the work, the general and local conditions and all other matters which can in any way affect the work under contract.

On July 8, 1960, the commissioner of roads wrote a letter to Robert McAlpine Limited.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: May I ask the member a question?

Mr. Ben: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Was the member a member of the council at the time of that letter, at the date of it?

Mr. Ben: Not this letter, no.

This is a letter dated July 8, 1960:

> Reference is made to a meeting in the office of our consulting engineers, Fenco-Harris on February 19 last. Your letter of March 8 to Fenco-Harris, their reply of April 1.
>
> A meeting held in this department's boardroom on April 8 and various discussions over the past eight months in regard to the disposal of numercus cubic yards of of unsuitable material encountered in the unclassified excavation between station 330 and station 341 of your contract No. R4-59 on the Don valley parkway. I concur with our consulting engineers that this material is unsatisfactory for the construction of embankments either in its existing saturated state or in partially dried condition and must be removed from the site.
>
> As you are aware, nothing has been done by ycur company relative to the actual removal of this unsatisfactory material condemned by our consulting engineers in September 1959.
>
> Your subcontractor, Anteci, commenced on July 6 with two scrapers to crosshaul, mix and spread this material on grade ncrth of station 33 in an attempt to utilize same in the embankment. This unsuccessful operation was observed by this department's chief project engineer, Mr. B. W. Bemrose on July 6, accompanied by our engineer assigned to the parkway project. You are hereby requested to stop this operation and refrain from any attempt to use this unsuitable material in the parkway prism.
>
> As a result of your reluctance to remove this unsuitable material from the parkway job site, in accordance with the terms of the contract, I advise that no further progress payments will be processed by this department relative to your contract No. R4-59 until a working force of sufficient magnitude to satisfy this department commences to haul this material off the site.
>
> As you are aware, your contract specifies

a working period of 66 weeks. The work on this contract commenced on or about June 29, 1959. This would set the completion of all work involved by the week ending October 8, 1960. I cannot comprehend how your company can afford to delay the removal of this unsatisfactory material for eight months and hope to complete the contract by the above-mentioned date or suffer the invocation of the penalty clause.

Again, a letter of July 8, 1960. Because this letter was delivered by hand, there was an answer which simply stated:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of today's date delivered by hand in regard to the disposal of unsuitable unclassified material on the Don valley parkway, contract No. R4-59. The writer would like to visit with you on Monday, 11th July, and will telephone for an appointment.

We are getting ready to clear this thing up.

On May 26, 1961, which is quite a jump, a letter was written by Fenco-Harris to Mr. Bemrose, the chief project engineer, department of roads, still with reference to this contract.

We are forwarding herewith copies of correspondence from Robert McAlpine Limited relative to their claim in connection with the excavation of some 85,670 cubic yards of material unsuitable for use as fill for embankment construction.

We have reviewed the breakdown of costs and are in agreement with the time and equipment claimed.

This matter has been the subject of much discussion and correspondence dating back to the first meeting in this regard on October 20, 1959, when the contractor stated his intention to remove the material by dragline during the 1959-60 winter months.

In actual fact, after repeated efforts by our staff and your department to get some action by the contractor, he commenced the removal of the subject material on August 6, 1960. The operation was deferred while waiting for the roads department to acquire the Frew property for disposal of this material

Under the terms of the contract, the contractor was responsible for obtaining disposal sites at his own expense. This was obviated by Metro in the interest of expediting the work and relieving the financial burden on the contractor. We acknowledge the fact that the material encountered was unsuitable for use in embankment and was unforeseen. The latter fact merits some consideration in your decision in this matter. We shall be pleased to discuss this further with you and suggest that a meeting be arranged with the commissioner.

—and so on.

The next letter is dated September 19, 1960, and it is a letter from Racey MacCallum and Associates to Fenco-Harris consulting engineers. Racey MacCallum and Associates Limited are also consulting engineers and were used with reference to the inspection of the steel girders used in these overpasses and bridges. Dated March 8, 1960, it reads as follows:

We wish to confirm the understanding reached during a telephone conversation between Mr. Weinstein of Fenco-Harris and our writer, on Tuesday, March 8, 1960, concerning the above inspection. If the girders for the Don valley bridge are to be fabricated by Dominion Structural Steel Limited and not York Steel, additional travelling time and expenses will be incurred by our inspector, consequently we would like to amend our quotation to you dated March 4 as follows—

and it is a small amount, not to exceed $100, by building up where these costs are going to start coming from.

Then there was an extra work order No. 1618, reissued on March 5, 1962.

Supply necessary labour, equipment and materials to remove 69,800 cubic yards of additional excavation in road prism of northwest leg of Eglinton avenue interchange and four infield areas of interchange, ramps, to vicinity of station 340 plus 00 and incorporate same in parkway embankment. Payment to be on a unit price basis, additional to item No. 4 of the contract, unclassified excavation, $23,383.

Now there was another item in information to tender as in contract on page 3, which I have read to you previously, which specifies "Borrow." Borrow means having to take fill off site.

The tenderer's attention is directed to the special specification for borrow and item No. 5 in the tender form and is advised that this item may be deleted from the work should the resident engineer deem it feasible to require widening of the roadway excavation to obtain the necessary suitable embankment material. Should the latter

course be taken the excavation would be paid for under the "unclassified excavation" item.

Then on page 1, special qualification with reference to "borrow"; inter alia this page reads:

> Except that widening the roadway excavations, when permitted to obtain additional embankment material, shall be included under the item "unclassified excavation."

The contract also has these following provisions:

> Measurement and payment:
>
> The unit price bid for unclassified excavation shall include the cost of furnishing all labour, materials and equipment necessary to complete the work.
>
> General condition No. 3, contractors' undertaking:
>
> It is understood and agreed that the contractor has by careful examination satisfied himself as to the nature and location of the work.

This is the clause I read previously:

> (e) No credit underhaul—by lowering infield ramp area south side of Eglinton avenue for short haul to south approach to Eglinton overpass, which facilitated a scraper operation over Eglinton from north side where bulk of excavation was situated.

Although the contractor wanted to claim for borrow, he gave no credit for underhaul; that is, what he did not have to haul. By flattening the cut in the vicinity of unsuitable clay, they had made it easier for the contractor to haul, with less material to haul, but no credit was given.

On November 14, 1960, a letter was written by Fenco-Harris, consulting engineers, to Mr. Grant, the commissioner of roads:

> We enclose herewith for your records as requested, an account of the various factors which occasioned the issue of the subject work order.

That is work order 1618.

> A revision to ditch grades in northwest quadrant of Eglinton avenue interchange yielded approximately 5,000 cubic yards of material not originally called for in the contract drawings. The haul length from this cut source to the remaining incomplete embankment at the southern reaches of this contract exceeded the mean haul length upon which the contractor's unit price bid was predicated. For this reason, the contractor, Robert McAlpine Limited, notified the Metro roads department of their intention to claim for the extra costs incurred by this imbalance of haul length, and inasmuch as their earth-moving subcontractor could not be encouraged to remove the cut and have the question of compensation reviewed after the event, they had no other recourse than to ask for a decision on this issue as provided for in clause 31 of the general conditions of contract.
>
> Accordingly, a meeting was held in the department's boardroom on September 21, 1960, at which the contractor presented his arguments in support of the claim and requested that consideration be given to an increase of 33½ cents above the contract unit price bid of 30 cents per cubic yard for the removal of the material.
>
> The conclusion of this meeting was that a revised rate of 63½ cents per cubic yard be allowed for the removal of the yardage under question and the contractor was instructed to execute this phase of the work under work order 1618 without further delays.

On November 2, 1961, Fenco-Harris wrote to Mr. Bemrose, the chief project engineer, re overhaul:

> We are enclosing herewith for your consideration, copies of Robert McAlpine Limited's correspondence of September 29, 1961 and October 26, 1961, relative to their claim for overhaul as a result of the presence of 85,670 cubic yards of unforeseen plastic clay.
>
> In accordance with the specifications the contractor is not entitled to payment for overhaul. Item three of the general conditions of the contract states that it is his responsibility to satisfy himself as to the type of material and equipment necessary to remove this material, thus establishing the unit price bid for which no claim for damages or extra work occasioned by his relying on the information furnished by the corporation will be entertained.
>
> The accompanying correspondence and data has been checked and found to be accurate. The computations and quantities used in determining both the pre-contract and post-contract average haul lengths has been verified by our office and field records respectively. As a result of our review of their September 29th correspondence we contend that a true cost of overhaul should include only that equipment which is necessary to provide for the extra distance traversed.

This would rule out the labour and equipment used at the loading and dumping areas. Further discussion with the contractor resulted in the estimation of October 26, where the time and, therefore, cost of moving a station yard of excavation over the increased 536 feet was determined. The total amount claimed on the latter basis is $25,908.25.

It is our understanding that this claim and their verbal request for review of the classification of quantities as outlined in their letter of June 5, 1961, and our reply of June 14, 1961, are the only outstanding items of contract R4-59.

On February 7, 1961, a memorandum was made for Mr. G. O. Grant, commissioner of roads, by Mr. B. W. Bemrose, the chief project engineer.

It was found after this contract was in progress that an excessive volume of unsuitable material at the southerly end of the contract had to be wasted. Consequently, 762,023 cubic yards of fill was provided within the contract, but at an average haul distance of 535 feet further than anticipated when the contract was let.

I pointed out to Mr. Irving, general manager of Robert McAlpine Limited, that we could have asked his company to haul in borrow at the bid price of 20 cents per cubic yard. His reply was that 30,000 cubic yards, as called for in the tender form, would then have been increased by 2,400 per cent and this excessive increase would warrant a renegotiated unit price.

McAlpine's claim, I am going to base it on figures given here, total claim $24,-286.82. McAlpine has already paid their subcontractor, Anteci Construction Company Limited, the sum of $41,775, the invoice for which is attached. I recommend that McAlpine be paid $21,775, this being the amount they paid to the subcontractor on account of this claim.

After pointing out here that they were not obliged to pay it, simply because McAlpine had paid $21,775 to another contractor for doing that which he ought to have done, Metro roads department paid $21,775, of which half was paid by this government.

At the present time we are on contract R4-59. We have only been dealing with the excavation of the material to show that this contract was originally supposed to have been completed in 66 weeks. In fact, this contract was completed one year after the completion date. The penalty clause was not invoked; they have already overpaid on the road alone. Now we are going to get to the question of the steel. The whole thing is a steal, but in this particular instance, steel is spelled s-t-e-e-l.

On June 18, 1959, Newman Structural Steel of St. Catharines, who was the low bidder on the supply, fabrication and erection of the structural steel for this particular stretch of the highway, was approved as the contractor.

Subsequently, Robert McAlpine wrote a letter stating that this firm, who they had recommended, they now wanted changed and asked that the name of York Steel be substituted as the contractor. I might point out that for this change there was no council approval, as was required. Council, Metro council, did not approve this change. On August 26, 1959—by the way, if I may just refresh the memory of the hon. members, the contract was as I stated, to have been completed August 31, 1960—York Steel construction wrote to Robert McAlpine:

With respect to the above contract, we request permission from the consultant engineers to redesign the riveted plate girders to welded plate girders. Our reasons for this are as follows: 1. Because of the current steel strike in the United States and the tight steel supply situation even in Canada, the mills will not give us delivery before next January or February, 1960. Keeping this fact in mind, we feel that if the girders are of the welded design, we could have them fabricated and ready to start erection for some time in May, 1960, which is very close to the date required by your construction schedule. However, if these same girders are to be riveted, we would not be able to start erection before late July, 1960. 2. Because our bridge fabricating shop is equipped with the most modern and up-to-date automatic welding equipment, we are confident that the welded girders will be a superior product to the riveted girders both in strength and appearance.

Subsequently, a letter was addressed to Robert McAlpine by Fenco-Harris, dated August 28, Fenco-Harris being the consulting engineers for Metro:

We have received a copy of a letter dated August 26 written to your company by York Steel construction relative to the above subject. We have discussed the matter with Mr. Harold Tannenbaum and indicated to him our approval in principle of his proposal.

On March 8, 1960, you may recall a letter

I read to you from York Steel stated that the steel would be ready for erection sometime in May, 1960. By a letter dated March 8, 1960, there was a letter from Racey MacCallum and Associates, who pointed out there would be extra costs.

If you recall, Newman Steel of St. Catharines was approved for the steel contract. Subsequently the contractor was changed to York Steel because they wrote in their letter that they have all these wonderful shop facilities, the latest and most up-to-date automatic welding equipment.

On March 8 Racey MacCallum and Associates wrote to Fenco-Harris, consulting engineers:

> We wish to confirm the understanding reached during a telephone conversation between Mr. Weinstein of Fenco-Harris and the writer on Tuesday, March 8, 1960, concerning the above inspection. If the girders for the Don valley bridge are to be fabricated by Dominion Structural Steel Limited and not York Steel, additional travelling time and expenses will be incurred by our inspectors. Consequently we would like to amend our quotation to you dated March 4 as follows.

On March 17, 1960, Robert McAlpine wrote to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, attention Mr. B. W. Bemrose.

> We confirm that we attended a meeting in your office on Tuesday for the consideration of York Steel Construction Limited's request that certain sections of the steelwork be fabricated in Disco plant of Dominion Steel Company.
>
> Mr. Mac Tannenbaum explained that the request was made purely to ensure that fabrication and erection would be completed on schedule.
>
> York Steel's own plant was working to capacity on the steelwork for contract R39-59 and a large contract of some 13,000 tons for The Department of Transport.

I might point out that all these companies make sure that they finish their work for The Department of Transport on time, and The Department of Highways on time, because they do impose penalties provided in the contract; and they just completely ignore the work of Metro Toronto; and, I daresay in all probability, all these other municipalities.

> He asked permission for Dominion Structural to fit and weld the large girders for structure No. 312, with their work force. All materials will be supplied by York Steel and the work done to York Steel's working drawings. The responsibility for the work will be entirely York Steel's and their staff will closely supervise the fabrication.
>
> If there should be any additional charge from your inspection company due to the location of the Dominion Structural Steel plant, York Steel are prepared to accept them. In view of the recent steel strike in the U.S.A. we consider that York Steel's undertaking to adhere to the promised completion date for the five structures involved in the two contracts is very good and we shall be pleased to receive your formal approval to this request.

On May 13, 1960, Racey MacCallum and Associates made a report to Fenco-Harris, the consulting engineers charged with supervising the job. I will just read the relevant parts of the remarks:

> It will be gathered from our reports on this structure that the shop fabrication being performed by Dominion Structural Steel Ltd. has been very disappointing. It has been necessary for us to make repeated requests for improvement in the standard of the work being performed, and whilst the personnel concerned agree that an improvement is necessary, and promise to take the necessary action, the quality of workmanship does not materially improve. Accordingly we are being involved in a great deal of additional inspection of completed components to ensure that the final item is satisfactory in all respects.

On June 23, a letter was written by the project manager of Fenco-Harris to York Steel:

> Further to our discussion with Mr. J. Tannenbaum of your company, we wish to confirm our approval to accept one-inch high tensile bolts in lieu of those previously approved. This modification has been requested in order to correct the poor workmanship by your forces which resulted in malalignment of the bolt holes in the web, flange and spliced plates.
>
> We advised our steel inspection company of this modification and have requested that they strictly inspect the work to ensure a proper job. We were very disappointed and perturbed to learn that the subject girders were delivered to the site over the rejection of our inspecting company, Racey MacCallum. We find this situation intolerable and an indication of a lack of co-operation from your company. Should this situation continue, we may be forced to take drastic action.

On June 27, 1960—let me tell you, there were a lot of letters written with reference to this. I am only going to quote part of it:

> Four pieces of structural steel for the south pier and abutment sections had arrived on site on June 20 and 21, respectively. The consultants rejected this material due to the elongation and malposition of the holes in the splice plates. The sections were removed from the site to the steel fabricator's yard on June 21 for the necessary repairs, in accordance with the advice given the contractor at a meeting on June 8.
>
> The structural steel subcontractor had removed the bulk of his equipment from site on June 21. The latest report from the fabricator's yard indicated that the repair work was in hand but no date had been ventured for the return of the material and equipment to the site.
>
> The contractor would continue to urge the steel fabricator to effect the remedial work as expeditiously as possible. The net accomplishment in nearly one month has been the erection of two south approach spans.

On July 13, 1960—this is from the minutes of a meeting, number 12, Don valley parkway, contract R4-59:

> Structure 312: The structural steel contractor had returned to the site on July 7. Five south spans and one south pier section had been erected to date. The contractor had still some difficulty in aligning the splice plate holes, but intended overcoming this by templating. The consultants had agreed to this procedure. The contractor felt that it would require five weeks to complete the erection of the steel superstructure. Forming of the deck would not start until the steel was in final position. However, a token start has been made to prefabricate erection.

I am pointing out all these delays and how they are being caused, then I am going to ask why penalties were not imposed for this delay.

Minutes of meeting on Monday, July 25, 1960:

> Steel erection was to start on the north side of the river on July 26. Erection of the north span over the railway would start after the centre span was in position. The contractor was of the opinion that all structural steel erection would be completed by mid-August.

This is mid-August of 1960.

On August 30, the minutes of a meeting number 15 of the Don valley contract R4-59, held on August 25, 1960, was recorded:

> Structural steel erection was now substantially completed and the contractor estimated that the steel subcontractor would be off the site within 10 days.

As I pointed out, the contract was finally finished on August 31, 1961—a year later. During that time, Fenco-Harris was paid an additional $44,000 for supervision fees. No charges were made to the contractors or against the contractors for the loss of time. The interest charge on this money at five per cent amounted to some $110,000.

The citizens of this province lost the use of the highway, but not one cent was obtained from them in liquidated damages.

Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate. Do you want me to keep going for five minutes?

Mr. Speaker: Could the member finish in five minutes?

Mr. Ben: Oh, no. This was just—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Could we have some indication?

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister wants some indication? Mr. Speaker, I submit I was caught short because I expected the debates on the estimates to continue. I was preparing a mimeograph of all that I had been relating to this House so that I could simply put it on the hon. Minister's desk and not have to go through reading it. But because—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Why did the hon. member not say so?

Mr. Ben: Because it was not ready; it was in the process of being mimeographed. I have covered only one contract and I have two more contracts, so I shall be able to wind up the next time I speak. I intend to place this in the hands of the hon. Ministers with all the excerpts from the letters that I have written and cut it down considerably. Had I gone on when I expected to, it would have taken only perhaps 15 or 20 minutes. But such is life.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: From what the hon. member says, how much time would he require? We want immediate needs, that is why I am asking.

Mr. Ben: I should estimate that the next time I rise, I should be finished within the half hour. I so undertake.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, among the items for Monday will be included time for Budget debate to meet the hon. member's convenience. Would the hon. member make the motion to adjourn?

Mr. Ben moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on Monday the hon. members should be prepared to deal with the estimates of The Department of Transport, certain items on the order paper and the Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 122



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 30, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 30, 1966

Questions of Mr. MacNaughton re construction of Don valley parkway and Gardiner expressway, Mr. Ben 3955

Questions of Mr. Haskett re reflective licence plates, Mr. Ben 3955

Question of Mr. Dymond re quinine derivatives, Mr. MacDonald 3956

Question of Mr. Simonett re railroad overpass in East Zorra township, Mr. MacDonald 3956

Question of Mr. Rowntree re inspection of elevators, Mr. Young 3956

Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Ben 3957

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Boyer, agreed to 3961

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, continued 3961

Recess, 6 o'clock 3996

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 30, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as visitors to the Legislature today, in the east gallery students from St. Philip's separate school, Petrolia.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions. Two of them are addressed to the hon. Minister of Highways, notice of which has been given.

The first is: Would the Minister inform the House whether he intends to order a formal investigation into the operations of the Metropolitan Toronto roads department in connection with the construction of the Don valley parkway and the Gardiner expressway?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member, I would say that I have directed the Deputy Minister to look into the matter referred to by the member.

Mr. Ben: May I ask a supplementary question? Would the Minister define what he means by the phrase, "to look into"?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think the term "look into" is self-explanatory. I have no further observations or more broadened terms to refer to the House this afternoon.

Mr. Ben: If I may ask another supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Ben: I am asking the permission of the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I think the member has had a supplementary question and the Minister has replied to it.

Mr. Ben: Well, may I ask another supplementary question? The Minister nods his approval.

In view of the fact that I asked whether the Minister would order a formal investigation, will he deem his instructions to his Deputy Minister to be for a formal investigation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would say to you, sir, and to the House and to the member, that at this point it is impossible for myself to determine the extent to which a more formal investigation is required; only upon receipt of the information that is made available to me following the references I made that the Deputy Minister of Highways would look into the matter can this be determined. At this point, I simply repeat that the Deputy Minister will look into this matter and upon his advice then the matter of further investigation in any form will be dealt with, if necessary.

Mr. Ben: I have an inquiry of the Minister which I submitted as a question, but I will give notice of this to the Minister now.

Mr. Speaker: Is that the number of questions which I referred to the order paper?

Mr. Ben: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Those have been given to the Clerk at the table for placing on the notice paper. Any questions of a voluminous nature that require a great deal of research are questions for the notice paper. They must have some matter of urgency in order to be asked before the orders of the day. Therefore that particular group of questions by the member has been given to the Clerk and will appear on the notice paper tomorrow.

Mr. Ben: I have a question of another Minister, Mr. Speaker, but I would say there is some urgency to these questions. I would like to use the answers later today.

I have a question of the hon. Minister of Transport. Would the Minister inform the House how many briefs have been presented to the government requesting that all vehicles in the province be equipped with reflective

licence plates and could he advise whether he intends to take action on this suggestion?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a rapid check indicates that three briefs have been received, one of which was from the manufacturer promoting the use of the material. In addition, one resolution in this regard was received and it was supported by four municipalities. With respect to the latter, I wrote to each of the municipalities, supporting the resolution, requesting that they write again with any documented evidence they might have respecting the effect of reflectorized plates on the reduction of motor vehicle accidents. Some months have elapsed and I have had only one reply to date. It was from the city of Owen Sound and reads as follows:

> I acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 22, 1965, in respect to the resolution of the city of Windsor concerning use of reflectorized licence plates in the province of Ontario, which the city of Owen Sound had endorsed.
>
> I wish to advise that the city of Owen Sound does not have any documented evidence respecting the effect that the use of reflectorized plates would have on the reduction of motor vehicle accidents.

I have, however, instructed the director of the department's research branch to fully investigate the need for further reflectorization on vehicles.

Mr. Ben: A supplementary question that perhaps the Minister will answer.

In view of the fact that there are many automobiles being used in this province which have rear bumpers so designed that they obscure the licence plate, is any action being taken by the Minister's department to compel motor vehicle manufacturers to so construct their tail bumpers so that the licence plates will be fully exposed?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I shall look into the question the member has raised.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, my first to the hon. Minister of Health.

In view of the recent testimony to a Washington Senate sub-committee that Indonesian exports of raw material for making quinine and such derivatives as quinoidine sulphate have not been in short supply since 1964, and that price increases have resulted from the action of an international drug cartel, would the hon. Minister consider making representations to Ottawa to correct this situation?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, while I have no knowledge of this testimony before the Washington Senate sub-committee, my information is that Indonesia forbade the export of quinine derivatives. However that is beside the point. When I was asked the question about this some weeks ago in the House, I undertook then again to contact the Minister of National Health and Welfare, which I did, asking him to advise me what lay within the power of the federal government to control this matter. So far I have had no reply to my letter.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I might say to the hon. Minister he may be interested in the report in the *New York Times* on May 17, which gives the details of the testimony in Washington.

My second question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, with reference to the railroad overpass on the 13th line in East Zorra township, constructed as part of the Gordon Pittock dam development, (a) what is the cost of the structure; (b) what is the cost of the fill; and (c) who pays for this and in what proportions?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was unable to get the information requested by the hon. member this morning, but my people are working on it now and I will give him an answer later this week.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Minister of Labour.

Concerning the elevator which was installed in February of this year in a warehouse on Carlaw avenue and in which an accident took place as reported in the morning's *Globe and Mail*, has it been inspected by the elevator inspection branch; if not, why not; and are there any other elevators which were installed in Ontario this year that have not been inspected?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister of Labour was not listening.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was going to embellish his question further, and I was waiting for it.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister would be the first to complain if he did embellish his question.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part of the question, the elevator was not installed by any company

registered under the Act. No drawings were submitted to my department for approval, and therefore no licence for this elevator was ever issued, nor indeed would the department have any knowledge of it. We are at present considering what charges will be laid against those at fault.

As for the last part of the question, all elevators legally installed in this province have been inspected.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, in the light of the hon. Minister's statement that he has instructed his Deputy Minister to inquire into—or look into, to use his phrase—the letting of contracts by Metropolitan Toronto roads department, with reference to the Don valley parkway and the Frederick G. Gardiner expressway, and further to my undertaking to the hon. Minister of Labour last Friday that I would try to keep it short today, I shall so do.

During my address last Friday, during which time the hon. Minister of Highways was absent, I mentioned a number of instances wherein I felt the Metro roads department fell down in its procedure with reference to road contracts; in fact there are 15 points stressing these failures. I shall summarize them and stress where I feel investigation is warranted.

My first point dealt with the standard road contract used by Metro Toronto and I suggested that it should be examined and revised. The standard answer given to objections to the method in which payments have been made for what are sometimes called extras, is that it is strictly a question of the interpretation of the contract. I suggest that if the contract is that indefinite in its terms, then it definitely requires revision and should be updated.

Point 2 dealt with the prequalification of contractors. It is the practice in The Ontario Department of Highways to prequalify contractors to see that they are financially able to undertake the job for which they are tendering and that they also have the necessary forces and equipment to carry on the job and that they do not have other pending jobs which would make it impossible for them to carry on two jobs at the same time. I think this is a good practice and I laud the hon. Minister for having such a system in his department, but thinking that it is a good practice—and I imagine that he does, too, because he utilizes it—I can see no reason why it should not be imposed upon or adopted by the metropolitan roads department.

I feel rather certain that this inquiry which the hon. Minister has ordered will establish beyond the shadow of a doubt that many contractors took on additional contracts when they neither had the forces nor the time in which to complete the job within the specified time. In fact, you will find that many of these contractors, at the time they were supposed to be working on any specific contract, were engaged, at the same time, doing other contracts for Metro or doing other contracts for The Department of Highways, or doing contracts for both Metro and The Department of Highways. They only used the Metro contract as a stopgap measure, so to speak, because Metro did not enforce its liquidated damages clause for delays, whereas, I understand, The Department of Highways makes certain that there are no delays in the execution of its contracts and does impose penalties for delays.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): I am sure that the hon. member would want to be clarified on that one point. Prequalification at the level of The Department of Highways involves contracts for other jurisdictions, so when the hon. member says that a contractor can have work with the department and municipalities, this is not altogether correct. He may have work from municipalities, but if he has work for municipalities up to a portion of his rating, it affects the work he can have with The Department of Highways.

Mr. Ben: I thank the hon. Minister very much for drawing this to my attention. It merely stresses what I have already indicated, because although The Department of Highways would not give to a contractor an additional contract were he already engaged to the limit of his forces on, say, Metro work or for another municipality, the metropolitan roads department has to adopt the same attitude. In other words, it would not, in the same set of circumstances, deny him a contract with the Metro roads department were he the lowest tenderer, simply because he was already engaged under a contract with The Department of Highways. So, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has

added strength to my suggestion here with reference to prequalification.

The third point, which I have partly stressed, pertains to liquidated damages. In the investigations I carried on, out of eight contracts I think I found only one instance where liquidated damages had been asked for. They had been reduced to a pittance, although the contract there was overdue almost a year; I believe the amount charged was roughly for 40 days. The Department of Highways does invoke the penalty clause. As a matter of fact, it is for that reason that many contractors ignore Metro work because they find themselves having to complete their contract with The Department of Highways or face the penalties provided in those contracts.

I suggest that it is the practice in The Department of Highways to abide by the letter of the contract, which should be the practice in other jurisdictions over which this government has control, and which should impose the same set of standards.

Point 4 dealt with the claims board. I understand that The Department of Highways has a claims board to handle claims for extras in cases of contract dispute on a fair and efficient basis. This is a good practice for The Department of Highways to follow and I laud the Minister for having such a system. I suggest that it would be a good practice to follow for the Metro roads department because it would be faced with exactly the same types of problems.

I found in many instances—and the hon. Minister's investigation will also discover this—that payments were made for what were deemed to be extras without the concurrence of the consulting engineers or the project engineers. As a matter of fact, the investigators will find that the consulting engineers and the project engineers recommended against payment for extras, and yet a lesser sum was paid. But this was paid when the advice of the consulting engineers was to the effect that they were not to be deemed extra work and they should not be paid.

Lest there be any confusion, I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that most of these contracts for roads were let out on a unit cost basis. One cannot determine exactly how many cubic yards, or hundreds of thousands of cubic yards, are going to be required to be moved. A contractor, in preparing his tender, usually calculates the mean distance of hauling this soil and then determines his average costs and that is the tender figure that he submits.

I found many instances where, in my opinion as a solicitor, the extra work claim came completely within the terms of the contract and should have been paid for at a unit cost. But simply because this particular work was done toward the extreme length of the haul, the contractor asked for and received payment not on a unit cost basis, but on a cost-plus basis which, in some instances, was almost double the unit cost under the terms of the contract. I would not want the department to fall into the error of not catching that particular aspect of these contracts. That was point 4.

Point 5, Mr. Speaker, was with reference to my allegations that the Metro department is inadequate and inefficient in many aspects of its operation. I found that consulting engineers are used extensively on a selection basis approved by Metro council, but that these same consultants then supervised the job. Perhaps some people may not find anything wrong in such a system. The Department of Highways, when it is pressed, also uses consulting engineers. It has its own engineering staff and may engage consulting engineers for the purpose of preparing the plans and drawings of the highway, but once it goes into the course of construction, it is supervised by The Department of Highways staff. Perhaps the hon. Minister will correct me if I am not right in that assumption.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not altogether correct!

Mr. Ben: Not altogether? Then I would stand to be corrected so that I will not mislead this House.

In Metro, the consultants are continually supervising the construction of what they plan. I found out also that they were calculating into their costs—because they were working on a cost plus basis which, at that time, was 150 per cent—the cost of the utilities which went into the project, although they were ancillary: for instance, the cost of moving gas lines, the cost of hydro installations, the cost of Bell Telephone installations, even city sewers were calculated in the total cost of the project and the consulting firm was paid 150 per cent of that. They were also paid 1.6 per cent of the cost of utilities but then they were also paid 150 per cent for supervision.

They are now paid 200 per cent for supervision and I suggest that it would be much cheaper if the Metro department set up its own engineering department. After all, there is enough highway construction planned to

keep such a department engaged for at least the next 20 years.

Point 6 dealt with Ontario land surveyors. The department has six Ontario land surveyors, of whom one is the chief surveyor. But they have been spending most of their time on geodetic surveys rather than on title surveys. For title surveys, they have been engaging private land surveyors. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of money would be saved, money which belongs to the taxpayers, if the Metro council authorized the setting up of a well-staffed surveying department as is in the city of Toronto.

Point 7, Mr. Speaker, stressed that Metro farms out or contracts out almost everything. I would ask why should not Metro have a department to carry out the maintenance on its own roads? The number of roads falling within its jurisdiction is increasing year after year; why should all this work be contracted out? I suggest that the hon. Minister's deputy will bring back an answer that in most instances, if Metro had its own maintenance department, it could do a lot of this small maintenance work in less time than it takes to call for tenders where the work is contracted out. They would also do it much cheaper.

With reference to point 8, I pointed out the difference in the practice between that of The Department of Highways and that of Metro. The Department of Highways acquires land well prior to need and before prices shoot up. Metro acquires land at the last minute, just before need and sometimes after need, but after prices have gone up because of the presence of the proposed work. As soon as it becomes known that a major artery or major highway is going into an area, that a new facility will be there, this immediately causes the price of land to rise.

In the past, The Department of Highways has been prudent in that it has acquired much of the land it needs before values skyrocket. I think that is a very good practice and I commend the Minister for it. I suggest that such a system should be imposed on Metro council. It would certainly cut down on the cost of land acquisition.

In many instances, Metro's costs went up because they did not have the land on time. A good example was at the Eastern avenue bridge crossing the Don river. It also held up the contract. As a matter of fact, I was on city council at the time when city council procrastinated in supplying an alternate route where the Fred Gardiner expressway joined the Don valley parkway. That held up construction for a long time because they did not have the necessary land.

Point 9: During my address on Friday I drew the attention of the House to the contracts for the rental of chain saws and front-end loaders. I pointed out that Metro paid out over $8,000 for the rental of chain saws, which could have been purchased for one-tenth of the cost of rental. I provided the Minister with photocopies of the orders and the charges. I pointed out that in many instances the total rental charges exceeded by 200 or 300 per cent the amount approved. The Minister should also look into the question of the rental of automobiles. Is this method being used to circumvent council? If Metro were to buy motor vehicles, it would require the approval of council and someone might object that there was no need for any more cars. By renting them at $95 monthly, the commissioner can obtain his automobiles without the approval of council because he is theoretically spending less than $1,000 and is authorized so to do without council's approval.

I should point out also that Metro leased four vans for three years at a cost of some $3,600 per vehicle. These vehicles could have been bought for $2,400 or less. I say $2,400 or less because that is the price they were offered at when we made inquiries. If bought in quantities of four or more—I am sure that was only the asking price, not the final price—they could have been $2,400 or less and each had a trade-in value at the end of that period of approximately one-quarter. It cost twice as much to lease as it would have to buy.

Point 10. In making my investigations, I found out that in some instances payments were made where the approval of the project engineer and consultant engineer had been lacking. I imagine this could properly come under the department of the provincial auditor. In many instances, there just is not the co-operation between The Department of Highways and Metro council. For example, I submitted some questions which I referred to at an earlier time, questions which I put in the form of an inquiry. They were:

When was the Spadina road extension approved by Metro council?

When was the Yorkdale interchange approved by Metro council?

What was the estimated cost of the Yorkdale interchange?

What was the contracted price for the Yorkdale interchange?

What was the final cost of the Yorkdale interchange?

When was construction started?

When was it finished?

What have been the debenture costs to date for the interchange and when will it be put into use?

I think very many members of this House are familiar with the Yorkdale interchange, it is reputed to be the largest interchange of that type in the world—not just in Canada or North America, but in the world.

The method of this interchange coming into being is a little bit questionable. The route of the Spadina road extension has not even been determined; as a matter of fact the proposed route has been changed four times. We have a fantastically intricate interchange which is not receiving any use. Why Metro has not proceeded with the Spadina road extension is open to conjecture but the fact is that we have a multi-million dollar interchange straddling Highway 401, which has been completed for some time, which is not being used and which is incurring costs by way of interest-carrying charges every day that it sits there. And I will be very interested to find out the Minister's answers to this particular inquiry. It perhaps falls within Metro but I think that, since this government has been paying or has paid 50 per cent of the costs of that interchange, we should have these answers and the Minister should express much concern as to what is happening with that interchange.

Point 11 dealt with the use of consultants in an advisory capacity overseeing the installation of public utilities. I ask, is this necessary? Has not the city of Toronto, do not other municipalities, have their own engineering staffs to provide this work? I already dwelt on that under an earlier point and I will not press this issue further.

Point 12 dealt with the lack of co-operation between Metro and the city of Toronto and probably applies to Metro and the other municipalities. For instance, in one of the contracts, I found out that East York objected to trucks using its streets; it objected to the presence of a cement-mixing plant and it objected to many other facets of the operation which increased the cost of that portion of the Don valley expressway. That I consider is biting one's nose to spite one's face. Perhaps the hon. Minister will take this as an example for advocating total amalgamation.

Point 13: This dealt with the geodetic surveys. Geodetic surveys, I believe, come under the responsibility of the federal government. I cannot see the homeowners in Metro or the homeowners in any municipality and the government of this province being saddled with the cost of geodetic surveys. But they had planned to ask for $600,000 at the rate of $125,000 annually towards the expense of carrying out this geodetic survey. I understand that this amount was taken out of the Metro budget and I will not press it but I would suggest that the Minister have his deputy look into this question of geodetic surveys and ask why the province should be paying for something that comes, I suggest, within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

Point 14 dealt with highway safety. The outside guardrails and the guardrails in the centre strip of both the Gardiner expressway and the Don valley parkway were not constructed until well after the opening of these highways and after a number of lives were lost because of their absence. I would ask why they were not included in the original plans. Were the designers too busy supervising utilities to think of these safety features? Perhaps the department should compel these municipalities to instal or include safety features into their highways before lives are lost, and not after.

And last, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to instruct his deputy to look into the question of tenders. The contract calling for tenders provides that if a tenderer withdraws his tender before a contract is let, he stands to forfeit his deposit, even though he was not the lowest bidder—and he may have been the highest bidder—and stood no chance of getting the contract. But he still stands to lose his deposit if he withdraws his tender before the contract is let.

I found examples where the lowest tenderer and the second lowest tenderer withdrew their tenders after the lowest tenderer had already been approved by the executive committee. Metro council permitted them to withdraw their tenders, and did not retain the deposit. The contract was then given to the third lowest tenderer, and the third lowest tenderer was half a million dollars higher than the lowest tender. Now why have these rules for tendering—if they are so ready to give back the deposit with these tenders—if they do not follow them? What happens is that if the lowest tenderer sees that his contract is too much below the next lowest, or third lowest, he says "Oh my goodness, I must have made a big mistake," and he goes running down there and withdraws his tender.

Let him withdraw his tender, if that is the attitude they wish to adopt there, but I suggest that under those circumstances the deposit should be retained, or else it makes a mockery of the whole business of tendering.

Also, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. Minister will look into another facet. It does not fall completely within the hon. Minister's department, but quite recently a sewer contract was let, which ran about 75 per cent over the estimated cost – a difference between about $2.5 million and $4 million. The estimated cost was approximately $2.5 million, but because there is so much work for these contractors, they have been bidding high because they are not too interested in the contract, and a tender came in at approximately $4 million. I suggest that, under circumstances such as those, they should not award the contract at all, they should postpone the project, instead of paying about 60 to 70 or 80 per cent more than they estimate the cost to be, simply because there is too much work for contractors in that line of work. It does not fall within the jurisdiction of this particular Minister, but I think it does fall within the jurisdiction of some department of this government, and I would suggest that that be looked into also.

Finally, I have already heard that the engineer, a very qualified engineer, who spent 17 years working on the roads in the county of York and Metro stands in jeopardy of his job because he exposed a lot of these inefficiencies. Now I do not think we want another Paschal affair in the city of Toronto or Metro Toronto, and I think that the hon. Minster while he is making his investigations should see that this man's job is protected, because I am sure that when he completes his investigation, the engineer in question, Mr. Alman, will be lauded for his work and his job should be protected.

Thank you very much for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 32nd order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

(continued)

On vote 2101:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister tabled–

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member goes on, I would like to comment on the two Opposition speeches.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, if you will. The Minister of Transport.

Mr. Singer: No, if he wants to do that–

Mr. Chairman: It is customary for the Minister to reply.

Mr. Singer: I will be glad to yield the floor to him.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If it would please you, sir, I would like to make a few brief remarks on some of the matters raised by the Opposition spokesmen on Thursday night and Friday morning last.

First, I would like to compliment the hon. member for Grey North on his presentation, and for his deep concern for greater traffic safety, which we share. I am quite certain, however, that he had no intention of providing incorrect information to the hon. members of the House and in order to correct the record, I would like to state that of the 77 recommendations made by the select committee on highway safety, some 74 of them have been implemented either in whole or in part.

With regard to the New York state safety car project he mentioned, I would point out that I had considerable interest in this project before ever it was mentioned in this Legislature and it was on my invitation that Senator Speno came to Toronto to speak to the members of our standing committee.

The hon. member stressed that no financial assistance had been offered by this government, and we have no knowledge of any financial assistance being offered to this project by any state in United States, neither has the United States federal government, nor has our Canadian government committed any money to this project, to this date.

Mention was made to laws in the state of New York on safe tires. As of this date, six bills have been introduced. Only one has reached the Senate and is still under discussion. If it be eventually passed, it would not take effect until 1968. It is interesting to note that the specifications proposed are those of the vehicle equipment safety compact six, which are the same as I read to this House recently.

When we rose last Thursday night, the hon. member was reading a letter which he read again on Friday morning. It dealt at some length with U.S. and Ontario fatal accident records. I think, Mr. Chairman, that great care must be used when comparing

accident statistics with the United States, to ensure that the same formula is used in the preparation. Highway traffic deaths per 100 million miles of vehicle travel represents a complex of factors entering into both the numerator—that is, the deaths—and the denominator—the vehicle miles. The miles per gallon co-efficient that is used in United States is higher than that used in Canada, which means that when compared with Ontario, the amount of travel in the United States is overstated, and the death rate is understated.

Further, the rate must bear some relationship to traffic volumes and the urban or rural nature of the state or province. Since these factors are not taken into consideration, it is simply not possible to state that the rate is, say, in Kansas, any lower than it is in Ontario.

In reply to a question by the member for Grey North, let me state that no licence has been issued to Trans-American Truck Lines Incorporated.

Turning now to the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth East—and I would like to thank him also for his thoughtful presentation—I would like to clear up a point or two with respect to the hours of work for truck drivers that he raised.

The hours for drivers in intraprovincial operations are governed by The Hours of Work and Vacations With Pay Act which is administered by our Ontario Department of Labour, but hours of work for drivers in interprovincial operations come under the purview of the federal Department of Labour.

As regards compulsory vehicle inspection, the hon. member may have noted in my presentation of estimates, that we are proceeding with the expansion of our compulsory inspection programme, that all units of our enlarged fleet will be in operation this year at some 80 locations about the province.

As reference was made to compulsory inspection in British Columbia, I would point out that the programme is in effect only in the city of Vancouver, and it is operated by the city. All hon. members will perhaps be interested to learn that we have been approached by the British Columbia authorities regarding our own mobile inspection programme.

In Manitoba, the Legislature has just passed a bill which makes provision for regulations respecting compulsory inspection. The legislation is to become effective on proclamation.

The last matter, sir, raised by both speakers, related to speed limits. I must say I find it surprising that on one hand they are criticizing the accident rate, and on the other hand they are suggesting that the speed limits be increased. Speed limits on divided highways are presently under review and the hon. members for Grey North and Wentworth East will perhaps be interested to learn that not all citizens in this province share their point of view. A letter which I received only last week, prompted, no doubt, by articles in the press, read, in part:

> Do I understand the provincial government is considering increasing the speed to seventy on 401? This is fantastic and stupid. Most accidents have been traced to excessive speed. With the increase to seventy the speed will be eighty to ninety miles, as you well know. Where is everyone going in such a hurry?

The relationship between speed limits and accidents is complex. When we have received results from the current study, they will be reviewed with care before any action is taken.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I could spend a little time answering the answer, but we will let that go for the moment. I am particularly interested in the hon. Minister tabling this report just the other day. Now, this is a very interesting report. The report of the so-called automobile insurance technical committee to the Minister of Transport of Ontario, dated November, 1965. I will have comments later on the report, but I wonder if before I get into what the report says and who the committee is and questions about why they were constituted, is the hon. Minister planning to make any statement of policy on the matters in the report? I think it is high time that we did have a policy statement from the responsible Minister. Are you with me, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think the timing of the discussion of this matter, I suggest with respect, should be considered. While I welcome a full discussion on the automobile insurance and the compensation paid to those involved in accidents, I am wondering if perhaps vote 2101 is the proper place, or if it might better come up under either vote 2106 or, since I have planned to introduce an amendment to The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, indicated on the order paper, it might be suitable for discussion then. I would suggest that if it is coming up in the estimates it would be more appropriate in vote 2106.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if that is the hon. Minister's view I have two remarks. First of all, I do not think we should be confined to a discussion in principle of a statute we have not seen yet. Second, vote 2106 deals with the motor vehicle accident claims fund, and this report of the whole principle of automobile insurance is far more embracing. Third, the Minister chose to bring it in when he did; and finally, it would come under vote 2101, in my opinion, under item 6—fees for expenses with special studies and research. Now, it would seem to me that this is a special study in research and it should be here. The hon. Minister has chosen his ground, let us get ahead with it.

Mr. Chairman: I think, for the member for Downsview, the main thing is that he would like to be able to discuss it; he wants to make sure there is provision to discuss it. I would suggest to him that if he would like to discuss it at length, there would be no reason why he could not discuss it, I suppose, under automobile insurance—the second reading of the amendment to The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act. There is a notice of intention to introduce the bill, so I believe it will be introduced soon; possibly we will get around to it within 24 or 48 hours. The best time, perhaps, to discuss it at length would be on the principle of the bill, if there is no estimate before us.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that is not the case at all. The notice could stay on the order paper for ever.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): We do not know what it is.

Mr. Singer: We do not know what the bill is going to say. The bill may be a very minor one. We have got caught in this thing before. They may be changing a few commas or inserting a few "ands," "ors," "ifs," or "buts," typical of the way this department operates, and we would then be ruled out, either by you, sir, or the Speaker, as being told that that is not the principle of this bill. Now, the hon. Minister has chosen his own ground; he gave us the report with his own name on it. I do not know whether it was written by his own hand or not, but his own name is on it. He has chosen his ground and given us the report; let us have a policy decision; what is he afraid of?

Mr. Chairman: I can see the member's need for anxiety. He wants to make sure what is in the bill. If the bill is not before us before we complete the estimate, I assume then that we could discuss it under vote 2106.

Mr. Singer: But, why vote 2106, Mr. Chairman? There is an item under 2101—fees and expenses with special studies and research, $425,000. There was a special study done here by a gentleman named Linden, "report of the Osgoode Hall study," that is part of the $425,000. There is a special study done here by an insurance technical committee. I would think that is where we find money to pay for these special studies. Finally, sir, he has introduced his report here; he did it, so let us discuss it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to add with regard to this matter. I wish to discuss this report, too, and I have no doubt I will have an opportunity some time. I am always prepared to accept the hon. Minister's suggestion as to where he himself would like it to be discussed. If he believes that vote 2106 is the most satisfactory point, all things considered, I am perfectly willing to go along with that. There is one thing I would like to ask, however, Mr. Chairman. Some reference was made to the fact that the Minister is planning to make a policy statement. Will he be making that policy statement under the discussion of vote 2106, or at any rate, if he makes it before the orders of the day, will it be before we discuss vote 2106? I think my reason for asking is quite obvious. It is much more sensible, I think, for us to discuss some of these matters in the light of all the information and, obviously, a policy statement from the Minister is a vital piece of information.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the matter being discussed in the estimates. The 2101 estimate in the general office is a catch-all for all kinds of matters pertaining to this department, but when there is an appropriate vote that seems to relate to a matter, that would seem to be the best place to make the discussion, and since vote 2106 relates to this department's implication or involvement in insurance, to that measure, it would seem to me to be the logical place for it to come. In answer to the hon. member for Woodbine, I would think that if we are discussing the matter under that vote, that is the time I think I should make my statement on it that pertains to it.

Mr. Chairman: Knowing that the member for Downsview is a very co-operative member of the House, I am sure that he will want

to fit into our scheme of things under vote 2106.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the matter of procedure, there is another point on which I would like guidance. I wish to comment on certain matters relating to safety. The comments I have to make cut across some of the individual votes. Partly they would relate to the highway safety branch, partly they would relate to vehicle inspection, partly they just relate to the general policy of the department. I had planned to bring it up under item 6, in much the same way in which the member for Downview had intended to bring up this insurance matter under that item. I do not insist on that, I would just like guidance as to where would be the best place.

Mr. Chairman: As I understand it, the highway safety branch is dealing with the pamphlets, and the driving courses, and public school safety, and so on, but, actually vote 2104 deals more with the vehicle safety. Would this be correct, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Vote 2104 is the general motor vehicle administration, and without my anticipating what the hon. member for Woodbine may want to say, I can quite imagine that his remarks may be general and could quite possibly cross from safety education into vehicle inspection. From what he suggests, they may project into the motor vehicle accident claims fund, I do not know, but I do not think you can be rigid in these unless you want to make short statements on each one, pertaining to one particular section, and I think that may not be too practical.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I confused the issue when I referred to item 6, I meant item 6 of vote 2101. Anything I have to say on this topic will have nothing to do with the motor vehicle accident claims fund. It is a matter really of—well, it arises out of some of the Minister's introductory statements and affects the policy of the department and its study of the whole safety question. That is why I thought it might appropriately come up under item 6 of 2101. It goes well beyond the—

Mr. Chairman: Under brakes and lights and steering and—

Mr. Bryden: I am now thinking of the study the hon. Minister said that he has been giving to the question of vehicle design, for example. That is a much broader question than vehicle inspection. Also, the way in which that relates to the general problem of driver education and the proper attitudes on the road in promoting safety. These things are all bound up together and it is very hard to discuss one without discussing the other. At least, it is impossible to discuss them in a way that brings out what I think are the right points; if you try to deal with driver education as one topic, design of vehicles as another and inspection of vehicles as still another. So I would feel, Mr. Chairman, that the best way might be to deal with it under this first vote, but I am quite willing to accept whatever the hon. Minister considers to be the appropriate time.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I cannot anticipate what the hon. member wants to speak about. The votes seem to break down into a pretty orderly separation and surely we do not need to be so hidebound that we cannot hear an expression that runs over into a neighbouring vote, if it seems inextricably wound up and I think we can be perfectly reasonable.

Mr. Chairman: If it concerns votes 2103 and 2104, why do we not discuss it under 2103 and if we overlap into 2104 that will be in order. Vote 2101 is before us.

The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the main office, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister respecting the summary of motor vehicle traffic accidents statistics: A year ago, we were given a sheet which outlined all the accidents in the province and the data relating to those accidents. I may have missed something, but I do not recall having received such a sheet this year. There was a press release some time ago. I do not know whether these were distributed to the House or to the members or not.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, in the back of "Accident Facts, 1965," that went out, I think, to all hon. members, there is a sheet—it is a little bit smaller perhaps than the one the hon. member remembers for last year, but it is exactly the same sheet; it is just that the photography is reduced.

Mr. Young: And that is for the year 1965?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It covers the year 1965 and it was put out just as soon as it was available. As the hon. member must understand, the compilation of these figures takes a month or so and as soon as it was available, it was put out. That was a month and a half ago, I would think, and there was con-

siderable press on it at the time, if I remember.

Mr. Young: I remember the press, Mr. Chairman, but I do not remember the document. It may have come to my desk and I missed it, but was it mailed out to all the hon. members?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think all hon. members would get it in the mail.

Mr. Young: Yes, you will perhaps send me over a copy?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if his department makes any recommendations to any departments of the government concerning certain features that must be incorporated in the automobiles, trucks and so on, that are purchased by these departments? I note that the United States government has set up certain safety features that must be included in the vehicle before it will be accepted from a manufacturer. Now, various standards have been set for 1967 and 1968, and I do not want to go into a discussion of the 10 different safety features, but the idea that one department of government would suggest to all other departments that do purchase vehicles that these vehicles purchased must have certain safety features before they will be purchased is worthy of merit. I would like the hon. Minister's comments on that.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In the United States, in Washington, there is a general services administration that has been drawing up these desirable features for incorporation on cars being purchased by the United States government. Now this is under consideration here too and we have been looking at all of the safety features that GSA lists that are listed in other recommendations. These are all under study, but at this time we have not, as yet, set any standards in regard to having these additional features—beyond what are available to the public—installed on all government-purchased cars for Ontario. In fact, the federal government is, at this time, looking at that also, but I think we are considerably ahead of it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hon. Minister speeds up his action on this because I think the thing is deserving of implementation and the sooner it is implemented, the sooner we curtail the number of accidents that involve vehicles belonging to various departments of this government.

I would like to ask of the hon. Minister, the total cost of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study?

While his deputies are looking up the answer, I would like to ask another question of the Minister, and that is, is the department considering assisting the transit systems of municipalities by rebates of fuel taxes or by the elimination of taxes on fuels used by the transit systems of the various municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: While we are trying to get the exact figures on the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study last year and those in the estimates for this year, I will take the hon. member's second question with regard to assisting local urban transit systems.

We have not made any decision yet on what assistance will be given to municipal transportation systems at this time. As the hon. member knows, this is one of the things that we expect will emerge from the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. The administration and the financing of urban transportation is part of the concern we have at this time. The amount of money being spent on roads is getting so high. By transferring some of the do-it-yourself driving into the public transit means we can cut down on the number of roads that would have to be built, and we provide the people with a more economic and more efficient means of moving. That is one of the ancillary benefits, I think, that will come from this Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study, on which we hope to have final reports early in the coming year. There will be a second part of the final report out by the fall of this year and we expect the concluding section of the final report of the preliminary conclusions early in the new year. These reports should be one of the interesting new things that may come from it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, that deals with the Metropolitan Toronto area only. The problems of transportation in a smaller municipality are much different than they are in the Metro area, and surely an experiment could be conducted with some municipality by subsidizing the transit system after some fashion. If this is not done, there are going to be more and more transportation systems in municipalities going

under, or if they do not financially become bankrupt they will be taken over by the municipality and will have to be subsidized by the municipal tax rate.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the hon. member misunderstands the purpose of all of the work being done on the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. What is being developed is a tool for trip prediction and choice of trimodal split of means of communication and travel, out of which we will devise a programme that will be of help in other communities and in other rapidly developing urban areas.

Therefore, all of the urban centres of Ontario stand to benefit from the results of the study being made in Toronto. Apart from the actual statistics that we get that apply to Toronto only, we will have devised a new type of tool with which to estimate the needs and the transportation problems of other urban municipalities and the ways in which they can best be financed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I am in the wrong slot about motorcycles in this vote 2101—motorcycles and motorcycle drivers? I would like to get some of the ground rules clear so that we will know where to go. It may be 2104, but the point about motorcycle drivers is that there are no examinations.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That will come under the driver examination branch.

Mr. Singer: I see. If the hon. Minister wants to talk about lack of examinations under the driver examination branch, that is fine.

Let me get into this one: Is the hon. Minister familiar with the Cornell aeronautical laboratory at Cornell University? Could he tell us about the discusions that it apparently has had with his department about its desire to do some research into our rather shocking death rate? I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this organization has been very anxious to come in here and do a study and has received absolutely no encouragement from the Minister or his department. Could he tell us about that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I am not sure of the organization to which the hon. member refers. Is it TIRF—traffic injury research foundation?

Mr. Singer: Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory Incorporated of Cornell University.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think we have had any direct approach from Cornell on this. We have had representation made to us when the group from TIRF, that is, traffic injury research foundation, in Ottawa, came forward. I associated myself with them when we discussed matters pertaining to accident review with the hon. Attorney General and the Ontario provincial police.

The latest news on an overall study of traffic accidents is the one being proposed in Ottawa at this time where there is consideration being given to establishing a national centre for the examination of motor vehicle accidents. I think it would be a most appropriate thing for the federal government to take on and it would be of immense value to us and to all the provinces in Canada. They have the facilities for it and we would be more than happy if that were forwarded.

Mr. Singer: Are the people in Ottawa talking to the Cornell University people?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would think that the TIRF people in Ottawa would be speaking for themselves and for the Cornell study in their representations for the federal government.

Mr. Singer: Now, is that Cornell study, is the Minister sufficiently familiar with it, is that conducted by a non-profit organization? Would there be a charge to the Canadian people or the Ontario people for it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The ACIR study, the automobile crash injury research, is being done by the university in the United States, at Cornell. I do not think there would be any charge to us for it. It would be largely supported by the industry in the United States.

Mr. Singer: Well, I have a letter here signed by B. J. Campbell, doctor of philosophy, who is head of the accident research branch of the transportation research department, who says:

> We are continuing to discuss with Canadian officials the possibility of a data collection programme in Ontario but no conclusions have been reached.

And that letter is dated January 28, 1966. I would have thought that the logical person to ask about it would be the Minister of Transport. It seems to me that here is an eminently qualified organization that conducts this kind of inquiry on a non-profit basis, and we certainly need statistics and studies into our rising accident rates and our rising death rates and I thought the Minister would have been just overflowing with information of this kind.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will just answer this. There was a member, as I recall it, from Cornell, who accompanied representatives from TIRF, Dr. Wilson, and Air Vice-Marshal Kerr, when they came here and when we discussed the matter with the Attorney General's department and the Ontario provincial police. There was some further material, I remember, when the meeting closed, that they were going to provide to the provincial police, as to the nature of the data collection. They were trying to reach some means of, I would say, reducing the amount of time and work that would be consumed, which apparently was one of the bottlenecks as far as the OPP was concerned. As I remember it, when the meeting concluded, it was left with the TIRF who were acting you might say as the Canadian agents for ACIR, the Cornell group, to come up with some revised programme that would fit in better with the kind of work the police felt they could do here.

Mr. Singer: If the hon. Minister can even recall preliminary discussions and it would seem to me this kind of study would be most helpful to the work his department is embarking upon, I would have thought the Minister would have been pursuing this. Is there any correspondence being exchanged, has there been any encouragement given to these people who want to come in and do a helpful study apparently at no cost to us?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think as I have explained it is chiefly a matter of manpower and time and is being discussed between the Attorney General's department and the provincial police and the ACIR people or their Canadian counterparts, the members of TIRF.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but it is no manpower and time for us, they are prepared to come in and investigate and tell us, are they not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is only a part of the story.

What they want to do, sir, is to have the OPP collect the data for them and they want to collaborate with the OPP both on the site of the accident and at the hospitals. All of this tends to increase the amount of time and work on the police officers and that, as I recall, is where the matter rests at this time.

Mr. Singer: Has the hon. Minister had recent consultations with Commissioner Silk of the OPP? Has the Minister discussed this with him, had any meetings with him about it? Does he resist this type of suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is the concern of the Attorney General at this level.

Mr. Singer: No, but this is the Minister of Transport; I would think that if there is available help apparently at a no-cost basis, and it concerns both this Minister and the Attorney General, that this Minister and his colleague, the Attorney General, who sits only a couple of seats away from him, would have gotten together and talked about it. The Minister would be able to tell us that either the Attorney General agrees it is valuable or it has no value. The Minister would have an opinion of whether it is valuable or has no value. But as far as I understand it from the meagre information available to me as an Opposition member, here is a non-profit organization which wants to come in and help the people of Ontario in cutting down these accidents and figuring out methods of better collection of statistics, and so on. And I would have hoped the hon. Minister would have had some opinion about it and would have followed it up, rather than saying it belongs up in Ottawa or it belongs in the Attorney General's department or perhaps no one has spoken to the commissioner of the OPP. Has the Minister followed it up at all?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think I have made it quite clear to the member where the matter rests. It is between the OPP and the TIRF people who are acting here for ACIR to establish what kind of reporting forms would be acceptable to both and that is where the negotiation at this moment stands.

Mr. Singer: It rests and rests and rests.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the questions raised by the hon. member for Downsview because the other day I asked a question along this line of the hon. Attorney General and at that time he had exactly the same amount of information, or less perhaps, than the Minister of Transport. This matter has been in the air for some time, the Cornell aeronautical laboratory, which is a branch of the Cornell University and situated in Buffalo, has been conducting these studies into accidents in motorcars for some years. They are undertaking a specific project at this time and what they want is specfic information regarding accidents involving small cars. They have not enough small cars in the United States in proportion to the population. They feel that we have enough in Ontario so that the data would be significant, and so evidently they made some approach somewhere, through somebody, to get

permission to get this information already in the files of the OPP and the co-operation of the OPP in conducting their studies in the future.

This matter was raised at the Ontario medical association recently, when the subcommittee under Dr. Loudoun brought in its report and that report indicated that there was real difficulty in getting the co-operation between the Cornell people and the authority in Ontario, whoever it might be. The OPP was mentioned in that report. Now, Dr. Loudoun was very concerned about this and his report expressed that concern, that they were unable up to this point to do anything about it. At that point, I asked the question in the House of the hon. Attorney General. The Attorney General said he had heard nothing of such approaches. Now, that baffled me, because it looked to me as if the approach must have been made to the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Health or, indirectly perhaps, to Commissioner Silk, I did not know, and still do not know where that approach was made. I have taken steps to get further information about it.

It seems to me that this is a place where co-operation could take place, where we could get very significant information from the Cornell people in return for our co-operation, and as the hon. member for Downsview points out, without expense to us, except perhaps in the time that is involved by our people on the police force, to get and to make available this information.

Now, if we are serious about this whole matter of research into what causes accidents, if we are concerned about what is happening on our highways today, then we must be willing to co-operate with perhaps the most significant group of researchers in this field on this continent. There are others in Europe which are doing parallel work and with very great success, but on this continent, I do not think we have a more knowledgeable group, perhaps, than the group centred in the Cornell laboratories. It seems to me that here is a place where the hon. Minister might really co-operate and if it is not his department, then perhaps he could talk to the hon. Attorney General, or the hon. Minister of Health, and work out some way by which Ontario might co-operate in a significant way with this research project and, in return, get very significant information for our use in cutting down this tragic death toll on the highways of Ontario.

I do not know whether the hon. Minister wants to make further comment. I have another couple of problems I want to raise.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the hon. member for Yorkview perhaps puts his finger on the confusion there is, because he speaks of the ACIR or the Cornell study and the Attorney General did not recognize an ACIR or Cornell study, it is probably because of the fact that the approach to him and to me at that time was made through TIRF, the Ottawa group, and the Attorney General may not know it, but I do, because we have had conversations before with Cornell. But the Cornell group are not going to do any work for us. The collection in Ontario will all be done in Ontario, and when the information is collected, and passed on, it will be processed through the Cornell study and we will get the results from them. That is the part they would play in it.

If there is a lack of harmony between what the hon. Attorney General said and what I said, I think it derives from the fact that the member probably asked if he had had correspondence or conversations with ACIR or Cornell, whereas the group he was discussing the matter with was the TIRF group from Ottawa.

Mr. Young: I thought perhaps if he did not have direct communication with the Cornell group, he might have had it through the doctor's subcommittee, but it did not happen that way, I know that now and that is why I asked the supplementary question I asked at the time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister for making available these accident facts for 1965. I do not remember getting them, as I said before, and I have them now.

Before one can discuss these with some degree of clarity, I think one would have to bring a magnifying glass in and have a look at these statistics in the back. Perhaps they could be printed another time with a little more clarity, for those of us who have to wear glasses. This is simply a suggestion I pass on to the Deputy Minister for his information in the future.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the hon. Minister might give us some further information about the problem we have of determining the actual cause of accidents. This has been raised in the House before, but I would like to direct this to the hon. Minister himself, because for years now, we have been very much concerned about safety in many other fields. Boiler inspection, factory inspection, equipment in factories, machines, have been safeguarded over the years until accidents are very rare except from sheer human carelessness. But

the motorcar, it seems, has not been subject to this kind of analysis and this kind of safety legislation, and so we have pointed the finger at the driver without knowing definitely whether or not the driver is, in all cases, responsible.

In the reports which are given, or turned in, in respect to accidents, certain data is established. The police have their reports to turn in, but they are pretty flimsy reports when it comes to actual details and those have been produced in this House and commented upon. But beyond that, we have very little knowledge as far as the police are concerned, as far as the department is concerned. But there is knowledge available, and that knowledge is with the insurance companies themselves.

Every time there is an accident, the insurance adjuster digs into this thing very, very carefully and very much in detail and those files in the insurance companies are full of data. I had one of the executives of an insurance company admit this to me not very long ago, but he said they have made no attempt to correlate that data and to find out where accidents are really caused. Because, as I pointed out to him at that time, and I pointed out to the House before, if we could correlate the data that is now available, we could find out where there is danger in the motorcar, what part of the structure of a motorcar is more dangerous than another part, where the head may hit in the interior of the machine, where the pedestrian encounters the danger on the outside of the machine. We need to know these things and this insurance man admitted that likely that data is there.

But, because of the reticence of the insurance companies, I suppose, to name models and makes of cars, they have done nothing with it. Now, it seems to me that the general public is entitled to know whether or not the kind of car they are driving is accident prone, whether it has a record of accidents or whether it has not, and what might be done by that driver, by certain modifications which are possible, to make the changes to make it safer for him to ride in it.

I would ask the hon. Minister if there is any thought given to this phase of his work, to co-operate with the insurance companies, or to introduce legislation which will make it mandatory for these records to be produced, so that they can be processed and so that each one of our people who is purchasing a car, or is driving a car, can know what these danger points are.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment as to whether this kind of action is contemplated by him.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: First of all, I would just point out to the hon. member that section 142 (5) and (6) require the reporting of accidents and we rely, for our compilation, on the reports that come to us largely from the police, required to be made to the registrar. Many of the reports are made in confidence, so that when the hon. member says they are flimsy, I will admit that some of them are more flimsy than we would like, but some of them are not as flimsy as that.

With respect though, to the pinpointing of weaknesses in individual cars, and to factors in individual designs or models of cars that may be contributing to more than normal number of accidents in crashes, this is the very kind of thing that this Cornell study to which he has referred, is directed, and they have put out substantial reports on various cars and various models and various makes.

Mr. Young: Yes, but Mr. Chairman, the Cornell study, while it has been doing this over the years, has always refused to make public this kind of data, so that the public which has to drive the car, the public which is injured and which is killed in imperfect cars, just does not have access to this kind of data. It seems to me that if we are going to get this data, then some legislation must be forthcoming to make this data available to the suffering public, not only from Cornell, but specifically I mentioned the insurance companies, which may have today, and likely do have, this data available to them.

The other facet which the hon. Minister mentioned is important, too, that the returns which the police actually make to him must be updated. I raised this with the Minister of Health, and he assured me that he would look into this matter of reporting, and see what changes could be made in the forms, so that more data would be given. I hope that the Minister of Transport will co-operate with the Minister of Health in this field and that this kind of data might be brought forward.

There is another matter which also, I think, in this same field, Mr. Chairman, might be brought to the Minister's attention. I have in my files, copies of certain service bulletins that have been issued to garage owners and to mechanics about certain defects in the motorcars manufactured by the industry. As we all know, over the last month, Senator

Ribicoff of the United States demanded that the industry file with his committee a list of all the recalls that the companies had made for repairs, because of defects built into the cars. Now, that list is available, I have a copy of it here. I think all of us have seen it in the press. But, the problem has been, over the years, that the motorcar companies, while they knew these defects were there, and while time after time the people suffered because of those defects, the car companies, while they issue these directives to their dealers and to the garage owners, have not seen fit to say to the general public, "This is wrong with your car."

Now, I happen to be driving a 1965 Chevrolet and that particular model and make of car has a serious defect, and 1.5 million of them have been called in. But last year, last winter, in several instances I had to reach down with my hand and pull the accelerator back up because the engine was roaring and the accelerator would not come back. I took it in to ask about it, and I was told that the floormat must have jammed the accelerator, that something may have happened, that it just was an accident of fate, and this is the first time it ever happened.

It is amazing the fairy tales that one hears in the field of automobile repair. I can tell you a good many of them but, Mr. Chairman, the fact is, and we now know, that 1.5 million of these cars have been called in for that one particular weakness. In other words, the dealers at that time must have known; if they did not know of that defect, there was something wrong. I have here a letter from a Mr. Mundinger, who has given me permission to use the information. Mundinger, Mr. Mundinger, I said. He owns a chain of music stores.

An hon. member: Is he German?

Mr. Young: I believe he is German. He also instructs the young people in music.

Last winter, one of his teachers was driving his car, and he was in it. They were going out to a music lesson at a certain place and they came up a grade. When they reached the top of that grade it was snowy and icy. The accelerator stayed down and the car shot forward. The driver was a little excited and did not know what to do. The car shot off the road, hit a tree, spun around, backed into a house, and he has had a certification from the machinist and some others that the accelerator had stuck. But when he took it into the garage, and then finally took up the matter with the company, they had never heard of this thing happening before. They would take no responsibility for it, and so he dropped it until, suddenly, in the newspaper he read that 1.5 million cars have been called in for this very matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when faults of this nature are built into cars, and when they are discovered, the public has a right to know that they are driving a dangerous vehicle. They have a right to know that, and they should not have to wait until a committee in the United States, in Washington, suddenly unearths this thing, makes a discovery, and then the thing is made public. And at that point it is discovered that every motorcar company has called in car after car after car for very serious defects that were built in. Quietly, many of them have been saying to their dealers: "Call them in, or when they come in, do the repairs, but do not talk about it."

Now, it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Transport, Mr. Chairman, has a responsibility. A responsibility to ask one thing. To ask that every time a service bulletin of this kind is filed with the dealer, it is also filed with the Minister of Transport. That should be his responsibility, so that every service bulletin that goes out, particularly those speaking of defects in the construction of motorcars, be filed immediately with the Minister of Transport in Ontario. I am only speaking of Ontario now.

Then, that having been done, the Minister of Transport owes it to the public to do two things. To contact the industry concerned and say, "These cars must immediately be called in," and give them a deadline if he wants to. And then to let the public know within a reasonable length of time, within a very short length of time, because people may die in the meantime, what these defects are.

In other words, he has an obligation to say to the industry, "You fix them." And second, he has an obligation to say to the driver, "This is wrong; take your car in and get it rectified." Now, Mr. Minister, I would like to know if the Minister has given any thought to this kind of mandatory action, because unless it is mandatory, I do not think we are going to get the co-operation he dreams about with the motorcar industry.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think the point the hon. member has raised is a very interesting one. He did not use the figure but I think it was 18 per cent of all the cars produced in the United States and Canada over recent years, have been subject

to recall for some kind of check, and it is an acknowledgment of the industry of that fact, in a public way today. And this is one of the benefits that has come from this intensive light that has been focused on the manufacturing industry.

Mr. Young: They were forced to do it, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is what I say, this is one of the good results that has come from this study, and this intensive focusing of the light of inquiry on the automobile industry. The industry is now publicly notifying all the people who have purchased cars with discovered defects. I happen to be the recipient of one myself.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Did your accelerator stick too?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not even know what the trouble is, it was just pointed out there was a defect in the car and the distributor would like it if I would bring it in for a recheck. But it is an indication that the companies are becoming more responsible to the end purchaser in that respect now, and I think we can follow up the suggestion made and see if it is a practical one first of all.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, one other question I have in respect to this vote, and I might as well bring it now while I have the eye of the Chairman, and that is in connection with the New York safety cars. The hon. Minister mentioned it a while ago, and indicated that so far no action has been taken by other jurisdictions in providing funds. He is right in this. New York itself now looks as if they will designate a good amount of money for it, they have already completed the first phase of the study, but it seems to me that here is a place where the Minister of Transport might lead. The whole concept of safety in the motorcar industry is one, so far, of putting safety devices on to existing motorcars, so each year they add one or two devices, and I want to say a few words about that in another vote. But this is not enough. We ought to look at the motorcar itself, at the fundamental structure of the motorcar, of the whole concept of the motorcar, because one thing emerged in the hearings in Washington about this and the ones in Iowa and Albany and also in California.

One thing emerged, that the motor car industry, or the motorcar as we drive it, is fundamentally the same machine as it was half a century ago. There have been modifications here and there, but there has been no attempt on the part of the industry to look at the car from a structural point of view, and to see whether or not the kind of changes that have been brought to pass in the whole aviation industry, for example, and in the rail industry, might be brought to the motorcar industry itself. In the air, we are getting a vastly different kind of machine than we got back in 1950, yet, fundamentally the motorcar today, with certain modifications, is the same car, the same concept, as half a century ago. And so, I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, that this concept that the New York committee is undertaking is carried through.

I know that there is tremendous pressure against them. The industry itself has indicated that they just do not want it to happen, and the lobbying that is taking place against this is powerful and sustained. But the concept here, Mr. Chairman, is that the car ought to be built around the driver, just as the astronauts have found a capsule built around them. The visibility ought to be important so that the driver can see in all directions easily. The structure of the car should be such that every possible hazard is removed in case of accidents, and there always will be accidents as long as there are people.

The time is here when Ontario, it seems to me, could team up with the state of New York and say to them across the border: "We are willing to go along with you, we are willing to co-operate in every way, shape and form we can to make this project a reality, to discover if in fact there are new concepts of building and of structure, if in fact there are ways and means of constructing a motorcar which can save, as the Fairchild-Hiller people think, up to half the lives that are now being sacrificed on the highways, and half the injuries." I do not think we should dismiss this in a cavalier fashion by saying that Washington has not yet come through and other states have not yet come through.

I think it would electrify the situation in Washington and in the United States if Ontario, where the major part of the Canadian automobile industry is located, would say to New York: "We are with you 100 per cent. Tell us how we can co-operate, let us get together and let us work out this co-operative venture."

Now, in the first vote in section 6, there is provision for this kind of financial help and other help that the Minister may work out. It seems to me that we ought to take action here and we ought to get busy about it. I would like to hear the hon. Minister give the House some indication of what his thinking is in this whole field.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, in the first place I might point out to the member that in the amendment to The Highway Traffic Act, section 50(a) would be amended to enable the Lieutenant-Governor in council to make regulations requiring the use or incorporation of any device in or on a vehicle and that may affect the safe operation of the vehicle. I think that is reaching well into the area that he has in mind of not only accessories or attachments or gadgets but basic structure.

He says the structure of a car has not varied much in the last half century. I think that is going back to pretty early days, and certainly the frames of automobiles, the spring suspension and the nature of steering have changed tremendously. They may be oriented one to the other in somewhat the same relationship that they were in those days but the construction of the vehicle per se has certainly changed greatly, including the nature of the body itself, with the unitized or all-welded structure.

There has been a great change in that direction. But it is not enough for safe cars simply to specify a gadget if the basic structure is at fault.

I would say with respect to the study that is being made by the New York safety car group, that I was disappointed when the senator came here that the project had not advanced further than it had. I think our position is very sound at the moment, of seeing what the further steps are that are to be taken with this, because there is a great deal to be done in it. The progress that has been made so far can be acknowledged but there is a great deal yet to be done.

I think our position is very sound and we are watching this to see what can come of it. I do not think it would be Ontario's place to jump in advance of the allocation of funds from the United States federal government, which is going to have a $700 million safety bill that is going to take care of things of this kind. I am not disallowing that we have interest in it, but I think to move at this time to put funds into it would be premature.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two points that I wanted to raise but I wonder if I might just add a footnote to the point we have been discussing.

I have been struck with the multiple standard that apparently has been exercised in the attitude of governments towards industry when the product of that industry might represent a threat to the welfare of the community or to people in the community, and the general laxity with regard to the automobile industry.

For example, we are constantly hearing—I would say almost once a month—of instances where certain airplanes have suffered an accident, and immediately, there does not need to be any dictate from government, the airplane companies will ground these planes and they will examine them and these planes will sit in airports all over the world until they have completed this examination.

Presumably the only difference between that and an automobile is that in the instance of an airplane, if it crashes, 75 or 100 or 125 people may go at the same time. This has an obvious element of drama in it. But if an automobile has a defect in it and the people are being killed one at a time or two at a time, the drama is dissipated to the point that there has only now been this inclination that if you have a defect in the automobile, it is going to be withdrawn.

This is true in so many other fields that it makes one wonder whether or not there has been an automobile lobby that has virtually had governments in its pocket for years. For example, we periodically hear of drug companies that have discovered that a drug has been put out with a defect in its formula. Considerable effort will be expended, voluntarily or on the dictate of a government department, to recall these drugs with all the difficulty of getting them from the drugstore shelves to make certain that they are withdrawn for examination and taken out of the trade.

I can recall a year or so ago—the exact detail of it has escaped my mind but I am sure members of the House will recall—how one of our meat packing companies in this area discovered there was some defect in the preservative that was going to be used in the meat and that this meat might be going bad. It spent, I am sure, thousands of dollars to reclaim meat that had got on to little country store shelves all over not only the province of Ontario but this whole country.

Yet only now, by dint of extensive effort and the most incredible kind of exposé and focusing of public attention, have we got an acceptance by (a) the industry and (b) the government, to see that if a defect emerges in an automobile, this shall be reclaimed and checked over so that the public are not going to be the innocent victims of accidents which were predictable. Indeed, one might put it this way, Mr. Chairman: that the automobile industry has got away with murder, figuratively and literally, up until this point.

I would just like to add and leave the matter—because my colleague, the hon. member for Yorkview, has put the case pretty comprehensibly and after a pretty detailed study both here and in the United States—that surely the government has a role to play. I am just a little bit puzzled as to why the government has been so slow in accepting this role when it is accepted in its relationship with so many other industries.

Mr. Chairman, the main point that I wanted to raise in the policy section of the first vote in connection with these estimates is that the government moved about three or four years ago, if I recall correctly, perhaps it was longer, to separate from The Department of Highways certain sections of that department's work and to establish a Department of Transport. It was my hope and expectation that this department was going to engage, among the many studies which it has now launched, on a study of basic transportation policy, the relationship of transportation and the various forms of transportation.

The party I am associated with has been interested in this for literally a generation at the federal and the provincial levels. It has been part of our programme, certainly as long as I had any conscious association with the CCF party, that we should establish a national transportation policy. I want to submit that the same thing is true at the provincial level and that some time I hope this government, through whatever department it desires—The Department of Transport obviously is the appropriate one to tackle it—should undertake some sort of study to seek a rationalization of transportation policy.

I do so for this reason, Mr. Chairman: I am convinced that if we were to make a study of the facts we would discover that in various ways the public Treasury is subsidizing all of the various forms of transportation so that they are competing with each other. The subsidy is often to compensate for the losses that have grown up because of this competition, with the result that we, the public, through the public purse, are subsidizing all forms of transportation.

I am not going to take a great deal of time, Mr. Chairman, because those who are interested can go back and read speeches that have been given by myself or other members of this group, I think, at the beginning of the consideration of the estimates of this department for the last three or four years. But I think if members pause for one moment and consider highway transport, water transport, air transport and road transport, they will find that there are significant subsidies that have gone into each one of these forms of transport.

I submit that the public purse is subsidizing what is, for the most part, a private enterprise, to the extent that this is the case in transport today. It is a legitimate right of governments, on behalf of the public, to examine what is happening and how we can work out a rational transportation policy so that we can minimize the amount of subsidy that we put into it. This, surely, is only an elementary protection of the public purse and the expenditure of the hard-earned taxpayers' dollars, and yet we have no suggestion that this kind of thing is being tackled at the provincial level.

Mr. Chairman, in a sense of defeatism, I would not have bothered raising this issue this year, except that I must say I was a little startled to discover that the approach of the Liberals at Ottawa to these basic problems is in conformity with that phrase that we so often apply to this government—"in the fullness of time." After some 20 years of pleading, at least by the CCF and the New Democratic Party—and I know others; I am not suggesting that we are the only ones preoccupied with this—apparently the problem is being recognized as a problem in Ottawa.

That is the first step forward.

I have here the rather extensive report of a speech that was given in the city of Winnipeg by the Minister of Transport, J. W. Pickersgill, reported in the *Globe and Mail* on April 29, 1966—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A fine fellow!

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, but he is a good Tory; it takes him 25 years to recognize the problems and get them talked about.

Mr. Sopha: He speaks well of you.

Mr. MacDonald: The sub-line at the top of the *Globe and Mail* article reads: "Does effective application not depend on integrated approach?"

The headline reads: "Pickersgill sums up background to idea of one authority for all transport."

Here we have an idea of one authority for all transport, and I am just going to take a moment or two of the House, Mr. Chairman, to sum up the case.

As Mr. Pickersgill put it, this would be the federal scene, and I suggest that in many

respects the same questions can be asked of The Department of Transport for this government with reference to the provincial scene —for example, Mr. Pickersgill listed a number of questions that would have to be answered in achieving national goals and these were his questions:

1. What policy should be adopted toward regulation of rates in the various forms of transportation in the light of competitive relationships?

2. Where competitive relationships do not exist and monopoly conditions remain, what principles should be applied to protect the public and to ensure that rates charged are fair and reasonable?

3. What principle of rate regulations are required to ensure that one form of transportation does not deliberately embark on unreasonable, uneconomic courses damaging either to a competitor or to another form of transportation?

4. What attitude should the government take toward the payment of subsidies designed to reduce transportation costs in order to make sure that they meet the public needs and do not discriminate against other forms of transportation?

5. How can the government provide for a consistency of approach with respect to the assessment of user charges for facilities provided by various forms of transportation?

6. How can the government avoid discrimination between modes of transportation; in particular, how can the government ensure that subsidies do not assist one form in a manner which harms the normal growth of another form; and how can the government ensure that the economic regulatory policies applied to one form of transportation do not hamper it in relation to different policies applied in another field of transportation?

7. How best can all transportation systems be kept under comprehensive review to ensure the overall approach that is necessary; what machinery of government would best achieve this objective?

8. Is the machinery for special research, and the volume of research being carried on, designed to maintain this comprehensive approach adequately; if not, how can the necessary research best be promoted?

The answers to those questions—

Mr. Pickersgill concluded:

—are both difficult and complicated.

And everybody would agree:

Obviously, certain principles can be embodied in legislation, but the application of these principles will be as important as the principles themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I just sum this up by acknowledging the complexity of the problem, by acknowledging the fact that in transportation you have your dual jurisdiction. If it is interprovincial or international it gets into the federal field, but the hon. Minister, I am sure, does not need to have any further detail to recognize that you have a portion of this problem that is wholly within his jurisdiction and in other instances, a shared jurisdiction with the federal government. Indeed, we have an example of it in the recent truckers' strike where the conflict between regulations here and regulations that were going to come down in the Canada labour code were one of the basic reasons that led to a prolongation of coming to grips with this situation.

My questions to the hon. Minister are these: 1. Has he at last reached the stage of acknowledging that this is a problem? 2. Is he contemplating any study himself? 3. It would seem to me the most advisable approach, if the government at Ottawa has at least got to the point to formulate the questions—and I submit that that series of seven or eight questions are pretty comprehensive terms of reference for any investigation—would the government consider approaching Ottawa and entering into some sort of a joint study so that the two jurisdictions and the overlapping jurisdictions could be dealt with at the same time?

What are the hon. Minister's observations in this connection?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The hon. member for York South raises a matter that he knows and we know is a very complicated one and one that is not made any easier by the fact that we have a restriction in our jurisdiction to the highway transport. But there is an increasing interrelation in these fields of rail and air and road transport, both as regards goods and persons.

The Ontario highway transport board grants licences to commercial carriers or in public vehicles on the basis of public necessity and convenience. Today we are running into this growing situation of the discontinuance of rail lines and so we have to look at these applications in an entirely new way, but we have no jurisdiction on rail or air or navigable waters, and that is the situation that is going to lead eventually to the very point that the hon. member raises.

We have to have conversation with the people who regulate these. We have seen the impact on the truckers with the subsidizing of freight on railways all the time. How can they continue to exist? They can be squeezed out of existence by a sufficient subsidy of rail at their expense. We have two separate systems but each is on its own; each has to make a profit or it goes out of business. The railways just have to go crying to Ottawa and they either get a subsidy or subvention of some kind to keep them operating. It is on the very face of it an unfair competition and this is going eventually to squeeze us—and I think perhaps sooner than the hon. member expects—into some kind of discussion at this level, that we have to try to resolve these problems that are becoming intense. I point out to him I think that where they are becoming the most intense is in those areas that are being summarily cut off from rail service on which they have depended.

These things are being taken into consideration in applications to the highway transport board for both the carriage of goods and persons right now.

Mr. MacDonald: With respect, Mr. Chairman, the problem the hon. Minister acknowledges and elaborates a bit on has been with us for 25 years. Just because it had not reached the present degree of intensity, the government has not been forced to acknowledge its existence and this is—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): It has always existed!

Mr. MacDonald: If it has always existed and we, in effect, have had to cope with the consequences of it in terms of pouring money in to subsidize each one of them, I would have thought that even this government or other governments at Ottawa, would have faced up to the problem before now. But without arguing that point, if one concludes correctly that the government is within reaching distance of a decision at Ottawa to tackle it—and I would agree with the hon. Minister that basically your problem is a federal jurisdiction—it increasingly involves that portion that comes under your responsibility here. Is the government considering approaching Ottawa and perhaps getting them to move in tackling the thing now, rather than a year from now, or five years from now, so that it can be of benefit both to you and to Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say to the hon. member that we have taken no direct action with my counterpart in Ottawa on this matter, but I see it coming, and I think it will be sooner, rather than later. Because, as I say, of the very serious disruption to life, where rail services are being cut off.

The hon. member formerly raised the question of the examination of vehicles. Immediately a crash occurs in a ship or a plane, the planes are grounded, or the equipment is put aside and an official inquiry goes into effect. I think there is a very real difference between the situation with regard to air and highway travel: the difference between an airplane and the automobile. The airplanes are operated all by professional crews. Every plane is checked out before it can take off. The restrictions are very, very severe, and very carefully supervised. There is nothing comparable to that in the operation of a motorcar.

In the first place, the motorcar is driven by the owner, in most cases, and if I may say it, an amateur—but an owner who is responsible for his own maintenance. Nine-tenths of the crashes in automobiles are caused by the driver. There is only a small remaining number that could be attributable to the vehicle anyway, and I think that this does put those two propositions out of a place where they can be equated very well. The one has a professional driver and a crew, and an intensive pre-flight check, and the other is a case of the individual driving out whenever he wants to, taking his car and letting it run down as much as he cares to, with no supervision on the maintenance, and this is one of the things that we are checking up very carefully now, with our automobile vehicle inspection that you may have some things to say about later.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister intervened to answer a question that had been asked earlier. It is a little difficult for you, Mr. Chairman.

The point I wanted to raise, I can do rather briefly, Mr. Chairman. I am curious to know whether the government is cognizant of this development, whether they are playing any part in the studies of it: On March 5 of this year, the Toronto *Star* carried a story, complete with maps, of a proposed new waterway which would start from the southern part of Lake Erie through a new canal and would connect at Plainsville, which is near Pittsburgh on the Ohio river, would follow down the Ohio river and then the Tennessee river, and then another little branch canal that would be built into a river which is called the Tombigbee—I am sorry,

I had never noticed it before and I do not know whether my pronunciation is correct—and lead right down to Mobile.

In other words, it is a waterway some 1,745 miles long, all but 373 miles of it is in operation at the present time. It would cost a proposed $1.2 billion. Now, sir, the story indicated that there is a significant lobby in the United States now, with even some rather blackmailing efforts towards Canada—"if you do not come in, we will go ahead on our own, and with rather serious consequences." Indeed, they predict that its future load is likely to be twice as much as the cargo tonnage on the St. Lawrence seaway at the present time, and such products as iron ore and paper from Canada would go down through there directly to American markets that now have to be met by more devious routes. Is the hon. Minister aware of this? To what extent has this project become part of government thinking, or government consideration? Have any representations been made to the provincial government with regard to it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, not to my knowledge.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here listening with interest to what has gone on to the present time. I want to thank the hon. Minister for giving us the statistics on the accident rate, and also for his report. I want to be forgiven, Mr. Chairman, that I believe in stating what I feel and what I feel is right. I want to rise to the defense of the hon. Minister as far as all this—I should say rattle-trap, or clap-trap—that we have been hearing here about auto safety. I still think that in the final analysis, the most dangerous part of the automobile, as somebody said here, is the nut behind the wheel.

Your statistics bear that out completely and I took cognizance of the opening address of the hon. Minister, with reference to the causes of accidents, and where the stress should be laid, and I agree with the hon. Minister.

I think that all that has been going on in this House and elsewhere, with reference to this talk of a safer automobile is nothing but a deliberate and dishonest distortion of the facts, in order to get a whipping boy, be it the hon. Minister, or what have you, to take the onus from where it lies, namely, we, the drivers. We are the ones that are responsible for these accidents.

Mr. Young: Talk for yourself!

Mr. Ben: All right, I will talk for myself, if that has to be, but the facts are clear here and you do not need statistics, you just need observation when you drive, to see where the accidents are caused. You drive along the road, you see somebody in front of you. They never look elsewhere, except in front. There is traffic to the right of them, there is traffic to the left of them, there is traffic behind them. They have a rear view mirror, some cars even have a side view mirror, but they are never used. They will straddle two or three lanes, making people behind them impatient and causing them to take risks. When they come up to an intersection, and I was always under the impression that it was now compulsory to have turn signals on an automobile, they do not turn on these turn signals 75, or 100 or 150 feet, or 150 yards before they get to the intersection; they turn on the turn indicators when they are already in the turn. I do not know what purpose they are accomplishing because when I see a car turning, I know it is turning, I do not have to have a flasher flash to tell me that the car is turning. In the meantime, you have to apply your brakes.

A good driver is not supposed to look just ahead of him to see what the driver ahead of him is doing, a good driver looks ahead of the driver ahead of him. A person is driving along, he sees nobody in front of the driver in front of him, the driver does not indicate that he is going to make a turn, but all of a sudden, with no signal at all except when he is already in his turn, he makes a turn. That is how accidents happen.

I always used to think that the rule of the road was that you drive as close to the right hand curb as practicable. They used to call the left lane the passing lane. Now, you see more cars passing in the right hand lane, than you see passing in the left hand lane—

An hon. member: It is legal!

Mr. Ben: Only when there is a divided highway, my friend. Only where the highway is properly delineated by a line. It is not legal to pass on the right hand side in other circumstances, except when somebody is making a turn.

This is a factual instance. A woman—I withdraw that—the driver, it happened to be a woman—this woman indicated that she was going to make a left hand turn and she made a right hand turn, and then she blamed the other driver who was passing her on the right hand side.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): I guess you will have lost the women's votes.

Mr. Ben: All right, I may have lost the woman's vote. The woman called this driver a fool for passing her when she was indicating she was going to make a turn, but he said—

An hon. member: Were you the other driver?

Mr. Ben: But he said: "Lady you indicated" —this came out in court—"you were going to make a left hand turn." She said; "Oh, no, I did not." He said: "But your indicator is still on." She said: "You fool, that means to pass me on the left hand side, because I am going to make a right hand turn," and she kept up this proposition all the way to the court.

Now, again you read these statistics. For instance, we are always talking about the drinking driver. I read the statistics and I was amazed, because I have heard so much on radio and television about the drinking driver, and when I look at these statistics, I find that they are responsible for relatively few of the accidents, that most of the accidents are caused by sober drivers, over 90 per cent of them. Yet we continue to stress the drinking driver, and we disregard the simply careless drivers.

The statistics which the hon. Minister has presented here indicate what the three major causes of accidents were, in particular categories. For the age group, 16-24 years, they run in this particular order:

Speed too fast for road and traffic conditions, driver lost control, and, did not have right of way. From 25 to 64 it is the reverse, the first ones did not have right of way, driver lost control, and speed too fast for road and traffic conditions. These are the things that cause accidents. But what is being done about this? Well, you hear all this stuff about getting a safer car. You find a situation where a youngster comes belting down at 90 miles an hour, driving on the right hand side of the road, forces a driver going the other way—who is on his own side of the road—into a ditch. He lands up against a tree and a life is snuffed out.

Along come all these experts. They take a look at it and say; "Hmm, you know, if he had seat belts, he may not have been killed." Nobody mentions that he got forced into that situation by a driver going 90 miles an hour on the wrong side of the road. They blame the fact that the automobile did not have seat belts or the driver did have seat belts on, and if he did have seat belts on then they would say: "Well, if he didn't have his seat belt on, he would have been thrown clear." They always manage to blame the motor vehicle and not the nut behind the wheel.

Now, I was very interested in some statistics here. For instance, two of the causes of accidents—they alternate between the most prominent cause and the third most prominent cause depending on the age bracket—one of them was for failing to yield, or did not have the right of way. And I look at the statistics which the hon. Minister supplied, the 1964-1965 statistics, and I note that only 2,213 people were convicted of failure to share the road and only 3,302 for failing to yield the right of way.

I should think that since it is evident in the hon. Minister's own statistics, that two of the three most frequent causes of accidents are failing to yield the right of way or not having the right of way, that we would be after the drivers who failed to yield the right of way. And we should also be after the drivers who lane-straddle and take up a two-lane highway and force people into situations where they have to pass. By the way, I want it understood that I do not think an automobile cannot be improved. Automobiles certainly can be improved, but if they want to—for instance, they say that the steering wheel causes a lot of accidents; well, take out the steering wheel, you can always put a joystick like that in an aircraft, at the side of the driver. Then instead of hitting the steering wheel, he is going to hit the dashboard. Well, if that happens, we can remove the dashboard and leave an opening there. Of course, without the dashboard there you are going to hit the windshield, so we can take out the windshield. After all, back in the early part of the century, the cars did not have windshields, so is that going to solve the situation?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): How about removing the car?

Mr. Ben: Well, we might end up with that, I think it would be more honest than just to blame the manufacturers. Certainly cars have defects in them, I do not deny that, but what galls me is the implication that all these defects, 18,000 I think the Minister mentioned—was it 18,000?

An hon. member Eighteen per cent.

Mr. Ben: Eighteen per cent, yes. The implication is that all these defects are such defects as will be responsible for an accident. That is the conclusion they try to lead one into, whereas in fact it is not so. For instance, I am not satisfied with my car at all;

it is a new car and in the winter time I have to blow on the heater to warm it up. That is a defect, but I would hardly say that that would be responsible for an accident. I have electrical window lifts and when I was working them, they went "clunk, clunk, clunk" and were not working right. That is a defect; it had to be repaired, but it would hardly be responsible for an accident.

An hon. member: You might get pneumonia.

Mr. Ben: I consider the high beam button to be in an improper place because usually if I put my left foot down it automatically goes on this button, and now I have to be careful that I do not hit it. I think I have to lean over too far for the ashtray but Judy LaMarsh can always tell me to stop smoking. So I am sure there are a lot of corrections that could be made to the automobile.

But to say we should have a safer automobile first of all implies it is safe to begin with or else you would not be making it safer. Second, where are the statistics to show that the defects in the manufacture of the automobile are causing accidents? By the way, I do not hold shares in any of these automobile companies, neither do my family nor any of my in-laws or anybody else I know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How does the member know?

Mr. Ben: But where is the evidence as to that? If you look at the Minister's statistics you will find much evidence as to the defective nut that they have in that automobile, mainly, the one behind the wheel. For instance, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's statistics for 1964 show that 19,622 were convicted of travelling in excess of 20 miles over the speed limit, but not more than 30 miles over the speed limit. There were also 3,161 travelling more than 30 miles over the speed limit. There were 91,466 who were travelling more than 11 miles over the speed limit but not more than 20 miles over the speed limit and 206,842 who were travelling less than 11 miles over the speed limit. There were 77,943 who failed to obey stop signs, signal lights or police officers. As a matter of fact, there were—well, if we deduct the 50,000 referred to on page 33, which were a carry-over from 1963—there were 536,664 convictions of The Highway Traffic Act, plus convictions under the Criminal Code in the amount of 16,298, plus convictions under the municipal bylaws of 48,466, which makes a very nice total.

And yet they still keep on saying, "Let us not get down to the basic issue as to what is causing the accidents." And I know why. I know why this party will not do it. You know why? Because if they got after the real cause of accidents, they would probably have to drive 40 per cent of the drivers off the road and then who would buy the automobiles? There would be a lot of unemployed automobile workers. This way they keep on creating more jobs for the automobile workers by putting the blame on the automobiles. Pretty soon we are going to be in a cocoon and they are going to insist on ermine lining inside; we are going to be strapped down, and we will not even have control over the car, it is going to come from some central station run by the NDP. They will press a button and the car will move by itself.

There are some other interesting statistics here, Mr. Chairman. For instance, on page 3, Mr. Chairman, of "Accident Facts, 1965." And this statistic rather surprised me. One hundred and forty-two, or 36.7 per cent of people who were fatally injured, were in the age group 15 to 64 years, representing—and this is what got me—.003 per cent of the population in a similar age group. The next figure is 100 or 25.8 per cent who were 65 years or over, which is .018 of the population in this same group. In other words, three times as many people in that age group had a fatal accident than the people below that age. I am sorry, six times as many. And it causes me to wonder about this. It indicates to me that our older citizens are much more careless than the younger citizens, because they have more accidents per percentage of their population, six times as many, as do those between the ages of 15 to 64.

And as far as children are concerned, 145 or 37.5 of the pedestrian fatalities were children under the age of 15 years. This represents .006 of the population in this age group. In other words, three times as many oldsters are involved in these fatal accidents than youngsters. Three times as many people over 65, percentagewise of their age group, are involved in fatal accidents than children under the age of 15 years. And the statistic is also carried out into non-fatal accidents.

We hear so much about driving with caution during the hours of darkness but we find that less accidents happen during the night hours when the visibility is supposed to be poor, than in daylight hours. I would suggest that people are more inclined to be careless during the daytime. And my suggestion, Mr. Minister is this, that I applaud

you for not being deceived and distracted by all this fuss about safer automobilies. We want safer automobiles, we want safer playgrounds, we want safer schools, we want safer airplanes, we want safer boats, but, in the final analysis, it is the people who determine whether a thing is safe or dangerous. Aspirin, acetylsalicylic acid, is the greatest benefit man ever invented. It has helped to cure more illnesses than any other form of medicine known, and yet, in excess, it is dangerous. So I am grateful to you, Mr. Minister, that in your opening address you pointed out that you would not be blinded by all this fuss about so-called safer cars, that you are going to continue to press to have safer cars, but that you are going to dwell on the real cause of accidents, the nut behind the wheel.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I understood that we would discuss safety under vote 2103.

Mr. Chairman: The chair would point out to the member for Bracondale that most of his comments would come under driver control under vote 2104.

Mr. Ben: Okay. I will make them again under that section.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, could I take this opportunity to thank the hon. member for Bracondale for his kind remarks?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I will not at any time try to untangle the mass of illogicality to which we have just listened. I will say that at the proper time, as we have agreed upon it, I will have some comments to make on that subject matter. The hon. Minister will find that I am somewhat less of a supporter of his than the hon. member for Bracondale.

However, just on the interpretation of the statistics which did come up incidentally in the hon. member's remarks, or on the adequacy of the statistics, I think note should be taken of the fact that the statistics published by the department on the relationship of drinking to accidents should by no means be taken at face value. For one thing, if anyone would take the trouble to analyze the statistics, he would discover that even though drinking is a factor, or is shown in the statistics to be a factor in only a very small proportion of accidents in total, it is quite a significant factor in what I would call the serious accidents—in other words, in the accidents involving personal injury or death. I do not think that should be overlooked by this mixture of levity and just plain nonsense that we listened to. It is a serious factor in serious accidents. I think that should be noted in the interpretation of the statistics.

The other point that I think should be made, Mr. Chairman, is that the statistics on this point, as published by the department, are far from satisfactory, and it is quite probable that there are a great many more accidents in which drinking is a factor than are shown in the statistics. The department pretty well has to rely on police department reports, as my hon. friend from Yorkview pointed out and as the hon. Minister noted, and those police reports are of varying quality.

I have not done so recently, but some years ago I discussed this problem with the statistician of the department because I was particularly interested. I do not think I am revealing any secrets, but at the time he was quite frank in stating that there could very well be a good many more accidents in which drinking is a factor than are shown in the statistics, because all he had to go on were cases where the police officer, in his judgment, thought it may have been a factor, and therefore would have reported it. There have been other investigations—I will not say studies, because I do not think they have probably reached that point—but there have been other investigations that suggest that in a good many of the accidents that my hon. friend was talking about, in which failure to yield the right of way or other forms of dangerous or reckless driving were shown in the statistics, there may very well have been an alcohol factor.

After all, there are a lot of factors in accidents. Even though the prime cause reported by the police officer may have been some other offence or violation, if not of the law, at least of common sense, nevertheless, behind that may have been a driver whose sense of discretion had left him to a certain degree because he had not drunk a large amount of alcohol but just enough to give him, shall we say, a more optimistic view of life than the circumstances merited.

This is one of the great problems in drinking and driving. It is not the seriously drunk driver who is usually a hazard; he is usually excessively cautious. The person who is a hazard is the fellow who has had just enough to depress the normal sense of responsibility and sense of discretion that he would have, and who will go out on the highway and do foolish things that he would not normally do if he had not had two or three or four drinks. That driver

frequently does not show up in the accident statistics; at least his case does not show up as a case in which drinking is associated with the accident. Therefore, I do not really think that we should draw the conclusions that the hon. member for Bracondale drew from the department statistics on the relationship of alcohol to accidents.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I have to answer that. The figures given by my hon. friend indicate that he has not read the statistics applied by the hon. Minister of Highways, because they are specific. They give the number who had been drinking but who had not been classified as "ability impaired"; that means that they simply had the smell of liquor on their breath, or that they had had a drink. The police officer recognized the fact that they had been drinking, but in his opinion he did not deem it to be drinking to the point where they should be charged with a criminal offence. The statistics are here; they do point out how many have been involved in accidents and have been drinking although alcohol was not necessarily involved.

Mr. Bryden: Well, obviously the hon. member does not listen to what I say.

Mr. Ben: The member had better read those things; he does too much yapping and not enough reading.

Mr. Bryden: I just explained, Mr. Chairman, that it depends entirely on whether or not the officer who investigated the accident considered this a factor that is worth recording.

Mr. Chairman: I jotted down names as the members rose in their place, and the member for Brant was next.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take part in the discussion that has been going on for some minutes, if you would like to complete that aspect of the work. All right, the aspect that I wanted to discuss does fall under the main office vote. It has to do with the statistics involving boating accidents, and the division of authority between the federal jurisdiction and this ministry as far as control of boating in the province is concerned. I would assume that the hon. Minister would be ready to discuss that at this time.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we have no responsibility in The Department of Transport for boating accidents and water safety.

Mr. Nixon: My position, Mr. Chairman, is that there should be some responsibility. If you would permit me to proceed briefly on that basis I would like to say that it appears that as the years go along, boating is becoming almost as dangerous as motoring in this province. No weekends during the summer go by but that we hear of a number of fatalities that have occurred, many of them attributable to lack of knowledge of boating safety, and in fact to boats that themselves are not properly fitted out for the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman: To the member for Brant, I just heard the Minister say that there is no provision under his vote for boating accidents.

Mr. Nixon: It has to do with transport, Mr. Chairman. I certainly accede to your views on this but I know that the hon. Minister himself will be ready to make some comments on it in the light of the fact that last year alone 135 people lost their lives in Ontario where this is concerned.

If you are going to call me to order and make me resume my seat I would say, Mr. Chairman, that there are areas in the province where the RCMP has supposedly the responsibility for this, but where the RCMP does not get near. The boats are not properly fitted out with lifesaving equipment; they are not under any control at all, as far as the police are concerned. My understanding in those areas was that the OPP, directed by The Department of Transport and the Attorney General, would have some responsibility.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would advise us on that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Brant raises a very real problem, in view of the tremendous growth in boating in this province. The responsibility for the waters is with the federal RCMP, but because of the place boating is beginning to play in summer life in Ontario, a committee has been set up under the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information, and includes representatives from Lands and Forests, Transport, Attorney General, Tourism, and the water resources commission, I believe.

They are looking at this to see in what area we should move, because I think we would agree with you that with the increase there is in boating, there is need for some further and much more intensive care of those on the waters—many waters into which the RCMP just do not go at all. That is why

we feel there is perhaps a real need to follow along the line that was suggested.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me just another word. It appears that the provincial responsibility has got to take some ascendancy in these areas where the RCMP really finds it impossible to enforce the enactments of the federal Parliament. I believe, myself, that the federal responsibility should certainly remain with the large vessels, of course. But when the hon. Minister referred, a few minutes ago, to the federal responsibility in navigable waters, this, of course, includes every lake and stream across the province, where a boat can go, and it means that really the boating is without regulation whatsoever, unless there is some gross neglect in which the enforcement of the Criminal Code would apply.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member for Brant realizes there is no provision for boating under this vote.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have recognized this problem in that this committee was set up and I understand that arrangements have already been made to meet with the officials of the federal government in Ottawa, and I would say it will be within the next four weeks.

Mr. Nixon: Is the hon. Minister's opinion on this—would he think that his department should take over an increasing share of the responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think we have decided, in our interdepartmental conversations yet, where the responsibility should lie, as between departments. The Department of Lands and Forests obviously are in many of the areas where the policing may be needed. Tourism operates in some areas and conservation has its areas, and we have to work out where it would be most practical to put the responsibility and the share of the costs.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk for a few minutes about item No. 6, in this, fees and expenses for special studies and research.

I noticed in the latest public accounts that DeLeuw Cather and Company was paid some $93,188.59. Ed Ingraham, some $6,000. The law society of Upper Canada, some $20,000-odd, Larry Smith and Company, $42,000. Traffic Research Corporation, Limited, $196,-000 and then sort of miscellaneous accounts under $5,000, $38,000, to make a grand total of $397,000.

Now, I think we should find out, because a lot of the criticism directed to this department has been for lack of research, what each one of these people or organizations—whom I have just named—did, how they were chosen, of what value their research has been, and whether the results of the research are going to terminate in any sort of action.

For instance, I would imagine that the figure for the law society of Upper Canada, $20,852.40 relates to the production of this book, called the report of the Osgoode Hall study and to my mind this has been a very informative study. The hon. Minister, having spent $20,852.40 of the money belonging to the people of Ontario, one would have thought and anticipated that he would have made some use of the statistics and the research that came as a result of that.

But I would like him to start with each one of these, DeLeuw Cather, what did they do for $93,000, what did Ed Ingraham do for $6,000, what use is going to be made of the Osgoode Hall study, who was Larry Smith and Company and what did they do for $42,000, Traffic Research, $196,000 and $38,-000 for accounts under $5,000.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to give the hon. member the information and the nature of the contracts with each of these several parties.

All but the law society of Upper Canada, and some of the smaller items under $5,000, had to do with the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. I can get the nature of the contract that was covered in each case, for the other contracts, for the hon. member.

I think you will remember that it was pretty clearly described last year how the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study work was being done on a contract basis, because it is relatively short term work. It is the kind of work that would not admit of the quick recruitment of the kind of personnel that would be needed for the job and so we went to people like DeLeuw Cather and Traffic Research Corporation, and those, to do the work.

With respect to the Traffic Reseach Corporation work itself, we were pretty well tied to using them for the kind of collection that they were doing because they were being used by Metro Toronto on its transportation study. And we had to integrate the material, the data collection they were making for the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study that we had, with the one they were doing for Metro Toronto itself, so that it

would integrate and be useable together in Metro's Univac 1107 machine which we are using for computer purposes.

If the hon. member would let me have time, we will get those.

Mr. Singer: That is only a partial answer. I am interested in Ed Ingraham. What did he do for $6,000?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not have the details here, but I understand it was in connection with the preparation of the reports for the study, three or four of which were tabled the other day.

Mr. Singer: The reports for the study. You mean—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The compilation and presentation of the four reports on Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I see.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think I intimated to the hon. member that except for the $20,000 to the Osgoode Hall law school for the study on the Professor Linden report, and some of the small items of the under $5,000, all the other research reports in the accounts, relate to the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study.

Mr. Singer: Well, would not the hon. Minister think there would be some sense in setting up his own research group? You have spent here, $397,000. This year you are asking for $425,000. That is a fair bit of money. Is the hon. Minister not able to hire people to do research within his own department? Are there not university graduates, are there not people of outstanding ability in Ontario that could be taken into The Department of Transport to do this sort of work?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I just explained to the member why we had done this. It was pointed out very clearly last year that we were not able, in a short term study of this kind, to recruit that kind of personnel who are in short supply, and are very expensive, and so we had decided that the best way to do it was to have it done on contract with these consultants. Furthermore, DeLeuw Cathers was doing this kind of work, but with respect to the traffic research corporation contracts, and we had either two or three with them a year ago, and with this one this year, that we were more or less tied to using them, so that we would unify the type of data collection they were making for Metro Toronto itself, with our Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study, because we wanted to integrate the material on this data bank, in our computer runs, and save us many times what we pay them, because we can use them together. If we had to duplicate all that Metro Toronto had done for our own study, we would have been running into several hundred thousand dollars more. So there was no seeming alternative in a reasonable and sensible way, but to use the same people that were doing the data collection and preparing the data for the feed bank, for their Univac, which we are using, and using at the expense of Metropolitan Toronto.

When you consider that a single computer run would cost us about $100,000, you can appreciate that savings of this kind are very vital. That is why we went out, and with a core staff, on this Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study, much of the work was farmed out to these consultants, and we were tied to the consultants we could use in these cases, because of the fact that they were doing the work, and had done a lot of work for Metro Toronto itself, which we wanted to integrate.

Mr. Singer: Well now, that study is finished, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No.

Mr. Singer: Well, what is the $425,000 for this year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The completion—I intimated in my remarks when I introduced the budget—we hoped would come about the end of this year, excepting insofar as the results of the trial computer run were concerned, and so there will be some carryover. There is also some question of refining our trip prediction and modal split tool that we have devised as we find there are chances of refining it so that it will be a more perfect tool to work with.

There is also the fact that the data collection that has been fed into the bank so far, concerns peak trip information and we think that it would be valuable to add to that the 24-hour factor and the truck factor, for these are further bodies of information that the study will want to collect to give us that much more information to get that much more accurate predictions. But, we are hoping that by the end of this year—and I intimated in my remarks when I introduced the estimates—that we would have the second of our final reports. The final report we look for is coming out in three parts, and we expect the second to come out by fall of this year, and

the third by the very early part of next year. By that time, we think that the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study's main work will be over and we will be deriving the benefits of it and making it available to Metropolitan Toronto and this whole region and those other rapidly growing urban areas in Ontario that can, to advantage, utilize this trip prediction and trimodal split tool that is being developed here—and I think I can say accurately and assuredly—for the first time.

We have broken new ground in this kind of study and it has not been cheap and it has not been easy and it has not been without headaches, but I think that we are getting places and the four reports that we distributed the other day give a picture of what we are getting ahead with.

Mr. Singer: Is it reasonable to assume then, that this study will come to an end about March of next year? And that the $400,000 will not be asked for in the following year's estimates?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is a reasonable assumption on our present plans. We have just had the first of the final reports received and I hope that before too long it will be available to all. We expect the second section of the final report to come out around the fall and the third one early in the new year. Then we will have the carryover until eventually we can assess the benefits of the commuter trial run and some further projections with regard to the impact of transportation on the economic development in this area.

When I introduced my estimates I spoke of the revision that has occurred in the executive committee where the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has been added to the committee because of the important contributions that his department can make by way of contribution to the final stages of this study. I think it will have a very real impact on the ultimate development of the area and make a real contribution to the final conclusions as we draw them in this overall work of the integrated transportation plan utilizing rail and road and public transit in this whole sweep of about 3,000 square miles with a population now of about three million; by the year 2000, it will probably be in the region of six million or seven million.

Mr. Singer: Then I hark to the words of my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich who said and, I think, very pertinently, that it is all well and good to do a study in Metro; certainly I do not decry that, but there are other areas of the province where a study should be done.

The hon. Minister now indicates to us that this is the last year, apparently, when he is going to ask for as large a sum as $425,000. Is there not some abundant good sense in setting up his own research department so that studies can be done in the Windsor area, in the North Bay area, in the Ottawa area and in the Kingston area? Does the hon. Minister not plan for it at all or has he abandoned this sort of approach?

The hon. member for Woodbine said that The Department of Highways is doing them; certainly the hon. Minister of Highways seems to be the one who has taken this responsibility upon himself. He is the spokesman in the House about all of these things, but it puzzles me that a department set up in the way that The Department of Transport is, does not have its own research branch.

I had occasion the other afternoon, to look at the old debates and look to the words of Mr. Frost when he announced the formation of this department; it puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not this department has ever really assumed the task that Mr. Frost set out that it would. The hon. Minister of Highways seems to have continued doing all of the things that Mr. Frost had intended, or said that he intended, The Department of Transport to do.

Now The Department of Transport seems to be nothing more than an administrative branch that collects licences and publishes some statistics. There is no desire, apparently, to do any continuing research; there is no real concern with the problems of the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich; the hon. Minister of Highways, perhaps with good reason, seems to have taken over all these responsibilities.

What really is the use of continuing The Department of Transport if reform is not going to be done within the broad outline laid down by Mr. Frost?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I want to explain to the hon. member that while a lot of this work and a lot of the expense is involved in the specific data collection for this immediate area—that is, the Metropolitan Toronto and region, the 3,000 square miles of it—out of this whole study is coming a new device—a "tool" we call it—that will be usable in one form or another, with modifications, to further studies in the other urban areas of the province. That has been

one of the aims of the study from the beginning and that is one of the great benefits that will flow from the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study.

Mr. Singer: I am not decrying the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study; I applauded it when it was announced and I applaud the type of work that it is doing. I make the very simple plea, Mr. Chairman, addressed to this hon. Minister that by now there should be enough intelligence within that department to recognize the importance of establishing its own permanent research branch and it should not have to refer to DeLeuw Cather and Company, and Larry Smith, and Traffic Research companies year after year at very substantial expense to the people of Ontario. Four hundred thousand dollars two years ago, $425,000 this year—I do not have the figure of last year—why can people not be taken into the department with sufficient intelligence to do this kind of research so that the hon. Minister would not have to go out shopping around? If this is a long-term view and if this tool is going to develop and is going to be of assistance to Windsor, to Ottawa, to North Bay and to Kingston, why should there not be a branch in the hon. Minister's department that is going to be able to follow on as a result of this? Perhaps they need some training; perhaps they needed the advice of DeLeuw Cather and the techniques of DeLeuw Cather. Surely to goodness this does not go on year after year after year!

If there was any justification for breaking the transport branch away from the highway branch, surely, in Mr. Frost's words it was that The Department of Transport would start to do this type of work itself and not that it would be just a farming-out device.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We just want to be practical in this case. To do a job like this—a crash job—we should have to enlist that much extra staff, because we would not want to carry a staff of that proportion, and we could not do this job except that we have that kind of arrangement with consultants.

We have a nucleus of staff in our reseach branch, but not enough to do this job. We have a research branch and we will go on doing these things, but not of this size nor at this rate.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister admitted a few minutes ago that this $425,000 estimate is about to disappear next year, because he will be pretty well finished. I want to know how he is going to do his studies in Windsor unless he is going to go back again to people like DeLeuw Cather and so on, to do the same sort of statistical research that they have been doing. The Minister has given no indication that—well, he has just given us the beginning of an indication that he has the nucleus of a research branch, but does he have any intention of expanding it? Does he have any intention of bringing people in? Does he have any permanent plans at all? I just do not understand in what direction, if any, the hon. Minister is moving.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is expected that by the end of the current fiscal year, the main burden of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study will be coming to an end, if it has not ended, and that further jobs that will be done will not be of the same proportion. What is more, we will have acquired the tool we have been developing with this large staff and with this large data collection.

Mr. Singer: Well, having established the tool then, what are the hon. Minister's plans for next year, and the year after? Does he plan to do a study in the Windsor area? In the Kingston and the Ottawa areas, and in any other area than the Metro area?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These can wait until we get the report from the committee that is doing this. That is one of their jobs when they report, to point out what can be done from here on in, because that will be one of the kinds of recommendations we will be getting in the final reports of this committee.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the hon. Minister can tell me, having paid $20,852 for this law society study, what use has been made of it, or what use is going to be made of it? It is a lot of money—$20,852 for a book that apparently, as far as I know, has never been used.

Mr. Sopha: No, he listened to Professor Linden about the gratuitous factors to some extent.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we can discuss under vote 2106 the use we are going to make of this book—what is going to be done with Mr. Linden's information.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you. Before proceeding with what I have to say, I would purposely but quietly like to raise a point of order. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that you have adopted the practice that I had thought

had gone into obsolescence, of making a list of speakers to be called. I made some remarks about that a couple of years ago, and I thought that the use of the list had gone into decay. But let me illustrate what I mean. When I came into the House this afternoon, with my friend from Nickel Belt—we had journeyed from Sudbury and were delayed only because he is such a careful and prudent driver—the member for York South was speaking about car safety. He was followed by the member for Bracondale, who continued the discussion, and the member for Woodbine joined in the debate. Then I wanted to say something about car safety and highway safety but, because of your list, first my friend from Brant got into boats and my friend from Downsview got into metropolitan transport studies. Now, I merely point out that the list makes debate chaotic and disorderly. I suggest the proper method of approach is to exhaust the subject and then go on to another.

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the remarks of the member for Sudbury; his interest in it, and his suggestion in connection with it.

The chair, under the circumstances, has jotted down the names of the people as they rise—only as a guide. The members of the House who do not wish the chair to rule on that basis, can advise me so, but otherwise it worked fine until now.

Mr. Sopha: Well, let me say this to you, Mr. Chairman, that historically the method of calling members is to call those who catch the Speaker's eye. In the British Parliament that is the way that they are called. I leave it.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the member for Sudbury that the car safety issue is something that we decided to discuss under 2104.

Mr. Sopha: I wanted to say a word to the Minister about highway safety. That is to say the safety—

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, surely it was agreed, and reaffirmed by you, that we were going to discuss highway safety under—I thought it was under 2103 and that you would make a broad interpretation at that point. Now, as I indicated to you, two hours ago, I have something I want to say about highway safety. I am quite willing to wait, but not if everyone else is going to discuss the subject now.

Mr. Chairman: Before the member—

Mr. Sopha: I was here, and I understood your ruling to be that driver safety—control of drivers—was to be discussed under the later vote.

Mr. Chairman: No, under highway safety. We are dealing with the high school driving courses and the public school safety courses, and pamphlets and movies and so on. We have decided that they were between 2103 and 2104, and that they overlap between 3 and 4 and we would combine them.

Mr. Sopha: Well, fine, the hon. member for Woodbine has provided a vehicle to have an understanding. Now, do I understand that the whole issue of safety as related to motor vehicles is to be debated under 2103?

Mr. Chairman: And the inspection under 2104.

Mr. Sopha: Under 2104.

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: Every aspect. That is fine.

Mr. Ben: May I ask a question; under which item will we be discussing the minimum driving ages?

Mr. Chairman: Driver control.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Driver licensing—2104.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier in the discussions this afternoon I had asked the Minister for the total cost of the Metro Toronto regional transportation studies. Has he the figures now?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The figure is $426,649.

Mr. Newman: That is this year's alone. How about the previous years?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This was last year, up to March 31.

Mr. Newman: That is from the starting date of the studies until—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, no, that is just for the last fiscal year.

Mr. Newman: Well, I wanted the total that has been spent for the Metro Toronto—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will get it.

Mr. Newman: All right, thank you Mr. Minister. I can recall that last year I had suggested to the Minister that he consult

with the automobile manufacturers concerning car safety. I notice, during the summer months, he visited the various manufacturers and observed the techniques employed by both GM and Ford in Livonia and in Dearborn. Because auto manufacturers generally work on a programme of two years in advance—and the Minister has already outlined the safety features that he will require in the 1967 automobiles—could he inform the House today what he intends to press the manufacturers for in the 1968 model?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, starting more than a year ago, we have been having consultations with the industry, looking to improved car construction and safety, and as the members well know, we came up last year with a joint announcement, including six safety features that the manufacturers undertook to instal on all models in Ontario —not as a delete option, as the five items in the United States were, but six, firm, non-delete, standard pieces of equipment.

We already have been carrying these conversations forward and the other day I said I was prepared to announce that they had agreed to put three additional items on all cars for 1967. We have discussed other matters, and I think it would—and I ask the members' indulgence in this matter—I think it would be in the best interest of our discussions that I do not go beyond what I have said because I cleared with the manufacturers that they were agreeable to my saying what I did the other day with respect to what was going to happen for this coming year. I am hoping that before the 1967 models are firmed up, there may be other equipment or other changes. But there is a list we have, that I might call an inter-office or within-the-office list of priorities. Some of them may change, some of them may rise, others may be added, and these we will continue to discuss with manufacturers as we seek to get the best. But we have to be guided in one thing by what is practical, and we cannot say that you have to have a certain item before the next model year comes up, if the manufacturer is not going to be in a position to produce it.

I think some members are aware that all the manufacturers are going to have shock absorbing steering assembly—in some cases, a telescopic or concertina action within the steering column; in others an impact-absorbing steering wheel. There is one of the manufacturers who is not going to be able to get his first delivery—at least it looks that way—in time to start installing them on the earliest 1967 models. But they give us the undertaking they will have them on as soon in the new year as they can get them. These are some of the practical problems we run into, and I think we want to be reasonable about it. I can give the House the assurance that we are working assiduously in this, and I think you can count on our continuing that. So, if the member will excuse me, I prefer—I think I could not answer his question more specifically without betraying confidences that I have with the manufacturers.

When we were in Detroit with Chrysler, at Milford with General Motors and at Dearborn with Ford, I think we were given a very good insight into many of the things on which they are working, which are still a year or two in the future. I think that with the current interest in safety, you will find the tire manufacturers and the car manufacturers not only making strides in these directions, but advertising it, proclaiming it, because while there was a time not long ago when to advertise a car as a safe car or feature safety features was to restrict or retard or reduce the sale. I think perhaps the public has reached the place now where a safety tag on a car can be a selling point. And we hope that is the case.

Mr. Newman: I want to pursue this a minute. Does the Minister have a series of safety features that he intends to insist that the manufacturer follow in succeeding years? Does he have a list say of 15 or 20?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have a priority list, and other items may be added to it or others deleted from it. When we get an item that is on the list, we scratch it off and we say "accomplished."

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, I suggest that in connection with these questions at the present time, we hold them over as prearranged until a later vote.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the Minister a question about the insurance companies? Do the insurance companies contribute anything to the department in the way of funds for research? They are probably the one industry that has the most to gain if the vehicle constructed is as safe as possibly can be constructed.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The department, of course, gets nothing from the insurance companies but the insurance companies I understand do give strong and substantial financial support to driver instruction.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could we ask the Minister to outline those six while we are still on this? He has raised the issue at this point and perhaps we can leave it until the proper vote, but he mentioned six safety features which came on last year and he mentioned that also in his speech.

Mr. Chairman: Other members of the House including the member's colleague immediately in front of him wish to speak on the same point. I think out of fairness we should hold it over until—

Mr. Young: We wanted the list of six, that is all.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is just a matter of information. The Minister did refer to that in his opening remarks and again now, but as far as I know he has not specified the six items. Perhaps we could clear that up now.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If the House would like, I will just enumerate them. They were the windshield washer, the padded sunvisor, the padded dashboard, the outside rear view mirror, rear seatbelts and back-up lights.

Mr. Bryden: These are all in this year's models?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These are all standard on all 1966 models, standard, non-delete options.

Vote 2101 agreed to.

On vote 2102:

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, on 2102, I have a situation I would like to raise with the Minister. I understand that this is the vote in the department that would administer The Public Commercial Vehicles Act. I wonder if the Minister would first explain to me the procedure and qualifications regarding application for the public commercial vehicle licences?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In making application for a public commercial vehicle licence, the application goes to the highway transport board, is advertised and eventually the hearing is held. In the event of there being convincing evidence of public convenience or necessity, a certificate is issued on which the Minister issues a licence.

I will give the member the steps specifically. Following is the course that an application takes to be considered for operating authority under either The Public Commercial Vehicles Act, about which the member asks, or The Public Vehicles Act, or The Motor Vehicle Transport Act, which is the Dominion Act that is delegated to us, relating to interprovincial or international traffic.

The application is completed by the applicant and filed, together with the required fee, with either The Department of Transport or the Ontario highway transport board. Upon receipt of the application, the board decides whether the matter can be proceeded with under regulation 8 or requires a public hearing. Regulation 8, under The Highway Transport Board Act reads:

> (1) The board may, in its discretion, publish notice of an application or reference in the *Ontario Gazette* without fixing a date for the hearing.
>
> (2) If no objection is served and filed in the manner prescribed in section 5 within 15 days of the publication, the board may dispose of the application for reference summarily.
>
> (3) If an application is served and filed within 15 days of the publication, the board shall fix a date for hearing with notices to all parties and the procedure is thenceforth the same as the proceedings to which this section does not apply.

If it is decided that the application can be proceeded with under regulation 8, the application is advertised in the next issue of the *Ontario Gazette* and if after 15 days no opposition is filed, the board may proceed to issue the certificate. If the application is set down for public hearing, then a place and date are set and the application and pertinent information thereto is advertised in the *Ontario Gazette*. Anyone wishing to oppose the application must file opposition with the applicant and the board within 15 days prior to the hearing date.

When a public hearing is held, evidence of public necessity and convenience must be adduced by the applicant and his witnesses. If the matter is of a serious nature, the board may reserve its decision and give a written judgment. The board then issues to the Minister of Transport a certificte of public necessity and convenience or a certificate denying the application. All parties to each application are furnished with a copy of the board's certificate. Does that answer the question?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister.

I would assume then the reason for a hearing is for interested parties who oppose the issuance of a licence in this regard. The Minister might explain a little later on, in regard to what I have to say, why this is necessary, but I want to relate the problem of the owner-operators and some of the problems that they are running into and some of the reasons the teamsters union feels there is quite an inequity in the issuing of the public commercial vehicle licences.

I understand that when one makes application, other parties can go and oppose the licence. I do not know all of the reasons for opposing but one would be that there would be some fear of diluting the business in a particular area. Of course, if that is one of the reasons, those with the strong voice would have quite a lot of influence on whether or not an individual received his licence.

I spent some time discussing this problem with both the owner-operators and the teamsters union, and the teamsters union has been attempting to organize the owner-operators. There are large groups of them that have attempted to be organized under The Ontario Labour Relations Act and other groups have attempted to form associations of their own. They want this kind of protection because they find they are under a strong duress from the cartage companies, the transport companies.

What some of the transport companies are doing is this: They have a licence, they can hire the owner-operator, and I understand that he can drive and operate under their licence. I do not know if this is strictly legal or not but this is the way the situation was given to me. The company owner, the transport owner, has the licence and he then hires a man who has a truck. With this kind of reasoning, the truck owner is strictly under his direction. He can tell him exactly what he has to work for; if he is not satisfied with the rate of pay he is getting, the transport owner can say, "Well, go someplace else," and then we understand that the operator is blacklisted if he tries to hire out his truck to another cartage company.

When they try to form an association of their own, they tell me there are instances of this happening, they are charged by the federal authorities of the Royal Canadian mounted police with a violation of The Combines Act, because they are a group of owners getting together to form an association to set prices and this is exactly what they are trying to do. They want to get together to form an association of truck owner-operators so they can demand a fair rate for the hiring out of their equipment to the cartage companies.

On the other hand, when they try to organize into a union such as the teamsters union, they are turned down by the Ontario labour relations board. It will not give them certification because they are not employees, they are owners, and this puts them in the same position of being at all times under the stranglehold of the transport companies.

I raised this question during my comments. I talked about the drunken driver and I said to the House there was another kind of impaired driver. I referred particularly to the owner-operators who have no protection and have to put a lot of hours in on the highways. There was evidence that they were using pep drugs and the Minister can read the full remarks I made in *Hansard* of last Friday.

But then I made some suggestions to the Minister and one of them was the introduction of a daily maximum of ten hours of work and a daily maximum of 400 miles. This was to give some protection to the owner-operators. The hon. Minister, in making some brief reply to my comments said that those operators whose operations are confined to the province come under The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act of the province, and of course those who are interprovincial come under The Canada Transport Act.

I was told, and I mentioned it in my remarks, that there was a regulation in the provincial Motor Vehicles Act that provided that all truck drivers must carry a logbook which would be available to the police for inspection on the highways at all times to determine just what type of hours they were putting in on the highways. I explained this problem by repeating what was given to me this morning in regard to trips from Hamilton to Sault Ste. Marie. The contract carried by the teamsters union provides for only two trips to Sault Ste. Marie a week with a 16-hour stopover with each trip. They tell me that the owner-operators, to make a decent pay, are obliged to make three trips to Sudbury and back. They tell me they are paid well, in fact they are paid for making three trips, similarly to the pay that the organized trucker gets for making two trips.

I wonder if the Minister would comment on this situation. First, why are not these people allowed to obtain a licence of their own without restrictions if they fulfil most of the qualifications, so that they can carry their own PCV with them rather than depend on the company to cover them; and what is

the Minister's reaction to the fact that, forming an association, they then come under The Canada Combines Act and can face charges under the federal government in that regard, and if they join a union they are refused certification by The Labour Relations Act because of the fact that they are not employees, they are considered employers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, perhaps first I would just draw the hon. member's attention to section 64, subsection 4; that is, to regulation 503 under The Public Commercial Vehicles Act:

> No vehicle licence shall be issued for a public commercial vehicle, except, (a) to the holder of an operating licence who is registered as the owner of the vehicle under The Highway Traffic Act, or (b) subject to the approval of the Minister to the holder of an operating licence who has entered into bona fide agreement for the lease of the public commercial vehicle.

I think that I should point out that we recognize there is a problem with regard to the owner-operator and lease arrangements, and it does compound the situation where these owner-operators are free of some of the agreements under which the other for-hire carriers operate.

With regard to the log book that the hon. member mentioned, I think it is all part of The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, or The Transportation Act of the federal government to which that question is tied up.

With regard to the use of the—

Mr. Bryden: These are not technically employees.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is what I say, the owner-operator is a problem and—

Mr. Bryden: You are compounding the problem.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He is operating his own business, it is just the same as a man who is running his own business in any other area, he does not need to follow the hours of work as a member of the union, and in some cases it may seem an encroachment on the rights of others. On the other hand, the owner-operator perhaps has rights too. In my estimate speech on Thursday night, I made mention of the review that had been held by the highway transport board. I pointed out at that time, until I have the report of the board and it has been considered, I have decided to take no action on it, but the strike was in course of negotiations and perhaps in view of the strike and the dislocation of some of the traffic we may want to rethink some of the implications of that dislocation before we can form a recommendation. But this matter of the owner-operator and the leasing of trucks is mentioned in the report, it was in the submission made to the board when they were holding their hearing, and we are aware of the problem. Whether we can come up with a suitable answer I am not able to say at this time.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, is the hon. Minister telling me that it is not proper for the companies to hold the licence and then hire an owner-operator without him having a licence of his own?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, it is proper.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow this up. The hon. Minister has said he is aware of the problem and is considering action which he hopes will remedy the situation. On the basis of what he said I feel far from certain that he is aware of the full ramifications of the problem. I think one thing that we should bear in mind is that this device of the independent contractor is an old device, and one that is growing at an alarming rate, to bring people out from under the protection of labour legislation. An employer can simply evade labour legislation by entering into a contract with some other person and then say this person is not an employee, he is an independent contractor, he is in business for himself. Frequently the owner does not want to be in that position at all, but he has no option, he has to become an independent contractor.

Now, in the trucking industry as in many other industries where this sort of thing has occurred, these so-called independent operators, these owner-operators, want to organize because they are not in any genuine sense of the word businessmen who are in a position to bargain on a basis of equality with a big trucking firm. They want to organize. Except on a technical legal sense they are in precisely the same position as an employee. Oh, I should not say exactly the same, they are probably in a worse position than an employee, because they have an investment as well—the employee at least does not have an investment—so they are in an extremely vulnerable position, with very little bargaining power and yet they get no protection under any labour laws at all; they cannot even organize to form a union and get certified because technically they are not employees within the meaning of The Labour Relations Act.

In my opinion The Labour Relations Act ought to be amended to change that. I think these small independent contractors should definitely be recognized for purposes of collective bargaining under The Labour Relations Act, that would help to solve the problem. The point is that at the moment they are not. I was amazed to discover from my friend to my left that when they try to form an association they may even be subject to action under The Restrictive Trade Practices Act, which is the most ridiculous thing. Here they are dealing with what in relation to them are huge monopolies, and when they try to get together so that they can meet on some basis of equality, they are subject to the ancient prohibitions that were wiped out in the labour laws 100 years ago. They then become conspiracies in restraint of trade. As I say, it is 100 years, roughly, since working people were subject to that sort of disability, but these people actually have been put in the position where working people were 100 years ago—unable to bargain, all forced to deal with a big company on an individual basis. And this is the whole reason why the situation has been converted to the independent contractors. It is the companies that are dictating this, not the men. The men, I am sure, do not want it in most cases, but now we finally get the problem compounded when we learn that the highway transport board really strengthens the hand of the big companies in this unequal contest. It permits these companies to get PCV licences on the basis of contracts negotiated so that they, although they recognize no obligations to these people, they recognize no employer-employee relationships which under the law would impose many obligations upon them, they cut them out from any source of protection, either of labour law or trade union organization, and then The Department of Transport, by its policy, enables the companies to gather together the PCV licences, which are absolutely essential, a sine qua non of earning a living, as far as the small man is concerned. So he is then in the position that he must go to the company, he cannot operate as a PCV operator unless he is okayed by the company with whom he is trying to bargain and in relation to whom he is already in a very weak bargaining position.

Now, why in heaven's name does The Department of Transport permit the companies to give the final twist in the tightening of the net that they have around these people? Surely the companies, since they have simply disclaimed the normal responsibilities of an employer under the law—that is bad enough, and I think it should be changed—but surely they should not then be given this additional device, whereby they can simply batter these people down into submission. There is nothing that the independent operator can do other than accept whatever terms the prime contractor cares to dictate to him. He simply is unable to earn a living, except by grace of the prime contractor and there the prime contractor sits, and can dictate any conditions he wants.

Mr. Gisborn: Undercut the organized!

Mr. Bryden: And as my friend pointed out, undercut the people who do have collective bargaining relationships, who do have an employer-employee relationship. The good employers in the field are undercut by these fellows, who use the independent contractor device.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that when he has this matter under consideration, he should take a very hard look at that provision which he read out of the regulations under which the prime contractors in the field, the trucking companies, can gather up these licences and then hand them out as benefits, given at pleasure, to some poor little independent contractor who has no bargaining power at all.

While he is at it, maybe he could also do what we have never been able to do, and that is persuade the hon. Minister of Labour that this whole matter ought to be looked at again in terms of labour legislation. It is a problem that arises not only in this field, it arises in a great many and, unfortunately, a growing number of fields.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has pointed out the one side of the situation in which the owner-operator leasing his equipment finds himself. He represents, of course, that these people are under the control of the lessor. But there are others, I am quite sure, who would fear just as much to come under the control of the labour unions, because there are some people who like their independence.

But to sum up on the last point he raised, with regard to certification, the federal labour board has certified a union to bargain on behalf of Midland Superior Transport and Gill Interprovincial just recently. This may be news to the hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I appreciate the hon. Minister bringing that to my attention. I had not realized that the administration of the

federal Labour Relations Act had moved that far, and I think that is—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These are "X" carriers, you understand.

Mr. Brydon: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These are "X" carriers, that move across the provincial boundaries.

Mr. Bryden: Well, that is what I was going to say. But there still remains the problem of the carriers who operate only within the province and I can certainly tell the hon. Minister that in this province, our labour relations board has not gone to the extent of the federal labour relations board. I am not criticizing the labour relations board, I think it is operating in accordance with the law, and that is all it can do, interpret the law. But our law, then, is lagging behind the federal law, and we should follow their example.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, this is just a recent move, I think, this certification. As far as I am aware, we have had no representations of that nature from the owner-operators.

Vote 2102 agreed to.

On vote 2103:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I take it that this is the point where we might be able to open up the question of safety, to a certain extent. I hope not to be too long in dealing with this, but I do think it is most important to deal with some of the comments the hon. Minister has made, both in his introductory remarks and elsewhere during these estimates. The water was muddy enough after the hon. Minister had finished. By the time the hon. member for Bracondale—who unfortunately is not here now—had got into the act, it was no longer a muddy stream, it was an absolute swamp, it was a quagmire in which he had become completely lost and there was danger that the rest of us might be lost. So I think it is worthwhile to try to sort this thing out a little bit and try to find exactly what the issues are.

I do not think that the hon. Minister's introductory statement by any means contributed to a clarification of the types of issue we are up against in safety. I would say, Mr. Chairman, to put it bluntly, that all he did in his introductory remarks on this point—and they were quite extensive—was to rehash and regurgitate the propaganda line of the industry. It was practically nothing but the old propaganda line of the industry. They have been under fire for quite a while, and quite properly under fire in my own opinion, and they have tried to draw a red herring across the trail. They have tried to confuse the issue. And how do they confuse the issue? They point out—which is beyond excuse in my opinion—that the major factor in causing accidents on the highway is the driver.

This was the great point the hon. Minister made. This is what the automobile industry—when it was under attack with regard to its total irresponsibility in the past in relation to the safe design of automobiles—its answer always was: "The major factor in accidents is not mechanical failure, but driver failure," and now the hon. Minister comes along and gives the prestige of his office as a support for that red herring. That is what it is when we are in the area of safe design of vehicles.

There are two distinct problems involved here, Mr. Chairman. I think it is important that we keep them in mind and keep them sorted out. There is the problem of accidents: what causes accidents. That is an important problem. I do not by any means wish to suggest that it is anything but an extremely important problem, but it is quite a different issue than the safe design of a vehicle.

As the hon. Minister has said, accidents arise mainly not because of the nut behind the wheel—as my hon. friend from Bracondale said, quoting many others—but mainly because of a failure, a temporary failure, on the part of the average driver. I think the hon. Minister in his statement repeated the term "average driver" many times. This is a problem. I am not disputing that. As a matter of fact, I think The Department of Transport has done some pretty good work in trying to get at and reduce the causes of accidents. Through its point system, for example, it has done quite a bit to get some of the—shall we say—psychologically unfit drivers off the road. It has done a good many things in driver education. As the hon. Minister said, there is still much more to be done.

But let us bear in mind that the average driver will always have some lapses. We are all human, and we are subject to error. As the hon. Minister said, a man can drive with a clean record for 15 years, and then on some occasion his attention wanders, or he momentarily dozes off, or a great many different things happen to him, and, boom, there is an accident.

Now, obviously the design of the car had nothing to do with the accident. But where the design of the car becomes important is in relation to what happens as a result of that accident. The design of the car can be of vital importance as far as the degree of injury is concerned. This does not come out in the statistics of The Department of Transport, because their statistics are not for that purpose, but the important point to bear in mind is the relationship between the design of the car and the severity of the injury, given the fact that an accident has occurred. I doubt if we will ever reach the point where accidents will be eliminated entirely; therefore, the problem of the design of cars is always a vital factor.

Does it make any sense that because a driver's attention wandered for a moment and he was involved in an accident which admittedly had nothing to do with the design of the car, he should be severely injured or even killed when, with different design, that was preventable? Even if he was a nut and used no sense at all in the use of his vehicle, is it reasonable or sensible that he should be severely injured or killed when with a different design the injury would have been slight or nonexistent? Also, what about the innocent victims, the people who are not the nuts but who are involved in the same accident? Does it make sense that they should be severely injured or killed?

I think that this is the way we should look at it. Accident prevention is one thing, but quite another thing, and equally important, is the reduction and elimination of the injuries and deaths that now occur because of accidents but do not need to occur if the design of the car is adequate.

I do not think that there is any question at all on the basis of authoritative information from a great many sources, that the present design of cars does, in fact, result in unnecessary injury and death; it has nothing to do with the cause of accidents, but where accidents occur, the improper design of cars leads to much more severe injuries than necessary and even to death. This is a quite separate problem and one that should not be tangled up with the question of prevention of accidents, important as that may be. The automobile industry, as I have pointed out, has always tried to get the two things tangled up, because that is a way to confuse the issue and I must say that I was appalled when I heard a Minister of the Crown in right of Ontario doing exactly the same thing. He tangled the two issues up so that it would then appear in the headlines in the paper that the driver is the main cause of accidents. And there is no need to worry too much about the industry. He suggested that they are doing as good a job as they can, poor little fellows that they are, and they are really quite a secondary problem. They are not a secondary problem at all, when we deal with the problem as it should be dealt with, namely, the prevention of injury and death.

The hon. Minister, I admit, made a passing reference to that point in his introductory statement, but it was a very passing reference indeed, and it was within the context of his serving as an apologist for the industry. Indeed, the Minister was engaged in a substantial amount of praise for the industry for what he alleged was the large amount of money it is spending on devising safer cars and on research into safer cars.

In actual fact, Mr. Chairman, the amount of money that the industry has been spending on this subject is peanuts; it has hardly been spending anything at all. Its attitude to it in the past has been totally irresponsible. It is beginning now to spend a little bit, but this is a very recent conversion and only under extreme pressure.

But the hon. Minister says to us—trying to assure us all, no doubt, and no doubt reassuring the hon. member for Bracondale and some others—that he is negotiating particularly with the industry to get it to incorporate safe features in cars and that he does not want to deal with this matter in the crude United States way of public inquiries that make the public aware of the problem. He negotiates with the industry behind the scenes to get some of the problems corrected.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the House that to send the hon. Minister of Transport to negotiate with the automobile industry is like sending a chicken to negotiate with a covey of hawks. It is probably worse, even. It is probably worse because in this situation the loss of feathers and such will be suffered not only by the chicken but by the public at large. We are the ones who are being defeathered and skinned because of this particular approach of the Minister of Transport.

The Minister proudly proclaims that he has, as a result of his negotiations, induced the industry to bring in a number of safety features in its cars in this province. Mr. Chairman, let us put it squarely on the record: The Minister has done no such thing. Anything that the industry has agreed to do, and it is pitifully little in relation to what is required, has been done because of pressure in the United States.

In a long series of moves—the government standards, to begin with, and the various

hearings and so on—this industry has had to make some moves because of growing pressure in the United States, first from the responsible legislators and administrators and then from the public at large, as the public began to realize the nature of the problem. Anything we have in Ontario has not been a result of the Minister's negotiations. The industry takes him down to Detroit, no doubt, and pats him on the back and tells him what a fine fellow he is, but anything it does is something it has to do anyway, as a result of standards that have been imposed upon it in significant areas in the United States. Once it has to do something in relation to significant volumes of sales in the United States then it might as well do it across the board.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman—and I think we might as well look at the matter in terms of its facts—is that that the automobile industry has been dragging its feet on the safe design of cars from the very beginning.

We can go back to the controversy over the seat belt. For several years after it had been conclusively demonstrated that seat belts reduced the incidence of injury and death in accidents, the automobile industry refused to do anything about it. The manufacturers kept saying, "It has not been proved." In fact, they were of the opinion that seat belts might even increase hazards. It was only under extreme pressure that they could even be induced to work in the fittings for seat belts so that drivers, if they wanted to, could get them installed without exhorbitant cost.

However, finally they gave way on that point, and then, as the next step, under public pressure and dragging their feet all the way, they finally agreed that they would instal seat belts as standard equipment. They are still miles behind the times, Mr. Chairman. It is now well-established that the harness-type of seat belt is a much better seat belt and models have now been devised that are quite as convenient as the lap seat belt.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Would the hon. member permit a question and just take a breather? I wonder how he would propose to have the public use the seat belts or the harness?

Mr. Bryden: This, of course, Mr. Chairman, is another typical red herring of the type that emanates from the industry. The fact that seat belts are in cars has led to their increasing use. It is true that there are some foolish people who do not use seat belts when they are there to be used. I can never understand that psychology, but then, when we are in the area of human psychology, we can always recognize that errors of judgment will occur.

The point is that when they are there to be used, an increasing number of people will use them and are using them now. There is no question about it at all. Even when they were not standard equipment, but when it became possible to have them installed without undue cost, more and more people were installing them, and I presume they were installing them for the purpose of using them.

But we now face the next problem, Mr. Chairman. To get back to the harness belt that I was talking about, it is now available in a model that is quite convenient and it is well-established that it is a much better device than the lap belt. The lap belt has certain disadvantages; it jack-knifes the passenger and he is very likely to bang his head against the dashboard. The harness belt overcomes that difficulty, but on most American models—in fact, I think I am right in saying that on all American models—it is not even possible to install them since the cars do not have the necessary fittings. So we are right back where we were with the lap seat belt.

We will have a long battle just to get the industry even to put in the fittings so that those who want to use them can use them. Right now, there is no way of getting them. You have to have the side of your car reinforced or else the harness belt is of no use, it will break free. This is just one example of how this industry has dragged its feet.

It has spent, sir, millions upon millions of dollars on what it calls research and—according to the information that came out in the hearings in the U.S.—peanuts in any research relating to safety. Anything it has done, it has done under protest; it has had to be pushed and badgered.

Even now one can see again the standard tactic. Now that the manufacturers are cornered and public opinion is very much exercised, they are suggesting that they will be co-operative. Of course, the way they co-operate is to get the standards watered down. There is much talk of public standards, but in the U.S. legislative system there are many roadblocks that any law has to overcome. Now, they will co-operate on minimum standards that they cannot escape from and use this ploy as a means

of escaping more adequate standards that they ought to be adopting but are resisting.

This will be all that I want to say on this subject, Mr. Chairman. There is one other aspect that I think we should note relating to the irresponsibility of the industry in matters of safety and that relates to its whole method of promoting the sale of automobiles. Everything it does, practically, is an appeal to the most primitive and juvenile instincts of human beings. It features its cars in terms of their tremendous power, power far in excess of anything that anybody could possibly want to use or should properly consider using on a highway—on the Indianapolis speedway, yes, the power may be desirable. Always the emphasis is on the power, and the appeal, as I say, is to the juvenile instincts of human beings.

All of us are frustrated to some degree, some a great deal. We feel a sense of power when we get into a great big vehicle. This is a compensation for our own sense of inadequacy and it is present in varying degrees in human beings. In some people who never grew up it is a compulsive sort of thing. This is the type of thing that the industry is always trying to exploit. "Unimportant as you may be to your wife and your boss and everybody else, you will be an important human being if you get this big powerful monster; at least you will be the master of that monster." That is the line the industry takes.

And just look at what this does to the work that the Minister tries to do in driver education. It appeals to all the very instincts that the Minister is trying to remove from the drivers, the aggressive instinct, the assertion of raw, crude power. This is the sort of thing that contributes to accidents which the Minister wants to remove from the highways. This was one of the purposes of the point system, to get some of these people, who cannot curb those tendencies, off the highways. If they have to find some sort of outlet or compensation for their frustrations, let them find it somewhere other than on the highways. But you see, the industry is going against him all the time in the psychological appeals it makes. The cars are called by such names as "Barracuda," "Mustang," "Tornado," "Jaguar," "Tempest," names that are all associated with an undisciplined exercise of power.

Mr. Newman: And then you have the tiger in the tank.

Mr. Bryden: I was going to come to that in a minute. This is the type of irresponsible appeal made by the manufacturers and we wonder why we have accidents on highways. They provide cars that are death traps; if you get into an accident you are liable to be clobbered, which is not necessary at all, and all the time they are trying to stir up the primitive, juvenile instincts in the driver so as to enhance the possibility that accidents will occur. One would almost think the automobile companies have shares in undertaking establishments, the way they carry on in their advertising.

As my friend, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville noted—and I was going to get on to the point in any case—it is not only the automobile industry that is irresponsible in this way; there are other major industries, too. The largest oil company in Canada—and it is actually a subsidiary of the greatest oil monopoly in the world, one of the greatest monopolies the world has ever seen—the Imperial Oil Company, for the last year has been promoting as its slogan for the sale of its product, "Put a tiger in your tank." Now, in heaven's name, what do we want with tigers on our highways of Ontario? Tigers in the jungle are very interesting animals and as long as they are in the jungle, I think they should be protected, and they kill only for food in the jungle. But here the Imperial Oil Company is trying to put tigers out on the highways of Ontario. Again, an appeal to the juvenile instinct, to all the aggressiveness of human beings which civilization has managed to curb to a certain degree but which is still latent beneath the surface and here we have this major oil company conducting a campaign of this kind over a long period of time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I can see that my friends on the opposite side of the House are unconcerned about the problem. They are unconcerned about the problem and so we hear various snide remarks and gibes such as "maybe we should go back to the wheelbarrow" or "maybe I have a tiger in my tank." But you see, Mr. Chairman, again I think we should try to overcome the brainwashing of the industry. The choice is not between a car unsafely built with excessive power and a wheelbarrow; but between reason and unreason. There has been very little reason in any of the efforts of the automobile industry and the industries related to automobiles in the promotion of their products. There has been very little reasoning except under real duress in the design of cars. There are many ways in which cars

can be made safer, not that they will be any less accident-prone, after all that is the driver in most cases who is responsible for the accident, but it is the—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Does the hon. member want us to go back to using wheelbarrows?

Mr. Bryden: If the hon. member for Simcoe East had listened or if he had been capable of following the most elementary logic, he would have realized that that is not the point at all. The main point is that even though accidents will occur it is important that cars should be so designed as to minimize the consequences of the accident. We should not kill people or maim them when it is quite unnecessary to do so, when it is possible to have cars which will protect them even when they are unfortunately involved in accidents. I think that this point should not be lost sight of and we should not allow the industry to obscure it by referring to what is quite a different point, the problems with drivers.

I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister has made himself nothing more than an industry spokesman in this important area. I think as a representative of the public of Ontario, he ought to be riding herd on the industry. Especially since there are so many other people in other jurisdictions with whom he could associate himself in that effort. It is only because of the work that has been done in the United States that we are getting even minimal safety features in cars now. The Minister should take a stand in relation to the industry and not bother with his little trips to Detroit to be told about how concerned they are, and above all, not tell this House that he cannot give us information because the information has not yet been released by the automobile industry. I do not think he should bother telling us any secrets of the automobile industry. What he should be saying is, "By 1967 I want certain features on cars"—a lot more than anything he has mentioned up till now—and that if the industry does not like it they had better learn to like it because they will not sell cars in Ontario unless they have those features. He would not then be in the ridiculous position that he was in a little while ago this afternoon, where he had to tell this House that he could not give us certain information that is of vital significance to the people of Ontario because the automobile manufacturers had not given him permission to do it yet. When we are in this sort of situation, Mr. Chairman, we are in a bad state of affairs. I would suggest to the Minister that it is time he reconsidered his role, and decided that he was the censor of the industry, that he was there to lay down standards for it —in association with other jurisdictions, to be sure—and that he was not content to have cosy negotiations with them but was putting it right on the line to them. Past history, Mr. Chairman, indicates that this industry will do nothing at all in the safety field unless it is put right on the line to them.

Anything they have done up to now has been because it has been put on the line. The Minister indicated that the publicity of the last year or so has made the industry move a bit in this field. Well, for heaven's sake, keep them moving. Do not go now making cosy arrangements with them. Start laying it on the line to them so that they will get moving a little faster. This is the way in which a Minister of the Crown and a Legislature should act in a situation like this. Let's forget about the working out co-operative deals with the industry. They have not worked up till now, and there is no indication that they will work.

Mr. Chairman: It should be pointed out that it is very difficult to stay with 2103 because it seems to overlap into 2104 with the highway safety and vehicle safety. And under the circumstances, I am not making any attempt to differentiate between the two votes.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I agree with my hon. friend from Bracondale, and his point of view that not much purpose is served, if I understood him correctly, in speaking about car safety and all the while flaying the manufacturers of cars—giant monoliths as they are—as being the repositories of all that is evil in respect of turning loose on our highways vehicles that have built-in innate dangers.

My hon. friend from Woodbine, he sometimes has such an obsession with bigness that he approaches a near paranoia when he gets on the subject of a giant like General Motors or Esso, a subsidiary of Standard Oil. Now, having said that, I am authorized to say that I did not agree with much else that my friend from Bracondale said. And I do not really believe that people involved in motor vehicle accidents deserve to be called nuts or, to put it the other way, that because a person is involved in a motor vehicle accident, ergo, he becomes a nut.

A good many people are involved in motor vehicle accidents and indeed find themselves

before the justices to answer for their conduct who are otherwise very reputable, law-abiding citizens in the community. I have represented a good many of them. And having been in magistrate's court for careless driving, those people—whatever the fate that befalls them before the Queen's justices—most of them will never be in a magistrate's court again in their life. And I pointed that out to many a magistrate that in dealing with driving offences they are not dealing with the ordinary run-of-the-mill criminals; but as I say, often very responsible citizens.

The area is a very grave one, and calling upon 11 years of experience, the more I reflect upon it and the more I read about it, this matter of highway safety, the more convinced I become that it is not capable of simple solution. I am firmly convinced that the auto industry—no matter how big it is, or how powerful it is said to be—that that industry will abide by the dictates of this Legislature. If this Legislature passes enactments that says cars after such and such a date must contain safety features, the industry has no alternative but to build them in. This Legislature did that with automatic turning signals and it did that with seat belts.

Now, we will progress at some time, I hope fairly soon, to the mandatory padded dash, though I understand that it is becoming a voluntary one by the industry, as well as the telescoping steering wheel. Eventually I hope we will progress to doing something about that immense amount of hardware inside motor vehicles that contribute to very serious injury, and I refer to the door handles, the window winders, ashtrays and so on. And I would think with the progress, the efluxion of time that we will tell the industry what they must do in respect of the building of their cars. It may be powerful, but it is not more powerful than this exclusive club here which is the respository of all final power in the province.

Now, having said that, I wish to turn to the matter of the safety of highways themselves. And I want to charge that there is a monumental indifference in this government about the conditions that exist in respect of some of the highways it builds itself and is responsible to maintain, indeed responsible in the law, under The Highway Improvement Act, and it is liable for negligence in the disrepair of the highways.

Let me give three illustrations. Along came the Minister of Highways—at that time it was the dairyman from Dunnville—and they built the new Highway 69 coming into the city of Sudbury, and at a place we call the Four Corners, the intersection of the highway with Paris street, then called the Trout Lake road, they had what amounted to a blind intersection. Now, after seven or eight people were killed at the intersection, they decided — their engineers decided — that it would be a good idea to take out several thousand tons of rock, a very expensive proposition, albeit nothing approaching the $700 million the Minister of Highways is apparently going to give to Metropolitan Toronto in my view. In my view the government must get up every day, the responsible Ministers, and call up the Metro chairman and say, "What can we do for you today?"

Mr. Singer: It took us a while to get them around to that.

Mr. Sopha: Of course, that is a reflection of the ability of the Metro members in the House. Look them over, every one is more than of ordinary ability. Every one of them on all sides of the House, the most able people in the House represent Metro. My friend from Downsview and several members of the NDP and the Ministers, Minister of Reform Institutions, no wonder they get a lot.

Hon. Mr. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): The hon. member for Downsview has persuaded the hon. member for Grey North.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder how many other places in the province this impediment to—well, I did not include you, but, I feel so good today and so benevolent that I will even include you. I wonder, in how many other places in the province conditions exist like the one I relate at the Four Corners of Sudbury, where it took carnage of human bodies, an immense amount of human suffering, to impel The Department of Highways to come along and correct the situation.

Let me go to the junction of their two highways in Sudbury, the junction of 69 and 17.

Mr. Chairman: If you are going to start another point, would this be a good time to interrupt the member?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Thank you.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 123

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 30, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 30, 1966

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, **continued** 3999

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, **agreed to** 4047

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 30, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

(continued)

On votes 2103 and 2104:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): On adjournment, Mr. Chairman, I was calling attention to the contributory part played by dangerous conditions of highways in causing human suffering and property damage. I had drawn attention to an example of an intersection that was obstructed and I pleaded in that regard for a good deal more of what I think is called "day-lighting" of intersections where houses and topographical features are removed from the intersection to give a better view for motorists who are passing through, and particularly in respect of intersections that are much used by vehicular traffic.

I want to turn to a prize example—I do not know if "prize" is the right word—but certainly it is an intersection under the control of this government that has caused a good deal of physical pain and suffering and death to a good many people in the city of Sudbury. That intersection is at the conjunction of four streets and involves a railway crossing where Highway 69 joins Highway 17, known as the Lorne Riverside crossing.

One wonders what concern the government has about its own highways. I believe I speak truthfully when I say that Highway 69 within the city of Sudbury is still under the jurisdiction and control of the government of Ontario and has never, since the amalgamation with the adjoining township of McKim, been ceded to the city of Sudbury, but every year on that intersection which crosses the main line to Sault Ste. Marie of the Canadian Pacific Railway, six or seven people or more lose their lives when they become involved in accidents with the trains which move rather quickly across that intersection. I raised this matter before about the human carnage that is caused there, and the response from a very senior member of the administration of this government was to the effect that Sudbury drivers were among the worst, if not the worst, in North America, which is hardly a rational answer that is acceptable to the responsible people of this city of Sudbury.

Some distance to the east, the CPR and the government and the municipality took steps several years ago to put an underpass under another crossing of the CPR. I will venture to say that the Riverside crossing was not nearly as dangerous as the Lorne Riverside crossing is, but plead as we might, and pleas emanate from the city council of Sudbury, no steps whatsoever are taken by the government to improve what amounts to a railroad crossing that belongs to the government and is under its control. It is perfectly impossible for the municipal council of Sudbury, facing a 10 per cent increase in local taxes, to engage in the heavy debenture expenditure that would be involved in building an overpass over this intersection, but if something is not done, I am depressed to have to say that probably in the ensuing year, three or four or five or six or eight people will lose their lives at that very same intersection.

The wigwags that warn of the approaching train, turn off all the traffic lights—and there is a great maze of them at that intersection—but apparently they are not sufficient by way of caution to deter people from going across the track into the path of an approaching train that is going sometimes 20 or 30 miles an hour.

Not long ago, there was a big General Motors dealer adjacent to the intersection and a young man in the employ of that dealership got into the tractor of a tractor-trailer and was moving the tractor out of the garage. He sped across the intersection into the path of a train and he lost his life. I would think that at a point past the midway of the 1960s we have come to a sufficient degree of sophistication of the intelligence that level crossings over railways ought to have become obsolete, or perhaps obsolescent is the word, and steps ought to be taken to eradicate them throughout the whole of the province.

I leave that one and turn to my third example. Sudbury is a place, vis-à-vis traffic happenings, that is the residence of many sorts. We have had the death-trap at the western approaches to the city for many years, and it was only after the most vociferous pleas made by all sorts of groups and people, including the hon. member for Nickel Belt and myself, that something was done about the fog condition that surrounded the intersection of the main road into Copper Cliff on Highway 17. Finally, after many pleas, the department undertook the responsibility of building a single meridian, dividing the highway into two lanes going west and two coming east.

They erected a series or a system of lights for approximately two miles, to offset the fog conditions which very rapidly developed there within a matter of minutes. Somewhat facetiously, but not altogether, I reveal that the day the lights were turned on, the member for Nickel Belt and myself were invited to do the actual turning on of the lights about four o'clock in the afternoon—a fine system of the most modern lighting that could be devised. We went out there at four o'clock, and the press, and the radio and the television were out there, and the cameras were going, and the member for Nickel Belt and myself with our hands on the master switch turned on the lights. Any politician worth his salt, of course, would have a gladsome heart for all the publicity that that evolved; a dangerous situation had been corrected by the installation of these expensive lights. Well, lo and behold, an hour later, 16 cars piled up, one into the other, at that location.

You can understand there was nothing on the TV or in the press about turning on the lights. An accident of that magnitude occurred with a good deal of personal injury and property damage, as 16 cars piled into one another.

Now what the geniuses in The Department of Highways are going to do about that situation, I do not know, but apparently the lighting does not counteract rapidly developing fog conditions. And so it goes.

I have always had the feeling that there ought to be on our highways, a good deal more of the guardrail employed. You see guardrails where there is a steep precipice and you see them where the highway abuts water; no doubt they are very expensive things to put in, but I would think, especially in the north country, that there ought to be a good deal more use of the guardrails where the abutment to the road consists of a rock precipice, or perhaps consists of a rock cut they have had to push through, part of the precambrian shield. A good deal of personal injury and loss of life involves the car going off the road and piling into one of these rock walls that abut the highways.

In respect of that, I want to say this, that what I so intensely disagreed with my friend from Bracondale about, when he talks about the human error in accidents—well, my goodness, in a great many fields of human endeavour we protect the individual from his folly. Legislatures for a couple of hundred years now have been passing statutes and enforcing laws to protect the individual from his own failings and his own weaknesses. We do that with workmen's compensation. We do not say that a person is silly if he puts his hand into the gear mechanism of a piece of machinery, and he is a victim of his own carelessness. We pass laws requiring safety devices to protect the worker against his inadvertence and momentary carelessness or the fact that his mind is dwelling on some private beef that he has against some person.

And so it goes with highways and motorcars: It is our obligation as legislators to take into account the human folly and weakness and carelessness and to make the environment, including our highways, as safe as we possibly can as a guarding measure against the human error that is inherent in all of us, no matter what station in life we occupy. I commend that as a sensible approach and say to this House that we have to do more; we have to do more than we have done in lessening as much as we can the carnage that has become part of our way of life. I for one object to this business of holiday weekends where some safety council announces the number that will be killed over the weekend. We live in an age of records; we are conscious of records in every sphere of human endeavour. We are always trying to establish new records. It just seems to me that by publication of those statistics, in a sort of an obverse way we are inviting the establishment of a record. What would these people do if they said 250 Canadians were going to be killed on a July 1 weekend—just to grab a figure out of the air—and only 220 were killed? One gets the impression in an age of propaganda that there would almost be a disappointment. When 375, in fact, are killed, well, you get the idea that a new record has been established. I wish someone would explain to me the rationale of that type of advertisement some time and show me the effect that it has in promoting highway safety.

Let me turn to the enforcement of the law. One is conscious of the tremendous

political success that Governor Ribicoff had in Connecticut in his programme of enforcement of the traffic laws, when he enforced them so rigorously that people who formerly had had their tickets fixed because of their status in the community, discovered that they were outlaws the same as the ordinary Joe on the street and that system vanished. It has disturbed those who do not feel that enforcement of the law is the answer that accidents in Connecticut have apparently been cut very significantly.

I just want to address myself to one aspect of it. We have come to a state of agreement where we all accept the fact that to drive on a highway is a privilege and it is not a right. That privilege is subject to being divested if conduct or behaviour comes to the point that it is anti-social and amounts to a crime against society, then the privilege is taken away. Legislators, when they passed the statute, very wisely gave no person, not even the Minister, indeed not even the representative of the Crown, the power to give the licence back before the period of cancellation had expired. It was a very wise decision that was made. And now people who come and tell us their troubles about having their driving privileges suspended, well, the answer which we politicians make is plain, we say that nobody except in the cases provided in section 25 of The Highway Traffic Act, can give you your licence back, you just have to sweat it out until the period is up. And that is fine, that bails us out of what could be a very embarrassing situation.

Now, the corollary of that is that I have felt that this privilege ought to be attended by strict enforcement. And I do not hesitate to say that I would support a measure—I do not like jails and I do not like to see people in jails—but I would indeed support a measure which said that for a first offence of driving while the licence was under suspension or while driving privileges have been prohibited anywhere in Canada under the code the offender should be jailed. Members will realize there are two ways of losing the right and privilege of driving. In either of those cases if the person had the gall, the temerity, and indeed, the boldness to flaunt the law—to flout, I suppose is the word, B. K. Sandwell will quarrel about that—to flout the law, he must go to jail for it. And that, if a few people were given seven days in the "crowbar hotel," it would not be long until I suspect that it would have a very therapeutic effect upon our citizens and those members of our citizens who think that the magistrate's words in suspending his licence are just so much idleness and he can dare to get behind the wheel of a car when his privilege to do so has been suspended. But, under the present enforcement of the law, I can say from my own experience, that a person will come before the courts a second, a third and a fourth time, having been apprehended by the police for driving his car without a licence and the magistrate in each of the cases will impose a fine once again.

I would think that rationality demands that we create the impression that we mean business. We mean business about the privilege of driving, and the person—

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): You would not have a job if they did not do that.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I might be willing to give it up. I would be willing to give it up if all men got to a state of complete grace, I would be willing to give up my profession. I could always do something else.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Go into idleness?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I could go into idleness and be a druggist. Almost anything else. But, seriously, until the interruption by my good friend from Perth—and he is my good friend—I was saying that we have to create an impression that the law must be obeyed. Let me give you an example of a thing I observed and its impact upon the public.

There was a case—and my friend the hon. Minister of Public Works is not here and he does not like me to talk about my cases, but it is not my case, it is a case of which I am aware—it was a case where an air force van came along the highway, and when it turned out to pass a car it hit two girls—two teenage girls 15 and 16 years of age—who were walking on their own side of the road, the left-hand side facing traffic.

He killed both of them. They died within a matter of minutes on the side of the road. He left the scene. This man left the scene of the accident and he went to a hotel where he was apprehended by the police. He was charged with criminal negligence causing death; leaving the scene of an accident—yes, just those two charges!

This man came on for trial at the assizes in Sudbury and some sort of agreement was made between the Crown attorney and defence counsel that a plea of guilty to leaving the scene of the accident would be accepted in the case, and the charge of criminal negligence causing death would be withdrawn. That, in fact, was what happened.

I think we have to get away from these deals made by local Crown attorneys in such cases, and we will deal with that when the Attorney General's estimates come up.

He was sentenced to two months. An intelligent citizen of Sudbury who watched all that going on in Her Majesty's courts took the trouble to write a letter to the newspaper about it and to express his sense of shock and dismay that such deals go on in the courts of the province. He felt, on the facts, especially in view of the circumstances —the two young girls lost their lives, this man left the scene—that the man ought to have been put on trial on the more serious charge to allow the jury, which is the community and speaks in the name of society, to determine the measure of his guilt.

Of course, he is right. The citizen that wrote that letter is right. But to relate the circumstances to the House shows that careless attitude, the lack of concern that we have as a government and a society about the enforcement of our traffic laws, and indeed the lack of concern about the consequences of dereliction and deviation from a reasonable adherence to their strictures.

Our traffic laws really are not that tough. They are not that severe. They are intelligent laws of a democratic society enforced by a system of justice which is strong. All we need, I suggest, is a stricter enforcement of them so that we can persuade the community at large that the legislators, the law enforcement agency and the judges mean business about them.

In other words, the creation of a climate where everyone in the province is aware that we are serious about the way in which you, Mr. Citizen, drive in this province. We are serious about it. If you will not abide by socially accepted standards of driving, then you are going to have to give up your driving privileges and indeed you may face a term of imprisonment.

Now in that regard, in respect of repeaters there is not anything in the province approaching a central statistical register which records and makes available within a short space of time the driving record of an offender. Where you have five or six police forces in an area they all have their—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I know, I am going to answer that in a moment.

They all have their own records. A person might be convicted in municipality "A" a year ago; he is apprehended in municipality "B" and prosecuted by the police in municipality "B." He comes before the same court that tried him a year ago for the incidents in municipality "A," but the police force is not aware of his infraction and previous conviction so that the court can be presented with his driving record.

Now, it might be said that the information is on file at the department, but the answer is there is not time to get it. These cases sometimes are tried very speedily, within a matter of a few days, a week. And I can say from experience that a good many police forces do not take the trouble to find out from the department what the driving record is. They do not.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): It is not marked on the back.

Mr. Sopha: It is not marked because the licence is current. If it was within the time that the individual had the licence it would be marked. If he has given that one up and got a different one it is not marked on the new one. The offence might be two or three years before. I know of a recent case, from my experience, where an individual was facing his third charge of impaired driving, within a period of five years. Third charge of impaired driving. The prosecutor did not know that this was his third offence. The individual pleaded guilty and was convicted as a first offender and sentenced as a first offender. I knew privately that this was his third offence but, of course, I cannot divulge that because of my oath, my duty to the client. I cannot get up and see a man put in jail for three months—which is the minimum on a third offence—through something I say. If anybody wants to dispute that, we will go outside a little later and I will explain it to him. But I make my plea and although I earn my living to a large extent from the traffic courts and the automobile litigation, I can say right now that I have no sympathy for the offender. My private attitude does not affect in any way my obligations as counsel.

I am extremely alarmed about the human suffering that is caused on our highways and feel that we, as a moralistic group here, would have an obligation. My plea is made quietly and courteously to the hon. Minister that we have to put some muscle into our drive to cut down the number and frequency of accidents and the seriousness of the damage that they do to individuals and others dependent upon him.

I want to repeat what I said some time

ago and that is that one of the troubles about impairment when driving a motor vehicle while the ability is impaired—one of the troubles about enforcement of that is that society has not yet appended that offence with the scorn that it deserves. They have not ostracized the individual who is guilty of that offence. Nobody in the House, without a considerable degree of embarrassment and surrounded by privacy would think of inviting to dinner at his house a person convicted of indecent assault, or shoplifting, or receiving stolen goods; he would not think of inviting such a person to his house for dinner, but some of my best friends have been impaired, and have been convicted and I, as an individual, do not look down on them or treat them with the attitude that I ought to. And so it is with every member in the House.

We have not put the degree of culpability and shame on that offence that it deserves. Indeed, many of us—and that is why the gratuitous passenger section was so foolish—many of us coming out of the golf club, a meeting of the Elks or some other social function, would cheerfully and willingly get in the car; we would get in the car with the person who had had one too many and allow him to drive us home—

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): We could not drive ourselves.

Mr. Sopha: Yes—well, I suppose that is so, in many cases. Instead of standing outside the car and saying to the individual, "You are not fit to drive a motor vehicle, and neither I nor my wife will get into car with you." Well, Harry or Bill or Jim or Jack would be offended. He would be hurt because we refused the ride, so we get in the car with him with the full knowledge that he is incapable, for the time being, because of the excessive use of alcohol, of carefully and prudently operating that motor vehicle. To talk about the passenger assuming the risk was so foolish in the light of social attitudes. I said some time ago, and I say it again somewhat graphically, that we would make a great stride toward making impaired driving unacceptable in society by friends or enemies, if the impaired driver, after conviction, was treated in about the same way as the guest who brought up on the living room rug—

An hon. member: Brought up what?

Mr. Sopha: —and he is no longer invited back to meet with civilized people.

In some American jurisdictions I note they publish on the front page of the paper a list of those convicted of impaired driving yesterday. I imagine that has a tremendous prophylactic effect to see one's name on the front page of the paper as having been through the courts and convicted. Something like that is needed to change social attitudes in that regard.

It is also foolish to think that the only menace on the highway in the other car is the impaired driver, but that is not so. A person's abilities to drive might be impaired, and I have seen it so often, for any variety of reasons, other than the intake of drugs and alcohol. His ability to drive might be impaired by reason of a fight with his boss, financial reverse, emotional distress. That person can be just as impaired and he can just as easily go through a red traffic light as the individual under the influence of alcohol. The trouble is that in the second category that I have delineated, we cannot do much about them, except to attempt by propaganda and information to encourage a person not to drive in the demands of modern-day traffic, when he is not emotionally or physically up to the task of driving carefully.

The member for Woodbine introduced a very interesting topic about the motor industry and the part they play in educating people—"training," I think, is a better word. Advertisers train people like Pavlov's dogs nowadays into the feeling of the tremendous power that is behind the wheel of this Thunderbird, this Toronado, this Wildcat—to mention some of the more graphic names that are put on the motor vehicles. Anyone who reads Marshall McLuhan, and it is very fashionable to read Marshall McLuhan nowadays among the cognoscenti—that is the intellectual Mafia.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): The hon. Provincial Secretary is a member of it!

Mr. Sopha: No, he is not. Anyone who reads Mr. McLuhan knows exactly what he means. It is not only imparting to the purchaser the feel of the power of 320 horsepower but, of course, the motor vehicle industry has gone to the extent of making the automobile a status symbol as well; and it is a sex symbol, as McLuhan points out. Watch the advertising and see how closely they ally the sale of the automobile to a pretty girl. I think General Motors and sometimes Rambler cannot sell a car unless they have a lot of feminine pulchritude in the advertising adjacent to the car.

An hon. member: It helps to sell it.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it helps to sell it because the automobile has become a sex symbol. McLuhan points out that

An hon. member: You would not single these out.

Mr. Sopha: That is true. It is just that they make an extravagant use of it. The automobile industry makes an extravagant use of it and McLuhan points out in his "Mechanical Bride," if you care to read it, that a good many individuals with a flashy new car love the car more than their wives; they endow more affection on the car in keeping it shined up, and the car turns out to be, in fact, better dressed than their wives.

It may be facetious but it has—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: My friend from Windsor-Walkerville says that it does not talk back. I am going to leave that and I want to deal with—

Mr. Chairman: Deal with the vote!

Mr. Sopha: I join my friend the hon. member for Woodbine—he made a very sensible point about that oil company and I can say that when Esso Imperial Oil started that programme about the tiger, the gas station I went to had a paper tiger up above the gas tank in a cage. I have always admired that company for the reason that it put on the national hockey broadcast which is part of our national culture in the boondocks—you know, out in the boondocks the interest in hockey is a direct opposite of disinterest in the local public library and that is the way it exists.

Mr. Chairman: How does that fit into this vote?

Mr. Sopha: I just want to say that a tiger in the tank has no relevance to the needs of my car for fuel.

One last point: I would like to see enacted and I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, a section in The Highway Traffic Act which would prohibit the driver of an automobile from conveying small children in the front seat of that automobile in a standing position. I think that is a very sensible suggestion.

If the child is seated—and, of course, the most ideal situation is to have the child seated, or the children are seated in the car, with the seat belts on, we cannot expect the optimum—but if the child is seated in the car, beside the driver-parent, mother or father, the child has a far greater chance of escaping injury if there is a sudden deceleration of that car, than if the child is standing.

The most frequent accidents, the most frequent injuries that happen to passengers in what is called the suicide seat—and that is the seat next to the driver—that occur to passengers in those seats is if the passenger is propelled against the windshield. The windshield very frequently breaks and there are extensive facial, neck, and sometimes shoulder lacerations.

If, on the other hand, the lower portion of the passenger's body is propelled forward in a sudden deceleration, a collision, then the most frequent injury that you are going to find is fracture of the patella, because the kneecaps hit the hardware, the metal on the dashboard. Now, the modern cars, equipped as they are, most of them—I do not know about that— but many of them, equipped with a padded dash, the youngsters seated on the seat will most likely be propelled against the padded dash which is a far different kettle of fish from that youngster hitting the windshield. Very serious injury and death frequently result from a collision with the windshield. Indeed, people have been known in many accidents to have their heads severed, it becomes that gruesome.

Now, the exigencies, the demands, particularly of city traffic pedestrian crosswalks, intersections, multilane traffic, create emergent situations where the driver of a car never knows where there is the need for a sudden deceleration, and the driver being human, faced with an emergent situation ahead, is going to react by putting the foot on the brake, and the driver will apply the degree of force to the brakes that is related to his conception of the nearness of the emergency. That is to say, if collision is imminent, the driver will apply those brakes with great force.

A child standing on the seat in the front, in such a situation, has not got a chance. That child has not got a chance. That child is going to be propelled into that windshield and his or her bones, at the age of five or six or four years of age, are not going to withstand the tremendous amount of force with which the head or shoulders make impact with that windshield.

I merely say that it would be easy for us —perhaps not this year; perhaps the exigencies of the business of the House are too great—but next year, to put a section in The Highway Traffic Act which would say that

no person shall convey a child in the front seat of an automobile in a standing position. I venture to say the result—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): How are you going to police it?

Mr. Sopha: It is perfectly apparent to police forces, who are always keeping an observation on traffic. They see a car go by and see a child standing on the front seat with one other occupant in the car, whose—

Mr. Letherby: Some children seated are taller than those standing.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I do not want to digress into a discussion. I am speaking of children of tender years. I am speaking of young children, frequently preschool children, and really, there is nothing funny about it.

Mr. Letherby: I am not trying to be funny.

Mr. Sopha: There is nothing funny about it. It is tragic circumstances. I know of one case where a psychiatrist was forced to decelerate his car and had his five-year-old boy on the front seat and that boy went through the windshield and lost his life, with very tragic results to the parent who was driving that car. I am merely pleading for the enactment of another rule of the road in The Highway Traffic Act.

I say, finally, that we must intelligently go on apace and conduct more and more research and more and more studies. I join with my friend from Downsview in urging and exhorting the hon. Minister to set up within his department some proper machinery and organization to enable us to understand the nature and causes, the frequency of highway accidents. I for one do not believe that these private safety councils are adequate to do the job, staffed as they are largely by volunteers. These people have a very genuine interest—I do not downgrade them at all—they have a very genuine interest and are very well meant, but they remain as volunteers with a rather tenuous interest, from the point of view of the application of their time, to the problem of accidents on our highways. It is incumbent upon the hon. Minister, and indeed this government, to put this province in the very forefront of a battle against the carnage that exists on our highways.

You know, it really distresses one, and this is the last thing I am going to say. It really distresses one. Let there be a little epidemic of diphtheria—well, it is gone—or typhus in a community, and we get tremendously excited about it. The hon. Minister of Health would be issuing press releases as if they were coming out of something like a meat grinder, talking about government activation. The lives of a few hundred people might be affected.

But we can kill thousands on the highways—and my hon. friend from Grey North, I think, pointed out that more Canadians have been killed on our highways than in all the wars in which Canada participated in the 20th century—and we stand idly by, paying lip service to the need for improvement and we do not ever seem to get on the move and tackle the problem in the way that it needs to be tackled so that we master it, and throw the problem for a fall. We must be the victors—intelligent, reasonable people—the victors over a problem that besets us and causes great anxiety among our people, when chances are increasing of sustaining personal injury every time you get into a motor vehicle.

We are told we are going to have four million cars by 1975 or 1980 in this province —twice the number that we have got today. We know we cannot build the highways fast enough to accommodate them because of the tremendous expense that is involved to our society in building the highways, and the steps we are taking in making the highways safe are not one of the emblems that we can wear on our shield and point to with pride. It is not a source of pride, it is a source of defeat and we have allowed a problem to conquer us.

Maybe the time has come for some political party to launch a crusade, something in the nature of a crusade, and so enthuse our people that we convince them that we are going to grab hold of this problem and we are going to do something effective about it. We are going to lessen drastically the numbers who lose their lives and sustain human suffering on our highways. Maybe that is a platform that invites the attention of some political party and would lead it to victory at the polls.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to offer a few observations on the programmes of the highway safety branch. I think first of all we should congratulate the hon. Minister for the outstanding leadership he and his department are giving in this area.

The challenge respecting safety on our city roads and highways is one that should be

the concern of all. As the increase in motor vehicle permits is growing at such a rapid rate, all levels of government are going to have to meet the evergrowing demands for safety. But it must be pointed out that any aggressive safety programmes relating to the roads will have to be a co-ordinated effort through which training facilities will be provided for citizens who require better driving habits.

The whole area of highway safety is one that is of particular interest to me. The highway safety branch has a 16-point programme of responsibility for its accident prevention organizers. The most important thing to persuade mayors, reeves and other municipal officials about, is to provide active and positive leadership in promoting more vehicle accident prevention at the community level.

As far as my own area of Welland is concerned, we now have driver instruction as an extracurricular activity outside of regular school hours at Port Colborne high school and Thorold-Fonthill high school. Because of the groundwork done by accident prevention organizers, Welland high school, the vocational school, Eastdale secondary school, and Thorold district high school are showing a desire to have these courses. It would be my hope that they would accept this programme before the end of the year.

In this connection I think it is important to draw the attention of the members of the Legislature to the activities of the Welland safety council during 1965, as follows:

1. They attended the Ontario traffic safety workshops in Niagara Falls, Ontario, January 14-16, 1965. Proposed stopping traffic for school buses.

2. President and past-president took ten school patrolees to the national school patrol jamboree in Ottawa, May 21 and 22, 1965. More than 50 per cent of the cost of the trip was borne by the safety council.

3. Advocated a driver education programme in high schools.

4. Distributed safety pamphlets respecting traffic, sports, schools, the aged, to interested groups.

5. June, 1965—they entered a float in the rose parade, in the great city of Welland.

6. Advocated eye tests to be given to school crossing guards before employing them. This was approved by the city council.

7. Advocated glo-vests to be issued to school crossing guards. This was approved.

8. Suggested pedestrian crossing light be placed at Hellems avenue and Division street. That is in the city of Welland and this is pending.

9. Advocated the banning of skate boards.

10. Endorsed Gordon school PTA regarding placing of school zone signs and 25 mph speed limit at Thorold road. This was carried out.

11. Continued the Elmer the Elephant safety campaign.

12. Instituted safety broadcasts on local radio stations. This is what they did in the great city of Welland.

13. Maintained throughout the year close liaison with interested groups and bodies in matters of safety. President and past-president spoke to various clubs and groups on safety. For example, the Kiwanis, Kinsmen, Optimists, Squires and various ladies' and church groups.

According to the information I have received from Magistrate J. H. Woodhouse of Welland, who maintains a constant interest in highway safety, these driver education courses have been found to be well accepted by the students. He stated, "The traffic court figures indicate that very few students who have taken this course and got their licences were ever involved in any traffic violations."

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we have in Welland the magistrate's court traffic clinic, conducted twice a month at the city hall and in which we have had many voluntarily participating. This clinic has generally been conducted as an informative arm of the traffic court and the court has referred traffic violators to its course. This clinic is conducted by members of the police department throughout the magistrates' jurisdiction in the great county of Welland.

Another area in which safety is of much concern is the enticing of children into cars by strangers. Again, in Welland county we are moving to check this problem by the introduction of a programme called "Beware of Strangers," pointing out the danger in young children talking to persons they do not know. This is a joint effort of the Thorold safety council and the chief of the police department, Mr. J. Ferrand. It is my hope that this programme will expand to cover all parts of the great county of Welland, also other counties throughout the province of Ontario. This programme is working so well.

Perhaps the Minister will investigate our setup and send out to all municipal authorities a report, along with a directive, urging municipal councils to implement safety programmes in their own localities. If I may go back to some of my earlier remarks where I

mention the 16 major responsibilities of the accident prevention organizers, there is one point which reads, "To promote public safety education through programmes on radio and television."

The use of this media is very important and, in my own view, should be increased. As an example, the road safety workshop held in Niagara Falls last year was an unqualified success. It has been suggested to me that maybe The Department of Transport should film parts of these workshops and arrange with radio and TV stations to use the information across the province.

I think this is a good idea since the motoring public can certainly learn a great deal from these workshops, if we are successful in getting our message across to them.

Finally, I want to mention briefly the vehicle safety check programme. Last year in Welland county in the voluntary check lanes, 1,065 vehicles were inspected. Of these 564 were rejected and 501 approved. In other words, only 47 per cent were approved and over 50 per cent were found to have some defect.

Now, in the compulsory check lanes in Welland county only 25 per cent were approved out of 230 vehicle checks. Although originally one had some anxiety about compulsory safety checks by the government, it is easy to appreciate their necessity when one considers that of all vehicles checked in Ontario last year, either on a voluntary or compulsory basis, it was found that more than 50 per cent were rejected because of some type of mechanical defect.

There are many other areas in connection with highway safety that I have not touched on and which reflect great credit on this government and its imaginative Minister. We all recognize the right of the Opposition to criticize, but I would suggest that the people of this province, when they review the record in this area as well as in other areas of governmental responsibility, will arrive at the final conclusion which will be the same as in past years; that is, we in Ontario are receiving good government by a people's government. Thank you.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question dealing somewhat on the same line as referred to by the hon. member for Welland; that is, dealing with driver training programmes in schools. I realize the Minister has not had an opportunity to reply to a lot of the questions put to him today. Before answering this question, possibly, I could also enter into the discussion regarding safety features on our automobiles.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the truth about this subject is somewhere between the submissions made by the hon. member for Bracondale and that of the hon. member for Woodbine. This subject seems to have overwhelmed us during the last few months and this is all to the good.

I do not agree with the member for Bracondale that all accidents are caused by nuts behind the wheel, as he put it and as has been said. Even the good driver, during years of operating a car, will have a momentary lapse of caution, and for various reasons. It may not be considered negligence of any degree under the law but this driver is in an accident. It may or may not involve another vehicle. It is important, therefore, that as many safety features as possible are available in autos.

However, I do not agree with the hon member for Woodbine in his criticism of the automobile industry. I think he went too far. Furthermore, I think he was wrong when he accused the Minister of being an industry spokesman. The member suggested that the Minister be a censor for the industry.

The first objective should be to get the co-operation of the automobile industry. If they will not move, if the industry will not co-operate within reason, then we must legislate. The industry in the sale of motor vehicles depends a great deal on design and taste. Any mandatory regimentation of a safety car must be viewed in this light. We must not forget that many thousands of people depend on the industry for their livelihood in this province. However, contrary to what the hon. member for Bracondale said, the Minister is not ignoring all this talk about safe cars. At the same time, probably more than any other member of this House, he is aware of the problems and is not in a position to oversimplify them.

There is a problem of accident prevention and there is a problem of injury reduction. Both are important. The fact that this government is doing something about accident prevention does not mean that we are ignoring the problem of safety features in or on the motor vehicle. Legislation has recently been introduced in this House to deal with these problems. It is natural that the best approach is to gain the co-operation of those who manufacture vehicles and automobiles and trucks. They have the research facilities and they have the know-how.

If the industry has been dragging its feet

in the past, I suggest that this attitude is changing. Some credit for this should go to people in government such as the hon. Minister who, amidst all the hullaballoo, have been meeting with those in industry, interpreting the statistics and anxieties of people concerned with the slaughter on our highways and safety generally.

The hon. member for Sudbury touched on the enforcement of our laws and I agree with him wholeheartedly in this aspect of his discussion. I do not agree with him entirely on what he said about our highways; I think we are building safe highways. The problem is, in many respects, that when we build freeways they sometimes turn into dragways. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that these problems will be solved by emotional exaggeration or tongue-in-cheek recommendations for 90 miles-per-hour speed limits, designed to capture headlines. The government should decide what safety features are required in autos and suggest that these should be included in all standard vehicles by a certain date. I submit that the industry will meet that date.

Mr. Chairman, getting back to my original question. I was wondering if the department has any plans to extend the driver safety programme in our secondary schools. With the co-operation of The Department of Education, for example, would you consider this to be a compulsory subject rather than just an extracurricular one? And, is there any possibility or consideration of raising the minimum age in order for a teenager to obain a driver's licence; has this been considered, and what has been the result of any such consideration?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the programme of high school education is one that is one of the most encouraging facets in our programme of safety education. It is only one, but it is one that is being advanced with a very gratifying rate today.

It was in 1960 that in conjunction with the Minister of Education—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): What is the rate of advance?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This programme was undertaken.

Mr. Sargent: I asked, what is the rate of advance?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The programme is an extra-curricular one. The decision whether to have it or not rests with the local school board, so that the question of making it compulsory, is rather beyond us at this time. Three years ago, after three years of the programme, we had advanced to the place where we had, I think, 73 schools giving the programme. Two years ago it had climbed to 105; this year it has advanced to 147, with 66 other schools looking forward to introducing it this fall so that by this fall we will have more than 40 per cent of all the high schools in the province giving the programme.

The programme is supported in various ways. The training of the driver instructors is done through bursaries provided by the all Canada insurance federation. The Department of Transport provides all the materials for the course, and the motor vehicle companies normally provide the vehicles with extra equipment making them dual controlled. For teachers there are night school rates paid them for their overtime. The pupils who graduate from these driver-training courses, for which they pay, usually save the cost of the course very quickly because of the reduced premiums that the insurance companies extend to young drivers who have graduated from the course.

We are looking forward to having the course provided by universities in the coming year, and The Department of Education is pursuing this aspect. All in all I think that driver education in the high schools is a must and that eventually we will come to the point when practically every high school in the province will have it. But if we just have another year or two at the rate of advance we are enjoying today, this will be accomplished before long.

Mr. Sargent: What percentage is that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This fall we will have more than 40 per cent.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, Mr. Chairman, on this point—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview is next.

Mr. Singer: Yes, on this point, I am interested in the Minister's optimism but I am not sure that the statistics really bear out his optimism. A comparison with what is going on in New York state really makes Ontario look very sad in this particular field.

The Ontario safety league, for instance, has stated that driver education will cut down accident damages incurred by teenagers by 50 per cent. Now, surely, that figure and that statement should move the Minister to much more rapid action than he has

already taken. The United States national education association reported that graduates from high school courses in driver education have fewer accidents and violations than those with no such training.

Provincial grants to this programme are very limited. The Minister depends on outside sources for this money, by and large, except for his grant to the Ontario safety league. It would seem to me that the big success that this programme has had in a jurisdiction like New York, where all of the problems that we have here in this province are multiplied by 10 or 20, would move the Minister to much more violent action.

I recognize that his colleague, the hon. Minister of Education, and many educators are reluctant to put another course into the high schools. The Minister mentions some emphasis on the university. But if we in Ontario are going to let youngsters start to drive at 16 years of age, surely the place where they should get the training is in high school. The rate of advance in this important field in Ontario seems to be almost a snail's pace.

Here is a field which an imaginative Minister should have realized has a tremendous potential. Our insurance companies complain at great length about the fantastic risk constituted by males under 25, and they put their premiums away up as a result. Perhaps some accident statistics have some relation to this feeling. But, surely, the time to train youngsters is when they first get their licences.

I would like to hear the Minister not be quite so optimistic about what we are going to do if we have another year or two. I would like to hear him commit the government to an intensive programme of youngster training through our schools, and with his Cabinet colleagues bring influence to bear on the Minister of Education so that those courses are in our schools—perhaps as after-hours courses—but that is where they should be. If we are going to attack this horrible toll of deaths and accidents on the highways, this is where we have got to start.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: No, the member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, just in reply to the other voice from the Liberal Party which uttered forth this afternoon, I would indicate to him that those of us who have been talking about car safety for some time have also stressed—and I think the record will show this—the importance of the very matter which the hon. member for Downsview has just been stressing, the importance of driver training, particularly in the high schools and this sort of matter.

The hon. member for Halton has just indicated that he expects that the motorcar industry will co-operate in full measure with the hon. Minister, and he castigated the hon. member for Woodbine for his statement this afternoon; but I would call the attention of the member to the fact that, by and large, the advances that have been made in the safety field have been forced by legislation or by the threat of legislation through the years.

I am not going to take the time of the House tonight to document this in large measure, because it has been documented before the committees in Washington and by Ralph Nader and by writers in this field, people who have investigated this thoroughly. But during the presentation the hon. Minister mentioned the matter of the collapsible steering column which is going to come into effect next year. This has a long history and I simply outline a bit of it today. When the Minister says that he has negotiated with the industry to get the collapsible steering column, I am not doubting his word; he likely did. But the facts behind that he is completely ignoring or else he has not been in touch with the situation.

The Minister must have been aware of what has been going on in the general service administration; he has mentioned that. It began its work by attempting to set up standards for federally purchased cars, but the matter of the steering column was always shelved, and as late as January of this year, 1966, the industry maintained that it was already too late to instal a collapsible column in the 1968 car. Then the furore over the New York safety car came, and the hearings at Albany, and in those hearings, Dr. Paul Gikas of the University of Michigan presented his slides and demonstrated the danger of the steering column. This was one of the graphic parts of his presentation and the industry was there to see it.

Across the country publicity rose about the danger in connection with the steering column and other features of the motorcar. Public opinion grew until the final day of those hearings in Albany. The announcement was made by General Motors and American Motors that they would instal the collapsible steering column in the 1967 car.

It was revealed at that time, Mr. Chairman,

that the industry had exhaustively tested and perfected the telescoping column over the past five years. In other words, they had it. Chrysler since announced that it will use the collapsible features and Ford has not yet made up his mind, but says a great deal about a collapsible steering wheel. But, let me say this, that without the determination of the New York committee we would still be waiting for the industry to move, and the hon. Minister would not have been able to make his announcement to this House. Let us remember too that the column proposed is not yet perfect and a great deal of work still has to be done in this field before the wheel is safer than it is today. And safer than it will be in the 1967 car.

Time after time after time, Mr. Chairman, this has been the history of safety devices on the motorcar. The industry has known about these things—the afterburner that we talked about some time ago, for example—and the state of California fought for 15 years to get that afterburner on their cars. But they finally got it only when they brought in legislation. And the industry suddenly discovered after California had mandated the afterburner, and after California had given approval to four small companies who had brought forward inventions—suddenly the industry decided it could do it without these inventions. The patent, the patent they used in connection with this afterburner, goes back to January of 1909. Now, can anything be more absurd than this? Because all the time they were assuring the state of California that they were doing research—sooner or later they would find out how to do it; give them more time, more time, more time.

I think the hon. Minister has to face the fact that if we are going to get safety features in Ontario, we are going to have to do as the hon. member suggests and we are going to have to mandate and give the industry a certain length of time to bring these out. We have to decide what we want, and then tell the industry, instead of asking the industry what they are prepared to do and then announcing that in a grandiose way.

I would like to ask the Minister a couple of questions regarding the statement which he made. One of these statements is this: It is apparent that the mechanical condition of vehicles contributes to not more than three or four per cent of the accidents at the outside maximum. This estimate includes defects resulting from lack of proper maintenance. Now, this is quite a statement, Mr. Chairman, and I wonder what the statistics are which led the Minister to believe that the mechanical condition of vehicles contributed to no more than three or four per cent of accidents at the outside maximum. I wonder if he could explain how he arrived at those figures?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, while we are waiting for him to find the place in the book, I thought the House might be interested to know that the Tory government of Prince Edward Island went down to defeat tonight to the Liberals.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): What was the score?

Mr. Singer: It was 17 to 13.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, in the accident facts on the summary sheet and in the portion numbered 7, the member for Yorkview will find that of the 231,000 vehicles involved in accidents, some 218,000 were found to be in apparently good condition. The brakes were defective in 2,619; the steering mechanism defective in 490 vehicles; tires, punctures or blowouts were defective in 1,332 vehicles; and headlights, 13 glaring headlights, dim lights in 22, headlights both out in 128, one light out in 113; tail light out or obscured in 216. Other defects, 1,983; not known 6,720, out of a total of 231,726.

I think you will find that without regard to those where the condition was not known, there were some 94.4 per cent of all the vehicles in apparently good condition.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this was the whole point. "Apparently in good condition," as I pointed out before—during the highway estimates, I think it was—I felt that the reports were very inadequate. Here we have a report which shows that most of the accidents occurred during a time when people were driving properly, when the driver was apparently normal during daylight and when the condition of the vehicle was apparently good and going straight, and so on. I am wondering whether the hon. Minister really feels that these statistics are accurate enough to base this kind of result on, or this kind of decision upon, because evidently we just do not have the kind of statistical information which gives us what we ought to have.

I raise this because not long ago, as a matter of fact on May 12, when Morgan Firestone was making a speech in London, Ontario, and he pointed out this fact which is rather an interesting one in view of the hon. Minister's conclusions here. He says:

> Statistics compiled by Firestone on 18 United States turnpikes show that 70 per

cent of all accidents were caused by the driver; nine per cent were due to animals or objects on the road; six per cent were due to mechanical defects in the auto and four per cent were due to the tires.

Then he goes on to say:

Of the four per cent, half had smooth or old tires. That is not our fault, that is negligence, said Mr. Firestone.

Now, what he is saying is that four per cent of the accidents in this area are due to tires, two per cent faulty, two per cent to new or good tires, which have blown. Translating that to our own figures, even that defect in good tires would account for about 32 people dead in Ontario each year, 1,200 injured and $1.5 million in property damage.

In addition to that, we have testimony which was given before the Senate committee in the United States, in connection with automobile accidents there. When Mr. Johnston, who was the general manager of the national safety council, was testifying and Senator Hartke asked him, and I quote:

Now we come back to the question; I want to try to find out, do you have any estimate on the number of accidents which are attributable to mechanical failure or involving designs of automobiles?

The answer is: "No."

Has the national safety council stated it is less than ten per cent?

Mr. Johnston: These are essentially defects that come about through lack of owner maintenance, brakes that are improperly maintained, and lights, and things of that sort, or bald tires. That comes out of police reports. A policeman investigates the accident and finds in his judgment that there are defective brakes. He has not reported on design.

And he said we cannot estimate on design, he is only estimating on these other things. Then Senator Harke says this:

What about the rest of it? What about the mechanical fault, and vehicle failure, whatever that may be?

Mr. Johnston: That would be of the types that the owner usually controls through maintenance such as a light which burned out, brakes deteriorated, or bald tires, the type of things which police officers can observe and report.

Senator Harke: Do you have any estimate on that part?

Mr. Johnston: Yes.

Senator Harke: What is that?

Mr. Johnston: Ten per cent.

Senator Harke: What is that based on?

Mr. Johnston: That is based on police reports.

In other words, what Mr. Johnston of the United States national safety council says is that these kind of accidents, because of bad maintenance and this kind of thing, apart completely from design, account for about ten per cent of the accidents. These figures just do not seem to jibe.

Then of course in addition to that, we have the whole matter of the cars that have been recalled, which are not classified here, the ones with defects that were built into them. We had some discussion of that this afternoon, and I do not need to go over it again, and we have no way of knowing after the accident, how many of these were involved in that accident, because that kind of defect has not been looked for up to this time.

Then in addition, of course, you have the built-in hazards in a motorcar. Dr. Gikas of the University of Michigan, has issued a report recently, he and his partner, and they tell about 139 accidents that they observed. The two-man team of the University of Michigan medical school have just finished a four-year investigation. They had a system with the state. Alerted by a police hot line, to home and office, the pair would speed from Ann Arbour to the scenes of auto violence in their own county. If the dead had catapulted off the road they were left untouched for Dr. Donald Huelke, associate in anatomy, and Dr. Paul Gikas, assistant in pathology, to examine. The researchers would also question the injured, and would do a whole job in looking into the accident. Of the 139 accidents, 177 people died.

Ejections from the car, the top killer, took 48 lives. Seat belts would have saved 80 per cent of the dead. I think this is something very significant from their report, that if we did use seat belts, particularly in ejection accidents, that 80 per cent might have survived.

Side-door impact—and this is where we are very weak in our cars—31 lives.

Steering assembly and wheel, 29. Instrument panel, 24. Others, 45. That is rear door, roof header and objects piercing or crushing the skull and that sort of thing.

Now, these are hazards that are built into the car which account for many more accidents. These would be in addition to the ten per cent which is given by the United States safety council.

So I am a bit puzzled at the hon. Minister's statement that he arrives at something like two, three or four per cent for his figures. Perhaps he might give a comment on this, but it just seems to me that in this area there is either lack of knowledge or there is very great disagreement among the experts.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, there can be a wide spread in statistics and how they are used. I have here a mention of a rather interesting experiment reported by the traffic institute of Northwestern University, conducted recently by a team of an engineer, a physician, and a behavioural scientist. They accompanied police to accident scenes when an accident happened and were given unlimited time to dig into all problems relating to each accident. In not one of the 65 vehicles involved in the accidents, which were investigated, was there a clear indication that a mechanical defect contributed to the accident.

Another interesting survey was based on 200 driver-reported accidents, allegedly caused by steering gear defects. It is reasonable to assume that steering gear failures would have some relation to peak volume periods of traffic, yet over 60 per cent of all the failures reported were between 10 p.m. and 2 a.m., which leads to the conclusion that these reports were for the purpose of covering up the real cause, such as alcohol, falling asleep and the like.

In summary, because of unreliable information in accident reports it is impossible to determine to what degree, if any, the mechanical condition of the vehicle contributed to the accident. Sometimes real defects are not traceable due to extensive damage in a collision; alternately many accidents may be reported as brake failure, when the driver has used this as an excuse to cover carelessness or lack of attention.

But in connection with the statement I made—and I was quoting from our own official records—I think that the hon. member for Yorkview has not refuted our statistics, because these are the ones we are dealing with. By these we are not guessing, these are police reports and they show positively that in 218,000 of the 231,000 vehicles, they were in apparently good condition, that in 1,332 vehicles tires had been defective, puncture or blowout and 1,332 vehicles with flat tires; and I think you could pretty well assess a flat tire either being flat or not flat. That amounts to just about exactly one-half of one per cent, and I think you can accept that. Of the 231,000 vehicles that were involved in accidents, only 1,332 had flat tires, so tire trouble was responsible for not more than one-half of one per cent of all the accidents.

Similarly, the statistics, when compiled, show that brakes were defective in 2,619 of the 231,000 vehicles, or approximately one per cent of all the vehicles involved in accidents.

These are what we go by and I say this further, for the benefit of the House, that when we make our reports to the Dominion bureau of statistics, Ontario statistics are compiled in this way, that of the 35 categories for which we are asked to supply complete data, Ontario provides full information on 34 of the 35 categories. I find on the other hand, our neighbouring province to the east provides out of the 35 complete categories, full information on seven.

I say to you that I believe our statistics are thorough and complete and these are the ones I go by. Surely if there are 1,332 cars with flat tires out of 231,000 involved in accidents, then tires could not have been responsible for more than approximately one-half of one per cent of all the accidents.

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Minister, the statistics are here, as you say. You go by these, but it just seems incredible that Ontario, with a death rate per 100 million miles of 7.2, as against the whole United States, 5.6, these just do not add up.

I agree with the hon. Minister that there is some difference in the way by which these figures are arrived at, but perhaps the hon. Minister could inform us how we can translate one into the other. There cannot be that much difference. So we take ours I suppose as correct, but somehow or other I think we have to get some sort of standard of statistic-taking so that we can arrive at certain conclusions about this whole matter.

Now, there is a question about standards which I wanted to ask the Minister—of the six items which were put into the 1966 cars, the padded dash was one. I was wondering how these standards for padded dash, for the other items that were in there, were arrived at. Were they general service administration standards or were they some other standard which was set up here?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I understand the standards used for these appliances or attachments were laid down by the society of automotive enginers, as a testing organization.

Mr. Young: Well, they would be then the general service standards which—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, I think they would use the same base.

Mr. Young: I am just a little concerned about this because the padded dash, for example, has come in for a great deal of criticism in recent years—in the last year or so—because very often a padded dash was put in there all right but then a piece of angle iron was put under it which made the padded dash more dangerous than the old dash used to be. I do not know whether the standards which were adopted in the United States finally are the standards—I take it they are from what the Minister said—but those standards are incredibly low; because again, if I could quote from the report of the hearings where William Steiglitz, who has a very good record in the field in the United States—he is an engineer with a B.Sc degree in aeronautical engineering from Massachusetts Tech, and he specializes in safety, reliability engineering, including accident prevention investigation, crash injury and protection and so on, and has worked with the bureau of safety, civil aeronautics board and other qualifications of this kind—he points out that and he says this is his testimony:

> Last year a large series of tests were conducted with the civil aeronautical research institute of the FAA. The work was done by John Swearingen of the staff there. He was looking for data on the tolerance of the human face to impact in order to establish standard applicable to aircraft design.
>
> Because of the availability of more data, he worked with the automobile dash panel, working co-operatively with the Oklahoma state police. They advised him of accidents when the dash panel was damaged. He obtained the panel out of the car, he got through the police the medical records of the injuries sustained and then in the laboratory under controlled conditions he reproduced that damage on the other panels that he bought from automobile scrapyards, identical panels. From his investigation, he found certain things; he found that loads above 30g's—and this was other medical evidence that was brought forward, there were periods of unconsciousness for 15 minutes to two hours in some cases. Every doctor I had talked to, he says, tells me that a period of unconsciousness of that sort is probably indication of a concussion with a possible permanent brain damage.

This is actually in the records. And yet the final standard that was set was an 80g standard, over twice what the human head should sustain. The original suggestion was made at the 40 mark. That was through negotiation with the automobile industry finally raised to 80, over double. In other words, it simply means that the strength of the panel to resist the head is now double what these investigations proved they ought to be. So this standard sounds as if it is rather a poor standard for us to adopt.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: What would be the date of that?

Mr. Young: The date of this is April 7, 1966.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Would the member like me just to explain? I assume he would have known the composition of the present so-called padded dash, because the dash that is being provided as a padded dash today is one that is composed of a fairly thick padding of sponge rubber, foamed polyurethane or material of that kind, superimposed over a metal base. Well, that metal base is not a hard metal and in impact the sponge rubber or the equivalent is recoverable from deformation. The metal underlay is not. But the metal underlay is soft enough under the impact of being struck by the head of a passenger in the passenger seat in the front, to take a permanent deformation but in deforming, of course, it is partly shock-absorbing. So it contributes to the shock-absorbent quality of the outer layer of sponge rubber or the equivalent.

Mr. Young: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand this, but the point that is made here in the testimony by Mr. Steiglitz is that the metal underlay is much too strong, the kind of construction that is allowed by the standards is much too strong and that the head will crumble before the metal will collapse in a proper way for safety. This is his point and he points out that the standards that have been set in the United States for these cars—and they are working now to get those standards higher—but the standards which have been set are standards of 80gs at 15 miles an hour, whereas the original standard that was asked for was 40gs, which, of course, was a higher standard than the 30 which the medical men said it should be, at 30 miles per hour.

This standard, of course, according to Mr. Steiglitz, who has very great experience in this field, and according to the experiments that have been carried out that he mentioned

in the testimony, would indicate that these standards are pretty poor standards and we should strive ot get them higher. That is all I am pointing out to the Minister at this time. This is one place where it seems to me that we should not be accepting the general service administration standards in the United States or the society of automobile engineers standards, because they are the same generally. We should be looking for our own standards, we should be setting our own standards for the protection of our own people here.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think I can say to the member that the industry is endeavouring to find the strength of that metal underlay that best serves the purpose. If it is too soft and crushable, then there is not the amount of cushioning that is desired in the impact absorption, having regard to the two parts that they play co-operatively, the sponge rubber to absorb the immediate impact of the person and the metal underlay to collapse on impact. Now, if it just collapsed completely without much pressure, it would not be giving the extent of support in shock-absorbing that a little bit stronger or stiffer metal underlay gives. There has to be a balance found there to give the best shock absorption possible.

Mr. Young: Yes, or, Mr. Chairman, a new principle of building this through, perhaps, aluminum honeycomb material instead of the metal behind it, because one of the startling facts that was revealed by the Swearingen tests — and this testimony was given. "I have seen the actual data myself," said Mr. Steiglitz, "the 1954 Dodge and the 1955 Pontiac with unpadded panels all did better in the tests as far as human survival was concerned."

His point is that the industry is willing to accept certain standards but they are not coming through with safety standards in the way they ought to be. And the general service administration, according to his statement, is accepting standards because of compromises here that are not as good as the old dash made of metal, and very light metal at that. So I bring that to the Minister's attention.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have two points that I want to bring to the attention of the Minister. The first one is in the form of a very short question. Could the Minister tell me if there are any licensed motor vehicles in Ontario, whose licences are not listed in the records? Could he answer that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the question puzzles me and it does my officials. Not to our knowledge. Could the hon. member throw some light on it?

Mr. Singer: I have some information and I believe the source is authentic. I am told there is a motor vehicle with licence No. 1013, which apparently is not listed. Now, I have a description of that vehicle and I would like the hon. Minister, perhaps before we are through this evening, to have a look and tell us whether my information is correct or not. We can explore that later. The licence number, I am told, is 1013.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the subject I wanted to talk about for a short time is the question of the control of motorcycles. Those of us who were in the Canadian army overseas will recognize the number of young Canadians who were either killed or maimed or injured in the years that the Canadian army sat in England waiting for the period to get into action. I do not know if anyone has bothered to compare the statistics, but certainly the casualties that the Canadian army suffered almost entirely from late 1939 or early 1940, when they first arrived overseas until 1944, were motorcycle casualties, by and large, and I have been trying to think—perhaps my friend from St. David could tell me the name of the hospital, but there was one Canadian hospital unit in England that concentrated solely on looking after those young men who had injured themselves very seriously on motorcycles.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Because of the blackout?

An hon member: Did they not have blackouts at that time?

Mr. Singer: Yes, But the point—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the Canadian army did provide a very rigorous course in training for these young men, in the use of motorcycles and notwithstanding that sort of training there was a fantastic accident toll. However, here in Ontario, in these times, the control exercised by the government over those people who are driving on motorcycles leaves a great deal to be desired.

In New York state, I am advised that for every 100,000 motorcars registered, there are four deaths, and for every 10,000 motorcycles there are 19 deaths. Dr. Shulman, the chief Metro coroner, has recently been quoted as

saying it is six times more dangerous to drive a motorcycle than it is to drive a car.

In Ontario, in a recent nine-month period, there were 482 motorcycle injuries and deaths. That is double the grisly total of the corresponding year previous to that. In 1964, there were 10,000 motorcycles registered in Ontario. In 1965 it rose to 22,000. This year it is expected to reach 35,000. If this growth continues, by 1976, someone has estimated, we can expect 125,000 registrations, and unless The Department of Transport does something about it, the slaughter rate is going to go up and up and up.

Hard-sell tactics, some people have suggested, have put too many bikes on the road. They apparently have a great deal of glamour to many of our young people. Interestingly enough, a person of 16 years of age can apply for a temporary licence, and without any test be given a 90-day permit. He can go on renewing that 90-day permit without ever taking a test. In fact, no one can ever find out really whether he can drive a motorcycle.

One would think it would be the course of at least some wisdom and prudence to ascertain, before issuing temporary permits, whether or not the applicant has had any course and has any real knowledge of how to use a motorcycle. Anybody can get a 90-day permit. Metro deputy chief of police, John Murray, has recently been quoted as saying some motorcyclists never pass any kind of a test. They just keep on renewing their 90-day permits. William LeSauvage, safety director of the Ontario motor league, says new legislation is urgently needed. You would think that motorcycles, because they are so dangerous, would be subject to more stringent legislation than automobiles, but certainly in our laws, the opposite seems to be true.

Last fall a committee of the American college of surgeons, made up of skilled specialists who had operated on scores of youthful motorcycle victims, declared in a public statement, "The motorcycle is the most lethal weapon on our highways and streets today."

Well, the hon. Minister has heard about these things, and I have a clipping here quoting certain remarks attributed to him, in September of last year, when he added a few regulations to apparently control motorcycles and drivers. One of the new regulations provided that a person holding a temporary instruction permit may no longer carry a passenger on the pillion seat and that a person with a temporary permit is now prohibited from driving a rented motorcycle. But if a person with a temporary permit is able to get a vehicle without having it rented—perhaps buy it, perhaps borrow it—what is there to stop him from going on about his driving, as untrained or as reckless as he may want to be? The Minister is quoted as saying:

> My department is concerned about every factor that contributed to the increase in accident totals. This concern certainly includes the effects of the growing number of motorcycles. We are continuing our study of the situation.

Well unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, in so many of these facets relating to safety of our people on the roads, whether in automobiles or in motor vehicles, in our studies of automobile insurance and so on, the best we can get from this Minister is that we are continuing our study.

The Minister must be aware of the various representations that have been made to him by numerous municipal officials. He has received representations about making crash helmets compulsory. He has taken no action in this. I do not know if there is a policy of publicity directed to those people who drive motorcycles, urging them to wear crash helmets, and urging that passengers wear crash helmets. It has been suggested that it may be very difficult to legislate this type of control, but surely it would be a very simple thing for those charged with enforcing our various laws to see at a glance whether the driver or passenger on a motorcycle is wearing a crash helmet. It does not seem to me difficult at all to enforce this type of reasonable and sensible legislation.

No policeman in Ontario is allowed on a motorcycle, unless he wears a crash helmet. No member of our armed forces is allowed to be on a motorcycle unless he has a crash helmet. Surely if it is that important for the safety of these persons, who are charged with substantial public responsibilities, there should be some legislative step that this hon. Minister is taking, to provide measures of safety for drivers and passengers of motorcycles.

I am sure the Minister has heard from Mayor Robert Keehan of Niagara Falls, and the views he has concerning control and regulation of motorcycles. He sent telegrams to the hon. Prime Minister, to this hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and he requested three things: an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act establishing crash helmets as compulsory for motorcyclists; more rigid standards in existing licensing provisions; and more stringent anti-noise legislation. This was in April of this year.

Well, more than a month passed since the time when the mayor of Niagara Falls sent these telegrams to various senior government officials. Does the Minister not have any report? Is he doing anything, other than considering the situation, as he was last September? Is he not concerned at all about the very serious and fantastically growing accident toll occurring to people who operate, and who ride as passengers on motorcycles?

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious and emergent situation and the mere statement that continuing investigation is going, I suggest is not enough. Frankly, I believe that the people of Ontario are getting more than a little weary of the continued answer from this Minister as every problem is brought before him, this year, last year and the year before that: "The matter is under investigation and in due course some action will be taken." Does he plan any action at all insofar as protecting those people who ride on motorcycles or who drive motorcycles?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that members are all aware that there has been a great increase in the number of motor vehicles. There was a bulge in the number of registrations of motor vehicles following the last war and then the peak subsided until three or four years ago and we have had substantially fewer motorcycles registered. The last two or three years has seen a very substantial increase in the number of motorcycles registered in this province.

With regard to the licensing of motorcycles: A motorcyclist applying for a licence is treated exactly the same as a motorist applying for a licence. He has to take out his application for a temporary permit, he must undergo the same tests of vision and signs, knowledge of rules of the road, and then he takes a road test. Now, if he does not pass the test, he is in exactly the same position as an applicant for a driver's licence for an automobile. They are motor vehicles; they both use the road; they are similar in some respects.

Mr. Singer: On temporary permits?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The only difference is that there is no place for a driver beside him and he is not allowed to carry a passenger except it be one with a licence.

Mr. Singer: Does he have to undergo a test for his temporary permit?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Not a road test.

Mr. Singer: Not a road test? Well, that is the whole point.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He gets—

Mr. Singer: Not a road test, that is the whole point.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The basic rules of the road test.

Mr. Singer: The rules of the road, but that does not prove he can drive a motorcycle. And then you turn him loose for 90 days.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is so he can learn to use it; how else could he do it? Put him into a compound and he still will not learn how to operate—

Mr. Singer: Surely the Minister is not as naive as to ask a question like that. Surely a system of testing for preliminary permits can be initiated very simply.

Mr. Chairman: Has the Minister finished answering the question? The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Singer: Oh, dear!

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, frankly I am becoming exceedingly embarrassed having to do the hon. Minister's job in answering questions put to him by members of the other party here, on points raised for which he ought to have the answers at his fingertips. The answers are not at his fingertips and I resent exceedingly the whole issue being clouded by people over here and the Minister not rising to give clear, concise answers to put an end to this nonsense. He is putting me in an exceedingly embarrassing position and I do wish he would complete the answers and discount their arguments right away.

Let me give you a few examples. The hon. member for Woodbine got up here and started talking about the fact that the Minister did not have statistics on accidents and so on, how many accidents were caused by defective equipment, and that the statistics were not there. They were not only on that last page the Minister referred to, but for the year 1964 and 1963 the figures are on page 13. It was the Minister's duty to direct the hon. members to those pages so we will not have to listen to this tirade.

The hon. member for Yorkview got up, and after the hon. member for Woodbine said that I was all wet, I did not know what I was talking about and that I was

asinine, and the hon. member for Sudbury got up and said that he agreed with the first remarks I made, and unanimously disagreed with everything else. And he started to agree completely with everything I said about the accidents and everything else, pointing out that they are not nuts behind the wheel; they are responsible citizens, with which I agree, because it is the responsible citizens who are responsible for the accidents, because they are temporarily irresponsible.

My colleague, the member for Sudbury, speaks of the number of people he has attended in court and he ought to know that it is responsible citizens who get into accidents because they are temporarily irresponsible or, as the other member put it, they have temporary failures of—I forget the exact words—temporary failure of driver. In a court of civil jurisdiction it is called negligence; in a court of criminal jurisdiction it is called careless driving or driving without due care and attention.

The fact is that if you want to cut down the injuries from accidents as actually this question of auto safety involves, then I suggest the best way to cut down the injuries sustained from accidents is to cut down the number of accidents.

But what I could not understand is the Minister permitting the member for Yorkview's attempts to completely confuse the issue. For instance, he cited statistics from the United States. He has that book; I always used to think that Marx was their bible, now it is the book on auto safety is something they have there. Then he pointed out that the American statistics show that 90 per cent of the automobiles involved in accidents were in a normal condition and only 10 per cent were defective. And that book is gospel. Our statistics are wrong, but those statistics are right, according to him. Our statistics show for 1963-64 that approximately 95.7 or 95 per cent of the motor vehicles involved in acidents were in good condition, were apparently normal, and this statistic is consistent all the way along. And here the Minister points out we have a good statistical recording system. We have reported on 34 of the 35 items that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics asked. You would think that was next to perfect, considering what the other provinces do.

Mr. Young: The police do not think so.

Mr. Ben: The police are the ones who gather statistics and there was a suggestion that we go to the insurance companies. And where do the insurance companies get their information? From the victim, the insured. And is he going to scribble down the absolute truth and say, "Dear Mr. Insurance Company, I was stewed to the gills"? He is going to write, "Well, the road was slippery and the other driver was halfway over the road. He had his high beam lights on, and just then a bee stung me on the nose and because the bee stung me on the nose, I dropped my cigarette which burned my trousers. I tried to put the fire in my trousers out and that is how the accident happened." That is according to the insured.

The police go there and try to make an unbiased investigation for the purpose of that report. They are the most reliable source of the statistics that we have at the present time. And it is from them that we get the source of these statistics, and they are the best in Canada. And what assurance have we that the American statistics are any good? They come from 50 different states and the hon. member cannot even tell me whether every state in the union demands that every accident be reported if the damage is $100 or more. In some of the states, you do not even have to report an accident. They settle it there on the street. "Your insurance company pays for mine, my insurance company will pay for yours and it is settled."

Mr. Young: Does the member mean in Ontario?

Mr. Ben: In Ontario we have a law that you have to report.

Mr. Young: All accidents?

Mr. Ben: All accidents where the damage involved is apparently $100 or more. And you cannot spit at a fender these days without causing more than $100 damage.

So after listening to this stuff, I am becoming exceedingly perturbed. And then, after reading out, he started quoting from that book, that bible, the gospel according to Spinelli or something—he started quoting from it, and he admits that even in the United States 90 per cent of the motor vehicles apparently have no defects. In 10 per cent of the accident cases, I believe 4 per cent involved defective tires and he used the word "bald" tires, lack of maintenance—

Mr. Young: These were Canadian—

Mr. Ben: And then—here is the thing that got me—he tried to show, by reading some excerpts, that another 10 per cent were due to padded dashes and other so-called safety

features. If the hon. member got up and said 10 per cent of the accidents are caused because of defects in a motor vehicle, but 10 per cent more injuries are caused because of the interior being of an inferior construction, I would accept that. But he blatantly tried to suggest to this House that in addition to that 10 per cent which involved either defective tires, bald tires or brake failure or something else, there are also 10 per cent of the accidents caused by the so-called—I have the words written down here—built-in defects and built-in hazards. Total attempt to confuse and get away from the issue.

The member for Sudbury was pointing out what we have to do in order to cut down on accidents. We have got to strictly enforce the laws that are in existence. We have to stop pandering to the motorist.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member said we pass laws to protect people against themselves. I did not think his example was the best, that we pass safety laws and compensation because those laws are usually ex post facto. In other words, we have got The Workmen's Compensation Act to compensate a person who was injured through even his own neglect while at work. We have the unsatisfied judgment fund to compensate people. But what we need is stricter enforcement of laws. We have got to make these people to whom the hon. member for Sudbury referred—who get involved in these accidents through drinking—we have got to make them social outcasts, perhaps.

I understand that in the United States one church said it was going to become a mortal sin to drive while ability was impaired. Perhaps that may be a solution, but to continually dwell on this question of auto safety, that we need safer cars, as if they are going to prevent accidents. They may prevent more serious injuries, but we have not established from that bible he read, he has not given one example that someone was able to say that motor vehicle accidents were caused because of unsafe car construction. He did not give one example, but he tries to lead this House to believe that we must put on a drive for safer cars. If you use the word "safer," the cars are already safe, you know, but we must put on a drive for safer cars to cut down on accidents, not on injuries, but on accidents.

I say that doing so is clouding the issue just like all this advertising, a tiger in your tank. What we have to do is put on a drive for safer drivers. Now a suggestion has been made that we educate drivers. We can educate drivers to drive a car. The simple fact that we have one car for almost every three people in this province indicates that it does not take any skill to drive a car. All you have to do, is sit behind a wheel like most people do, steer straight ahead without blinking, paying any attention to left, right, or behind you. You can drive a car and they will give you a licence. But does teaching them how to drive a car skilfully instill in them judgment, does it instill in them courtesy, does it instill in them care, does it instill in them prudence and caution and responsibility? That is something that you can only develop. You just cannot teach them in a high school, or anywhere else, to have those particular traits, and that is the reason, Mr. Minister, I am advocating that the minimum age for obtaining drivers' licences should be increased to 18 years of age, because I am the first to acknowledge that these youngsters have the necessary skills to manoeuvre a car. They are easy to acquire. In this modern day and age, almost anybody can get behind a wheel, and almost anybody does get behind a wheel and drive, but to do so with prudence and caution, and responsibility, and with consideration for others, that is another point.

As a matter of fact, I would suggest the reason these teenagers do get into accidents is because they are too self-assured. Their skills are so well developed and their responses and reflexes so fast, that they think an accident cannot happen to them, that they are too good a driver to get into an accident; they can pass that car and cut in before the oncoming car hits them.

Now, I am all in favour of more driving training in schools, Mr. Minister. Your own figures here indicate that it does have a salutary effort, because those that do take your course in school get their insurance ten per cent cheaper, so it means that even the insurance companies have come to the conclusion that your driving training in school does have that effect. The trouble is, Mr. Minister, there is not enough of that in schools. You mention 78 schools here, but you do not mention how many high schools there are in the province. What percentage of these schools do have this driver training? You do not say.

An hon. member: Forty per cent.

Mr. Ben: Forty per cent? Thank you very much. Is that the figure?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister indicated earlier today that there was 40 per cent.

Mr. Ben: Well, sorry for mentioning—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Earlier I mentioned that by this fall we expected the programme would be in operation in more than 200 of the slightly more than 400 high schools in the province, or about 40 per cent, just over 40 per cent, giving a course this fall.

Mr. Ben: Oh, but they are not yet? Well, thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): All will be looked after in the course of time.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Sopha: He came out of his newspaper and made a contribution!

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister asked the member for Yorkview what was the date of the article he was reading. He said "1966." What the hon. member did not mention, and to which I do not know the answer either; When was the experiment carried out that was recorded in this book that was published in 1966? If you will recall, reference is made to 1959 cars and it is interesting that just recently the Ford Motor Company published some fact-finding on skull impact to dashes and one of the things they pointed out was that it was not the softness of the padded dash that counted, but the deceleration rate and the Ford Motor Company found that they had to improve this padded dash, they had to stiffen it, because as the hon. Minister pointed out, if it is too soft you do not have deceleration. You have to have some resistance to have a uniform deceleration, that is why you have to have the padding and then you have the metal at the back, which is supposed to be the impact point, but if you also permit that to give, you have further deceleration.

Mr. Young: Put a honeycomb in there, and you have got your answer. That decelerates.

Mr. Ben: It is still, I think, worthy of note that the latest experiments show that the padded dashes were not safe because they were too padded and not having the effect—they had too much give.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Harder seat belts too.

Mr. Young: Too much angle iron too—

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry Mr. Minister, but I do wish you would, when we get on with these estimates, give quicker concise answers. You have got answers in these books you have provided. I think they are well detailed, and you ought to instantly—

Mr. Young: Invite him over, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Ben: —refer to them and let us get on with the other estimates.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked a specific question with regard to the licensing of the 16-year-olds.

I would point out that if we did not license them at 16 or 17, there would not be many of them getting the benefit of high school education, or else we would have to give them their training and then withhold a licence for a couple of years.

I point out for him specifically that our records show that the accident rate for 16-year-olds is just about half of the accident rate for the 18 to 25-year-old group—6.7 per hundred, as against 11.2 per hundred. I just gave him those facts. We look at them and it seems on the basis of them, that the 16-year-olds are quite reliable. If we can make good drivers of them at that age, with high-school driver training, perhaps we have made good drivers of them for life.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Minister, could it be that the 16-year-olds have such a low accident rate because Daddyo is sitting in the bucket seat right beside him?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That could very well be the reason, Mr. Chairman. I think that is valuable.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): We have only got one set of boxing gloves over here.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): You should have two sets.

Mr. Sargent: I will say to the hon. Minister that once a year, the hon. Minister gets his come-uppance as it were, in these estimates, and we only hold these grudges at estimate time. We in the opposition get this come-uppance all the time, so you must know how it feels to be in the opposition.

But I take exception to the remarks of my colleague, in that he does not take the U.S. statistics insofar as accidents are concerned, because it must follow that they have a wider experience in some areas—experience ten times as great as ours, so they will have a better experience insofar as mortality is concerned.

The hon. Minister stated, insofar as the driver training programme is concerned, in high schools, that 40 per cent were getting it in projected plans, and that means that 60 per cent of our potential drivers will not

be exposed to driver training. I think herein lies, possibly, the key to driver safety and to accidents, the end result.

The figures of the national safety council indicate that improper driving is a major cause in nearly 90 per cent of all accidents and that drinking is a factor in eight per cent more. This suggests, Mr. Chairman, that the motorist is at fault 98 per cent of the time and the hon. Minister's projected programme is to give driver training to only 40 per cent of our potential drivers.

From this evidence many authorities conclude that the best hope for a better safety record lies in more driver education and strict enforcement of traffic rules and in efforts to get the bad drivers off the roads and keep them off. In the United States one million drivers a year lose their right to drive.

Further in the matter of driver safety, in Maryland the governor's advisory committee on traffic safety urged that all prospective drivers—all of them—under 18 years of age be required to have 30 hours of classroom study in driver education. I am not carrying this on too far because the point is that the driver is the key. In the truckers' score in this field, the national safety council is launching a programme of driver improvement courses to all motorists. These safe driving courses are based on the type of training that is given to the drivers of large trucking concerns and this brings us to another important point about education. The large trucking companies have accident rates of only half of that of the general public—only half. Their training programmes place a heavy stress on teaching the trucker to make more effective use of his eyes to spot developments and so on.

More important than anything else that this government does not plan on doing is a physical examination of all licence holders. I think, Mr. Chairman, to summarize these statistics—and they cannot be wrong—98 per cent of all crashes are due to the driver. Driver training is the key answer to safety in the driving of tomorrow, and the great need I feel, is that we must take steps to require a physical examination of all people who have a bomb in their hand on the highways. I think if you would take this test you would find that the experience in the United States has been this, that of two million people tested, more than 30,000 of them were disqualified. So using this as a yardstick in this wide area of 7 million people here, we have possibly 90,000 people who are not fit to drive a car because of their physical defects and at this point you do not know this because you do not have any programme along this line.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask of the hon. Minister, are there regulations that control the height of bumpers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There is no specification with regard to bumper height.

Mr. Newman: Does the Minister not think that this is one place where some safety features could be built in, not only in the shape of the bumper itself but a standard for the height of the bumper, for the positioning of the bumper, not only in the front and the back of the car, but possibly even wrapping it around the car?

May I ask the Minister if any tests have been undertaken by the department on the three-light system for the vehicle where there would be a green light on while the vehicle is in motion and as soon as the foot is off the accelerator, a yellow light would flash at the back and at the front, and when the vehicle is being braked, then a red light would go on?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the question of bumper height is an important one; the hon. member has a very valid point there. There is a problem with respect to the smaller sports cars where if the bumper is put at the standard height it would be up in front of the headlights and almost on top of the fender grill.

Mr. Newman: There still can be bumper guards with that.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is a reasonable point and if it could be achieved it would be an addition to safety.

With regard to lighting, the question of lights and coloured lights has been arrived at and it is being reviewed now by the Motor Vehicle Administrators Association because it is obvious that it is not the best system that was designed. But it became established and we are sort of stuck with it until we can get some uniform change from it, but the colour system the hon. member suggests is a very sensible one.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, Ohio State University is experimenting with this and I hope the Minister gets the results of their experiments.

The next question I would like to ask is the safety factor involved in stud tires.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The language of our Act with respect to the use of studded tires for traction in winter is perhaps not too clear. At any rate we have not had the specific prohibition of studs on our roads that has been so clear in some jurisdictions, and to date we have taken no action against the users of studded tires in winter. In fact, The Department of Highways is quite interested in assessing the amount of damage that may be done to the roads by studded tires, especially in areas where there is a concentration of traction, either acceleration or deceleration; for instance, on the approach ramps or the exit ramps on the main highways. There you might begin to see the effect of excessive wear from the use of studs. That has not been carried on long enough for us to know whether they are going to do any amount of damage or not, and if they are not going to do any particular amount of damage, I think the situation may remain as it is.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, could the results of studies conducted in various European countries not be taken into consideration?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): I might make a brief comment on that. I do not think there can be any question about the fact that studded cars during period of winter conditions involving icy roads have a satisfactory effect on braking; this is pretty well established. On the other hand, it is difficult to measure the effect of the use of studded tires against the damage they may do to the road surface itself. There is no question about the fact that particularly in terms of braking on asphalt pavement it can be well substantiated. Tests are under way and there will be a report prepared shortly that will prove there is extensive damage done to the road surface, particularly on asphalt.

On the other hand, the difficulty of course is measuring the value of the damage to the roads against the value of the loss of life and property that may accrue.

I do not think it has been completely substantiated yet, either, that the use of studded tires is an altogether safe device. There have been some exhaustive testing procedures undertaken and we find that from time to time the tires with studs impregnated in them—they are of a special type of metal—throw these studs from time to time. Frankly, at high speeds when these studs are thrown from a tire on the highways there is an element of danger, because they have all the impact of the bullet end of a rifle bullet. They can hit the windshield of a car and again do untold damage.

Certainly this matter is being exhaustively examined by The Department of Highways. I think we have the facilities to do it. It is being done in conjunction with the Department of Transport and we expect a report on this shortly that will provide an accurate measure of the extent of their usefulness and the extent of their damage.

At that point I think something will be capable of recommendation to government again in due course, in terms of statutory amendments and regulations to the House, but it has not been positively resolved as yet. These few comments may not answer the question as broadly or as satisfactorily as one would wish, but there is some doubt as to whether they are the absolute answer to the safety measures that we all want to see introduced into the operation of cars on the highways of this province.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister inquired at all from the Scandinavian countries who do use studded tires? Their experience is quite lengthy in the use of stud tires.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that in the conduct of the investigation that is being undertaken, certainly the experience of all other jurisdictions is being looked into. Sweden would be one. We have examined into the other states of the Union. Some of the states have banned the use of studded tires. I cannot tell you how many have done this but some of them have. Some of them have encouraged the use of studded tires. But there is a whole pattern here to examine and look into and I think it is only sensible to examine this in its full scope and reach determinations on that basis. I think it is fair, along with the Minister of Transport, to assure the House that this will be done soon, because we are reaching the end of the study that is under way.

Mr. Newman: That is fair enough, Mr. Chairman. The next safety feature that I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister is the reflector ring that is put around the headlight. The Reflex Corporation of my own community manufactures one and in the tests that they have conducted, they found that this is extremely helpful, not only to the oncoming driver but also in the case of one of the headlights burning out. You still have

that reflective ring that catches the light emanating from the approaching vehicle and shows to the driver that even though one light may be on this is not a motorcycle but a two-light vehicle coming along.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, some of the vehicles in the department have been equipped with these reflectorized headlight rings for test purposes.

Mr. Newman: The department is conducting tests?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat settled down at this point. A moment or two ago I was becoming somewhat disturbed at the extent to which the hon. member for Bracondale went to counteract the efforts made by the hon. member for Yorkview and the hon. member for Woodbine. I do not know just what point he was trying to make. I am sure that no member in this House feels he has a monopoly on finding all the answers to this serious question of accidents on our highways. We are making our contribution along with the hon. Minister and the government and the Opposition, to try to thoroughly go over all of the areas that need attention so that we can reduce accidents and injuries and fatalities on our highways.

It has been explained that we agree there is a great degree of human element involved in accidents, and it was pointed out very clearly by the hon. member for Woodbine that the safety devices on cars was another aspect that we have to start looking at now.

I wondered when I listened to the hon. member—he was not in the House a few years ago when we started to debate the real serious problem in the construction industry—and I remember talking just in the same manner—what can we do to reduce the great number of accidents occurring to people at work? That was 15 years ago and we never heard of such things as safety hats, safety shoes, safety clothing, safety tools, hoist inspections, scaffolds, good slings, safety belts, gloves and safety glasses, the extensive inspection that is being done today, proper lighting in the industries, ventilation, decompression chambers—

Mr. Chairman: I know the member is trying to make a point but I wish he would stay with the vote, please.

Mr. Gisborn: I want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, because we have talked about these things. We talked for hours about safety devices on steam boilers, machine guards, the very extensive improvement in the mines across the country, the equipment. Not just the element of the human being. Equipment has saved many lives. And this is what we are talking about now. We are trying to reach out into the other elements of factors that cause injuries. Certainly I do not think it is getting us any place for one member to get up and try to counteract an argument put forward by another member in good faith. No one of us has any monopoly on the proper answer. With that I will leave this point.

I would like to direct a couple of questions to the hon. Minister. I have not read anything in his reports about the questions I might raise. What is the hon. Minister's and his department's liaison with the provincial police? Does he have reports from the provincial police on certain areas of our highways that might be considered areas in a community that might need particular attention? What kind of liaison is there with the hon. Minister's department and The Department of Highways in regard to particular areas?

I recollect that the Stoney Creek circle in Saltfleet township, No. 8 Highway and King street, have been two particular areas that have been under special surveys because of the large number of accidents and the hazardous spots in that area. Does the hon. Minister have anything to do with the number of policemen on the provincial police force as regards to whether they are up to strength, on a certain basis of quota? These are the kind of things that also have to be looked at.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we have no control over the number of members on the OPP force nor on the detailing of them for various purposes. We do carry on a great deal of relationship in many fields with the OPP. But as to numbering the force and assigning them to different detailed work, that would not be our responsibility. We would be happy to see more patrols because we believe, as I am sure the hon. member does, that enforcement is one of the factors in cutting down traffic accidents.

Mr. Gisborn: If the hon. Minister states that he would like to see a larger force, has he made a request to the government that the situation likely deserves an increase in the recruitment in the provincial force to see that we get the proper enforcement of the regulations and laws?

Mr. Young: I was very interested a few moments ago to hear the Minister say that

he was looking into the matter of the three-colour tail lights. I have in my hand a clipping from the Toronto *Star*, May 19 of this year, when it reports that the Ontario traffic conference is very interested in this very matter. One of the resolutions was this:

> Permit red lights on the back of vehicles only as brake lights. Tail lights would be green and turn-signals amber.

Now, this is something which has evoked a lot of interest in safety circles and in many circles across the continent. I know the problem, the Minister knows it well, that many jurisdictions demand red tail lights for stopping lights and all the rest. But I think the time is here when we should look very seriously at the matter of bringing our automobile signals into conformity with our traffic signals, so that when a person sees a green light ahead of him, he knows that the road at least is clear, that it is a going concern, and when the red light flashes he knows that there is a stop situation there.

I have in my hand a patent—a Canadian patent in the name of Harry C. Rynan; I think the Minister knows him. He has been in touch with me, and he feels very strongly about this matter and it seems to me that he has something here. Whether his device is one that will finally be used I do not know, but he certainly has something where, if you see a green light you know that the traffic is moving, then an amber light means that there is a change of speed, either increasing or likely decreasing, and then the red light comes up and you know that there is trouble ahead and that you must take action at that point.

Mr. Whitney: What if you are colour blind?

Mr. Young: The colour blind person is in trouble no matter how you slice it. But this, it seems to me, is something that we should be looking at carefully, that the various provinces should be looking at and the states of the Union and the federal governments and studying this very, very carefully because all these matters should be under very serious consideration and I hope that hon. Minister is giving that kind of consideration.

Has the Minister actually discussed this with the ministers of transport in other provinces or in other jurisdictions and what might the results be in this field?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, this matter of the lights and the colours of lights —for tail lights and for stopping lights—is under active consideration by the American association of motor vehicle administrators. Unfortunately, there are cars all over the continent and to bring about a change is a difficult matter. They got off, perhaps, on a wrong step in the first instance and to recover the position and get a new kind of lighting system accepted all over the continent is one of the difficulties. But the question of the coloured lights for the tail and stop lights and warning lights is all under consideration right now.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have what I think is a very important suggestion for the hon. Minister. I would like to ask him if studded tires are illegal in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There have been no cases to prove them illegal.

Mr. Singer: There is a section in the statute.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: There is a section in the statute.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It does not mention studs.

Mr. Sargent: The only places in Canada that studded tires are legal are Alberta, British Columbia, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan. Is there any intent on the part of the government to ban studded tires? That is what I would like to know.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Highways just discussed this a few minutes ago from their standpoint. The laws of the other provinces are worded differently from ours and they have been found illegal in other provinces. We have not found them so in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: Then I take it that studded tires are permissible in this province.

Mr. Letherby: At the moment.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any thought on the part of the government that if the hon. member who spoke on it had any right to say what he did—"at the moment"—I think we should have the thinking of the Opposition that studded tires should be permitted here, because the hon. Minister of Highways did not seem to know the attributes or the need for them in Ontario. If he is right, there

is an area of doubt. There is a compromise situation for studded tires in the southern United States where there is no snow, but in most areas where we have snow conditions, they have the physical attraction that they show that they have in starting 155 per cent more traction and they cut stopping distance on glare ice up to 50 per cent. So if there is any thought on the part of the government to ban these, let us hear about it.

One tire maker, U.S. Royals in the United States, said that next year they were going to have to greatly expand their production to meet the demand for studded tires, so I do hope that it is not in the hon. Minister's thinking to abolish these. For the record on this section on safety, here is a letter from a constituent of mine through which I hope, if the hon. Minister takes the idea and patents it, he can put the proceeds into the Conservative election pot, if he wants.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The man who wrote this letter is in the general insurance business and has had a lot to do with the settling of claims and his exposure to accidents is very high. He says:

> We build bypasses at $13 million per mile or more, but it seems the straighter and more level the highways, the greater the slaughter. We do all sorts of things to try to lessen the awful slaughter and injury to our population, 50 per cent of whom are innocent victims of some act of negligence, ignorance, bad manners and drinking, and so on, on the part of some other motorist.
>
> We could go on for pages with this preamble, bringing in everything from civil rights to motherhood, but here is an idea: Why not an outside speed indicator on all motor vehicles? To keep it simple, use a flasher type accessory with different colours—green, shall we say, for under 30 miles per hour; amber from 30 to 50 miles per hour and red from 50 to 60 or 70 miles per hour.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: How about an ejection seat, too?

Mr. Sargent: I thought that this would be what I would get from this House, but I think it is important to find out some way, if you will let me explain this.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): How are speed lights distinguished from tail lights?

Mr. Sargent: This is on the front of the vehicle. I continue:

> Any other combination or limit could be arranged to suit the conditions. If we can afford to spend up to $400 per unit for a bumper which should be a piece of steel, but instead is a work of art on a car, why could we not spend a small fraction of this to indicate the approximate speed of the vehicle at any time?
>
> If a witness, or witnesses, could establish the minimum speed at the time of accident, you can readily see that the responsibility could be put where it belongs in cases where speed is a factor in establishing liability.
>
> As the law now stands, the speed of an oncoming vehicle is never established in court. There is no evidence—only skid marks, etcetera—and some person's opinion is seldom allowed.

This has merit if you will listen to it for a moment. It is a good idea, I think. The letter continues:

> If an outside speed indicator were established it could be maintained the same as any other safety device on an automobile such as brakes, directional lights, etcetera. The cost of litigation could be tremendously reduced and it seems logical that death and injury and property damage would also be drastically reduced for many reasons.
>
> Who wants to go through a 30-miles-per-hour zone with evidence apparent to all that the speed of the vehicle is 50 miles per hour? Citizens' arrests could be effective as they very seldom are at present. Possibly at certain excessive speeds, a siren or a bell could be incorporated so that people could hear the fool as well as see him and take precautions.
>
> No doubt there are objections that can be raised, but surely the saving of human life is important to us all.

I think that has some merit and it should be studied because it is a visual indication to an oncoming car as to what the other vehicle's approximate speed is, and it is a matter that someone should study if it is going to save some lives.

Mr. Whitney: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this thing is the same terminology, so to speak, as the young lady who went out for a drive, and continuously her boy friend took her to a spot where the sign that she saw was "Yield". But by the same token, on the other side of the street there was a gar-

bage can that said, "Refuse". I would say that the hon. member has made his point on the one hand, but on the other hand there is refutation for the things that he has suggested.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if his department has ever considered the painting of the underside of the trunk deck and the underside of the hood some type of colour so that if a vehicle is parked on the side of the road and is in trouble, the deck or the hood could be raised and in the night time the drivers' headlights hitting this would immediately point out the vehicle parked on the side and show that there is trouble ahead and to be very cautious in approaching the vehicle?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, there was an illustration in The Department of Transport safety monthly magazine showing that idea.

Mr. Newman: Is the department considering this?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It has been tested. There is not sufficient evidence to show whether it warrants legislation or not, but there was an illustration in our magazine of it being shown to the OPP and I think to the Metropolitan Toronto Police.

Mr. Newman: If the hon. Minister does not think it has merits, I doubt if he would consider reflectorized licence plates then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have had enough—

Mr. Newman: After having seen conclusive evidence in the motion picture in the committee room several weeks ago, I surely would expect this hon. Minister now to realize the time has long passed that this province should have a reflectorized licence plate.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Let us do away with cars.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister if the department has undertaken any studies concerning power assists in a vehicle, like the power brakes. An individual confronted with an emergency, has the tendency, instead of slowly depressing the brake, to jam it, and this jamming at times is the worst thing an individual could do, especially with a vehicle with power brakes. Has this department evaluated power braking?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No.

Mr. Newman: Your department has not done anything concerning that at all? Well, what does your department do—

Mr. Singer: That is a good question.

Mr. Newman: —as far as the various safety features that are of value in a car? Do you not do any type of experimenting? Do you not have a research department at all that looks into some of these aspects of vehicles? Do you depend on the U.S.?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We do not have facilities for complete mechanical examination. The hon. members should know that. The department does not assume responsibility for checking all kinds of automobile equipment, but where we do legislate equipment, then we set down standards and we have the item in each case measure up to those standards, such as seat belts, glass, brakes, this sort of thing.

Mr. Newman: Has the hon. Minister experimented with reflectorized licence plates?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, and we had thousands of reflectorized licence plates out on test some years ago.

Mr. Newman: And you find them of no value at all?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think we have had the report several times on that issue. They were of doubtful value. There was acknowledgment that they were more visible, but that they were inclined to reduce legibility. At the present, there is a review being made of the use of reflectorizing on the vehicle, the whole question of reflectorization, of light rings on the front and back and sides of a vehicle, to ascertain what reflectorization is needed, where it is needed, and the areas where it can best be used, and the size of the areas that are required.

Mr. Newman: I think 30 of the U.S. states have reflectorized licence plates. Surely you could take a clue from them and follow suit, or are you going to be the last one of the provinces? I think there are half a dozen different Canadian provinces that use reflectorized licence plates.

An hon. member: Why are they any better than we are?

Another hon. member: Do they use it in Scandinavia?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Newman: Well, if this was not of any value they would not be paying—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why are they better than Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to accept anything from any country that would further safety in this province.

An hon. member: All right.

Mr. Newman: And surely I would expect if anyone would be interested in reflectorized lights—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Newman: You can ask me a question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am going to ask you a question now. Every time the hon. member gets on his feet, he throws on the floor of this Legislature something about some state that is better than the province of Ontario. Maybe he would be interested some day in finding out the extent to which many states copy Ontario. Maybe he would.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I find anything of value that can contribute to the welfare of the citizens in Ontario, that is being done in any of the states to the south of us, I am more than pleased to introduce it here. I am not so stubborn headed as to refuse to take something of value from some other jurisdiction.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Talk about the State of Union—

An hon. member: The hon. Minister of Highways may have apoplexy.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He may have apoplexy, that he may.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In the matter of reflectorized plates, Mr. Chairman, we have two provinces in Canada, two—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, the Minister of Transport has the floor, please.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In Canada there are two jurisdictions that have recently adopted reflectorized plates, Newfoundland and the Northwest Territories. On the other hand, such states as California, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and others of those in the United States, have not seen fit to adopt reflectorized plates.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, are we still on 2104?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we are doing 2103 and 2104 together.

Mr. Sargent: Is it permissive to talk about the driver licence—

An hon. member: Ask the question, do not ask—

Mr. Singer: Right on this vote.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are waiting to see whether it is or not.

An hon. member: Oh, the new House leader.

Mr. Sargent: God forbid, God forbid.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in my remarks on the estimates—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Which vote are you speaking on?

Mr. Sargent: I am talking, Mr. Chairman, about the examination centres across Ontario. My point is about the opening hours of these examination centres. When a workman wants to obtain an operator's licence, he must leave his job for a considerable time.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, that obviously is not on this vote.

Mr. Chairman: Yes it is properly before us under—

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would you allow the Chairman to rule please?

An hon. member: Do not break the gavel.

Mr. Chairman: And I do not expect to receive instruction from the hon. member for Sudbury.

Driver examination branch comes under 2103-2104.

The member for Grey North has the floor, please.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, will you ask the hon. House leader to try to find out what is going on please?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sargent: I was trying to make the point that when a workman leaves his place of business to obtain an operator's licence, he must leave his job for a considerable length of time. I think it takes 25 minutes for the actual examination, and if he fails his test, he must leave his work for the number of times required to get the licence. Or if a workman's wife or child wishes to get an operator's licence, the workman must leave work or the wife will leave work, if she is not a housewife, or the child will leave school, if he goes to school. It is all at the convenience of the hours that are set.

Now this situation is a mess around the whole province. I feel that the examiners of these examination branches should work on Saturdays, like many types of employees in our administration across the province. We have firefighting experts so that we must have a shift system. In the police forces and our hospitals everybody has a shift system. But this department is unique. They are an executive type of operation and they only operate with bankers' hours. I suggest, as I told the hon. Minister in my estimate remarks, that I think it is important that they think in terms of serving people, not the members of the staff. This is a top-level decision to make, it is a matter of policy. I would like the hon. Minister to tell me, so I can tell my people, why he thinks that his people are better than other people in our economy, that they do not have to work shift system.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Grey North was not in when I was making my opening comments today with respect to the speeches made by the Opposition critics on Thursday night and Friday. I recall very well the point he made that these are people that want to be served.

It is simply a practical problem. Of course the driver examiners are people too, and they like to have time off the same as everybody else. There are always people who want night shopping because it is convenient and so shops operate some nights a week to accommodate them. That is a problem we looked at and thought perhaps that a reasonable compromise in the question would be to operate on Saturdays or some nights a week, but it just did not work that way.

We tried to accommodate the people but we found that Saturday testing in jurisdictions where it had been tried had to be abandoned. It was instituted for the benefit of people who found it impossible to appear on weekdays, but the programme was defeated by housewives and students and others who could attend during the week, but instead chose Saturday. Instead we had a gumming up of the whole programme on Saturdays with a lineup of people all demanding to be seen on Saturday.

Mr. Sargent: What is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well, you could not handle them all on Saturdays, and because the Saturday afternoon opening was there—

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister does it when he issues licences. When licences are issued there is a jam-up.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Licence issuers are private operators and if they want to stay open on Saturday afternoons, they can if they want to.

Mr. Sargent: We are not asking that they work in the evenings; we are asking that they work in daylight hours and on Saturdays.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These people have a large choice of time. They are going to get their licence in two or three months and they can choose the time. If they leave it to the night-before-Christmas shopping idea, then they have to get in a lineup, but there was not much of that and there is not much now.

But that was the problem we ran into. It is not because we do not recognize that it is a problem for some people to get out for their test, but when we tried to find this way of compromising and meeting the demand, it just did not help. We found that everybody wanted to come on those days and the driver examiners were running—

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister says he has a jam-up; so he cannot have it, that is all. It is thrown out.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It did not help the situation.

Mr. Sargent: It does not help the Minister, but it will help the people.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It just did not work that way.

Mr. Sargent: I do not agree with the Minister. That is not logical. In ordinary

business one does not close the store on Saturday because one is busy.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2103 carried?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, we still did not get an opportunity to hear the hon. Minister's views on motorcycles, and I think we should before this vote passes.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the hon. member was asking about the use of crash helmets and why we should not legislate for crash helmets. We have not reached that place. The feeling is that to legislate what one should wear, when it is for his own protection, should be a matter for his own choice. Whether a woman wears high heeled shoes when she drives a car, whether you wear a tight jacket or whether you wear goggles or a helmet in your car—that is the choice of the operator. If it was affecting the safety of others, we might feel that we have a greater responsibility for legislation. That was one of the points raised, I think, in the letter the member spoke of which appeared in the *Telegram* from the mayor of Niagara Falls.

The use of helmets, I would say, is promoted and in our safety materials we suggest it, but we have not felt that it was time to make it mandatory.

The third point the member raised with respect to motorcycles had to do with noise. I think it was mentioned in the letter in the *Telegram* from the mayor of Niagara Falls, and if he will note the amendments proposed to The Highway Traffic Act, he will see that they do move to clarify the section on noise of vehicles.

There was one other question the hon. member for Downsvew asked with respect to licence 1013. Licence 1013 was issued to The Department of Tourism and Information for a Buick Electra. The reason it did not appear in the records was merely because there was an error in the information that was given and results from the fact that the permits are typed on sheets of five and this permit is on a sheet that is not completed and has not been processed.

Mr. Singer: That is a very interesting reason because now that we have established that there could be one mistake, I have listed several more. I just wanted to make sure that my information was correct.

If the Minister will just bear with me for a moment. It is rather interesting. The ones we have on our list seem to fall into the same sort of a series—1013 is the one I asked about specifically and there is another one, 1008, another is 1016 and another 1012—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Number 1016 is The Department of Labour.

Mr. Singer: That is on my list, too. I just wonder, if my information is correct, why this information is not obtainable by the people who were inquiring of the department. There is a whole series of them here.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is purely an error on the part of the clerk. These completed records have not been transposed and they are not available in the phone room. I think it results solely from the fact that they are on incompleted sheets of five.

Mr. Singer: At least it is a very strange coincidence that 1013, 1008—the numbers between 1012 and 1017, 1019, 1020—all seem to be involved in the same mistake. I somehow had a suspicion that these did belong to various departments of government.

It might have proved very difficult for an investigating policeman, who might have seen one of these cars committing a traffic offence, to have quickly found out to whom they are registered. It might have proved very difficult to someone who might have been injured by one of these vehicles to have found out in whose name they are registered, because the normal course of inquiry seems to have uncovered a whole series of mistakes of automobiles which, by a strange coincidence, were on sheets of five and were not listed. But by the same strange coincidence, all seem to belong to various government departments. Could the Minister elaborate on these various coincidences?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think that is the only explanation I can give. These are on loose sheets that have been used in the issuing of one or two licence plates and the sheet of five has not been completed. They have not gone into the phone room, but the information is there and on application it should be available.

Mr. Singer: It was not, if the information which my inquirer gave me is correct, and the hon. Minister has confirmed that it is.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Did the hon. member inquire of the Minister or of the registrar?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These are incompleted sheets and these may be the very ones, but the sheets have not been completed. There are some unissued licences on the sheets and so the sheets were still in the issuing room and had not gone into the phone room. I can tell

you of licences that are missing and they would be 1018, 1016—

Mr. Singer: That is the hon. Minister of Labour's licence.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Numbers 1011, 1012, 1013 and 1015. These will be in the record.

Mr. Singer: I expect they will, after tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: It is interesting to note that any other citizen is not permitted to avoid registration, and indeed must not to change his address. There are all sorts of sections in there, of prohibitions and penalties for the ordinary citizen.

I suppose you are on good legal ground. I have to admit that because the statute does not bind the Crown unless it is specifically stated in the statute, so one cannot complain about the legality. None of these vehicles owned by the Crown have to be registered really, in the absence of a statutory enactment to that effect, but reasonably and morally you are on very unsound ground. You leave yourself open to the suspicion that the hon. Minister of Labour's car is not registered because if a parking ticket is issued for it downtown, the police cannot find the owner of it because there is no registration for it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Number 1016 is registered; 1018 is registered, but 1017, 1019 and 1020 on the sheet are not, and that is why the sheet was not instantly available to someone on the phone. The registrations have been effected in the regular and proper way and the error, if it occurred, occurred between our phone room clerk and the information in the issuing room.

Mr. Sopha: Does the hon. Minister know what the answer would be from the girl if somebody called up? She would say, "You must have made a mistake in taking down the licence number because there is no such vehicle."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: What is the system for allotting special licence plates? The record shows that licence number 7000 has been issued to one Harry Price for many years, Where do these directions come from to give these favoured sons of the party these numbers? How do they get them?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, there are blocks of licences reserved for government use. The others are available on a first-come, first-served basis. A lot of people will come along early and say, "Can I have the same licence number?" and they put their application in early and they get it.

Mr. Sargent: I understand that No. 2000 is Mr. Diefenbaker's in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The 2,000 issue goes to Ottawa for distribution by the federal government to members of the House of Commons and Senate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is rank patronage, is it not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sargent: This year for the first time the hon. Prime Minister gets licence No. 1000. How many licences are issued to 1000?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: How many are issued? Only one, of course.

Mr. Sargent: Only one plate.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: One pair of plates.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, what would have happened if the ordinary citizen had an unlisted licence number? What would have happened?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There is no such thing as an unlisted licence number.

Mr. Sargent: Well, we just read off five of them here.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They are registered. The unfinished sheets happened to be in the issuing room instead of transposed into the phone room. As soon as one more licence goes off there, that sheet will go in the same as the others. It is just a case of uncompleted sheets because they were reserved blocks of numbers.

Mr. Sopha: The rest of us just had our registration since January. How does it happen that these are not registered yet? Does anybody know who Harry Willis is?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: These licence numbers may not be taken up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the hon. Minister could inform us as to

whether jackknifing on the highway is a serious problem in Ontario vis-à-vis trailer trucks? I notice the trucks are responsible for about one tenth as many accidents as the ordinary motor car and I am wondering if in fact the jackknifing process which does take place with some regularity has been a real problem or how much of a problem it is in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Statistically, I would say that jackknifing is a very small problem but it is one of the dangers that the drivers of big equipment always face and it does happen at times. But there are some pretty efficient anti-jackknifing or restraining devices that are being used on the big trucks today, between the tractor truck and the semi-trailers.

Mr. Young: Is that device being used—that is the fifth wheel the Minister is speaking about, the fifth wheel device? Has that been used extensively in Ontario and has the Minister given any consideration to having it mandated into the trailer trucks? Because I understand it is a very effective antidote to jackknifing.

When one reads about, or sees on the highway, as many of us have, the jackknifed truck and then somebody jams into it from both directions, often there is a great deal of damage done. This device, I understand, which costs only about $100 complete, can prevent that happening and it is something the Minister should give very serious consideration to, because in the total investment of the truck, it is a very small item.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the so-called fifth wheel the member refers to will be found on all connections between tractor trucks and semi-trailers. But in addition to that, I say there are other controlling and restraining devices that tend to reduce or limit the possibility of jackknifing even further.

Mr. Young: I do not think this is found on all such trucks. It is an extra that must be put on.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is what I say, some of these extra restraining devices are used.

Mr. Young: Yes, this is a restraining device which is an extra, not automatically on the vehicle. I just wondered whether it is in widespread use or whether the hon. Minister has considered it as such.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, I would think—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under the—

Mr. Young: Could I ask one further question about the drivers' alert, the dead man's throttle so-called, which will take over when a truckdriver goes to sleep or when something happens to him? If his hand comes off the wheel and his foot off the accelerator at the same time, then this dead man's throttle takes over and the truck is brought to a gradual stop. Is this a device which is used widely in the province?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I know the device the hon. member refers to, but I do not know to what extent it is used. It is one in which immediately the pressure is released, it automatically shuts off and brings the vehicle to a stop.

Mr. Young: Is it something the hon. Minister has considered mandating into the trucks?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I have not so far, but I could look at it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under the safety aspect of this vote, Chief Mackey of Toronto feels that the point system where you have to chase an offender to give him a ticket is deadly and he thinks the police should summons the speeder. Has the hon. Minister any plan to change this policy whereby the offender is chased in order to be given a ticket? I think it should be a straight summons deal; it would save lives.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, it is essential to the operation of the demerit point system that we require that for moving offences the charge be laid against the driver rather than against the vehicle. It is an essential part of the functioning of the demerit point system. I think the hon. member for Downsview would even approve of that.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I do.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, is this debate going to last all night? There are questions that have to be asked and I am just wondering if we are going to sit for another hour or so.

Mr. Chairman: Go right ahead, sir.

Mr. Racine: Well, my own feeling, Mr. Chairman, is that we should adjourn at 10:30. This is my own feeling. And I do not think you have the right or the hon. Prime Minister has the right to detain us here in order to pass a vote.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with driver examination, I have had many complaints in my area from people who come in from the province of Quebec to establish residence in Ottawa and try to pass an examination in the French language. They come from certain areas of Quebec, and particularly in the case of women, have tremendous difficulty in getting service in the French language. I know there are some French-speaking examiners in the Ottawa area and there might be some in other areas.

I think the hon. Minister had a letter not very many weeks ago from a chap who had an appointment with the federal government. His wife had been driving a car for eight years, had her driving licence from Quebec and she was told to go and learn the English language before she could pass her examination. Now, I do not think that this should be done in this province, Mr. Chairman, and I think the hon. Minister owes this House an explanation. I know he got a letter from Mr. Allaire, I think, or Dalaire, who lives in the south end of Ottawa, and I think something should be done to correct this situation that exists in other areas of the province.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the department has been keenly aware of that kind of situation and the very matter raised by the hon. member for Ottawa East is being enquired into because we do not approve of that. We have bilingual examiners in all parts of the province where there is a predominance of French-speaking citizens and we try to provide a French examiner whenever one is needed. We try to meet the situation.

This one case that he raises is one that rather surprises me because in the Ottawa area and in Eastview and in the eastern part of the province, as well as to the north, we have made a very real point of having bilingual examiners. I might even say that we have bilingual examiners in Ottawa, Kingston, Cornwall, Sudbury, Kirkland Lake, Kapuskasing, North Bay, Timmins and Pembroke. Bilingual clerks or English-speaking examiners with an adequate knowledge of the French language are located in most of the areas of the province. It is a problem that we faced and we are trying to meet.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned one case. In the very same week there was a young chap from Hull who was working for an Ottawa company. He had the same language difficulty and he was told that he could not try his exam. As a matter of fact, somebody in the office told him, "Well, maybe if you go and try your examination in Rockland, maybe you will be able to get through." Now, I do not think it is necessary to do that; I mean, as a convenience for those people, just as we would expect the English-speaking people from Ontario going into Quebec to have the same facility. I mention that, Mr. Chairman, and I know I can give the hon. Minister the names. This thing happens much too often and I think something should be done to correct the situation.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Ottawa East knows, there are a great many French-speaking people in Ottawa, and the situation there is rather delicate. If he will give me the name of the second person, I will follow it up the same as we are doing with the other complaint.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 2103 carry?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. My colleague from Windsor-Walkerville tells me he has another series of questions he wants to ask. The hour is now 11 minutes past 11 o'clock, and I think we should find out whether or not you are going to go on interminably until a particular vote passes, or whether there is some sense in fixing a reasonable closing hour for this Legislature. I would like to hear from the hon. Prime Minister just how he intends to conduct the affairs of the House at night.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, we have two votes being dealt with here together. I think we would be quite prepared to listen to the questions of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister regarding the testing of tires that is going on now through the American association of motor vehicles administrators—a couple of questions in connection with that?

I understand the testing started some time ago and is progressing, and in reply to a question which I asked some time ago, the hon. Minister gave the details. That is in *Hansard*. But could the hon. Minister inform us when this test might terminate?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to put the date when we are going to have the final report on it, but I think it is imminent and it is the same standard that is being used by the state of New York that has the six tire bills, one of which has

got as far as the Senate, it is the same standard they are using. And yet I see that they have postponed their date of adopting that practice until the 1st of January, 1968, in the event that bill goes through. But I would think that we could have the report from the MMVA in advance of that. We are anticipating it much before that.

Mr. Young: That 1968 gives quite a long period of testing. It seems to me that an organization which is really interested in getting this data could provide these tests much before that date. It seems a long time.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes. The member is aware that in the amendments to The Highway Traffic Act, provision is being made to give the hon. Lieutenant-Governor in council authority to regulate tire standards and markings, and I may say to him that we have already had conversations with the rubber industry and discussions are being set up with regard to markings, even at this time.

We are waiting for the report on standards, but we are moving as quickly as we can in this direction.

Mr. Young: Is this report going to be available to Ontario, directly? I understand this from the hon. Minister.

Is Ontario participating in this test? Are we making a grant towards this organization for the tests?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, indirectly through our membership in the American association of motor vehicle administrators, of which our deputy is the vice-president.

Mr. Young: But the cost of the test itself is being borne by the association?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Young: But very little of the expense of the association is actually met by the grant through the Deputy Minister?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think I could estimate where all the various moneys come from that go into this work, but it is being done under the auspices of this joint association of vehicle administrators from all jurisdictions on the continent.

Mr. Young: The fee for this association would amount to how much?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It varies according to the number of vehicle registrations in the respective jurisdictions, so we pay pro rata to the number of registered vehicles we have in Ontario.

Mr. Young: How much would we pay last year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would not say the figure, but I would say in the area of $1,000 a year.

Mr. Young: This would not go very far toward the payment. I am simply asking this because as I understand it the American association of motor vehicle administrators is financed in large measure by two organizations, the automotive safety foundation and the insurance institute of highway safety. This is where the bulk of its funds come from. In other words, it is being financed in large measure by the automobile industry itself. It just seems to me that this is not as independent an organization, because of that financing, as one would like to see.

Then the question arises from that, as to whether or not we are going to get as speedy action and as effective action from this kind of testing as we would if the organization were standing on its own feet and were entirely independent and were not dependent on the industry itself.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would think that the work as carried forward so far, there would be no point in disrupting it at the present. It is the same organization on which the state of New York is waiting for its report, but we are ready, and they are still talking about it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if he is considering any special type of licence plates, for ham operators, for historic vehicles? We have asked this in other years and the hon. Minister's answer was in the negative.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There was a specific question in the last month or two about the vintage vehicles, and I think we intimated at that time that we had a brief from them and we were looking to see if there was any possibility of issuing these machines that have very restricted use with a special licence. Very old machines.

We have not advanced any further with respect to the ham operators than when we last spoke of the matter, namely that we are not prepared to break into the regular issue series of licence plates for them. But we would run them an extra plate with their number on, at their expense, if they wished.

Mr. Newman: I imagine they would go along with that expense.

Has the Minister considered a special licence plate for handicapped? Cars that are driven by handicapped people that may have special controls, and by a licence plate you could identify the individual, and in that way you would be extra cautious when passing, or approaching?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: To my knowledge, we have never had a representation, or request of any kind with respect to that group. Not that we have not had from lots of groups. Not from that one.

Mr. Newman: Is the department considering the use of a picture on the driver's licence?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This question was raised last year and I answered then that the police enforcement people feel there is as much to be said against it as for it, because once you get a false photograph you have that much surer means of identification for deceit purposes.

Mr. Letherby: Get false moustaches on them.

Mr. Newman: Apparently there is a reciprocal agreement with various European countries concerning driving privileges. Now, if an individual moves to the province of Ontario, how long must that person wait before they must apply for an Ontario driver's licence?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In the event of a non-resident coming in, they can operate for one year under the new international driving licence that we have recently agreed to accept.

If they come in to live here, then they are required to take their examination forthwith.

Mr. Newman: What period of time do they have before they must take their examination?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think my word was straight. I think it is forthwith, once they become residents established here. When they have become Ontario citizens.

Mr. Newman: The reason I asked that: there has been an individual from the county area who was told he had a waiting period of about three months before he must apply and then found out that he must apply immediately. So that the information given to him in the first instance was wrong.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the question really depends on whether he was a non-resident or a visitor, or a resident.

Mr. Newman: This individual was a resident.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If he is a resident, then the requirement to take the test and obtain his driving licence here applies. If he comes in as a visitor, he would have the period in which to apply.

Mr. Newman: May I simply read the one sentence to the hon. Minister:

> On consulting the local police I was told that my British licence was good for three months. On arrival at the testing place I found that I should have applied within six days.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is right. When he came in here and the police thought he was a visitor then his driving licence would be good for three months. When he went to our testing establishment they identified him as a resident now of Ontario and told him that he would have to take his driving licence.

Mr. Newman: I suggest that hon. Minister make this clear so that the various police departments know about that.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The Windsor police do a pretty good job normally.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, during the estimates of The Department of Highways, I asked the hon. Minister a question about traffic signs in certain areas of the province, particularly around Ottawa, and I was told that this should be asked during the estimates of this department.

I wonder if anything has been done regarding a letter that was written on February 3, 1965, to the hon. Prime Minister by the mayor of Ottawa, regarding the erection of bilingual signs? It would seem that there is a conflict of opinion. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has said that there is nothing in the law preventing the erection of traffic signs. On the other hand, other people who are supposed to be experts have said that it is strictly illegal to erect a sign other than in English in Ontario.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether this problem has been solved. I know it was partly solved when the new bridge was opened between Ottawa and Hull, where some of the signs were bilingual and some of the signs were just in English. But has the policy of the department changed since this correspondence has taken place between the hon. Prime Minister and the

mayor of Ottawa regarding the erection of bilingual signs, not only in the Ottawa area, but in the Cornwall and Windsor areas and in other parts of the province where there is a large proportion of French-speaking citizens?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the question of bilingual signs has been raised a number of times. There seems to be some confusion regarding it. Actually, the regulation with respect to signs says that:

> Stop signs shall be octagonally shaped and not less than two feet in height and shall bear the word "Stop" in white, retro-reflective letters not less than eight inches in height on a background of red, retro-reflective materials.

The question is, can it have the word "Arrêt" as well as the word "Stop"? I do not think I would want to give an opinion on that. The rule simply says that it should be a red sign with the word "Stop". Now I think we have seen plenty of instances where we have had signs erected with an added word on them, and I do not think there would be any objection to doing this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the number of boating tragedies in the past year has increased, and doubled in the case of non-powered boating. Where is this estimate is safety considered toward pleasure boating?

Mr. Chairman: We do not have anything under this estimate for boating, it was ascertained earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, in regard to that, this very day I looked at a document that was an advertisement for candidates for the Ontario provincial police. It is the document issued with a replica of the shoulder flashes, with the information inside, and it says in that document—I will get one tomorrow—that the Ontario provincial police assume responsibility for patrolling the waterways in this province.

Mr. Chairman: In that case it would be under the Attorney General's department.

Mr. Sopha: May we take it that my friend, the hon. member for Brant who wanted to speak on this today, can raise this under The Department of the Attorney General?

Mr. Chairman: He could raise it at that time and we will be interested in hearing him at that time.

Mr. Sopha: I think we are entitled to some assurance that it can be discussed in the House.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think I gave the hon. member for Brant a statement this afternoon as to our present position with regard to this patrolling. I would think if there is enforcement of the Criminal Code on water that the OPP would be responsible if there are no federal police in the area.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on the fact of vehicle licensing, if a citizen of Ontario leaves the province and goes to the southern United States and comes back in without a licence, the entry is pretty tough. What is wrong with making a slip of paper available at the licensing offices, signed by border authorities, giving authority for a person to return to this country with one business day to get his licence? Has this been considered by the department?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is a problem. I take it the hon. member finds that it is encountered when someone is returning from the south after spending the winter there and the time for his licence has run out. There is a simpler way by far, and that is simply to mail the application to the department and get his new licence plate by mail before the expiry date.

Mr. Sargent: The plates would be sent to Florida?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I had a case last winter of a gentleman who was over 70 years of age and who apparently would have had to take a physical test. In this case, his licence was expiring during the period he was down south and he had to wait until he came back here to pass his physical test in order to get his renewal. Now is there somewhere where this man could pass his test before he goes down south, even if it is two or three months before the expiry date of his licence?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He could do either. He could apply for his licence and get his licence and have the test postponed until he came home.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is another case where this great money-making department with all its staff cannot streamline it to serve people. The idea of mailing plates

down to Florida when just a simple slip of paper on leaving the country would do it! I think that there should be some intelligent approach to it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 2103 carry?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, a year ago I asked the hon. Minister some questions about the Traffic Injury Research Foundation. I would like to know the extent to which certain areas of safety have been referred to that foundation, whether any reports have been submitted and what exactly is that reference designed to accomplish?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We discussed this earlier in the day, Mr. Chairman, the approaches that were made by TIRF, as we call it, acting here as agent for ACER, the organization from Cornell, to the hon. Attorney General's department or through the Attorney General to the Ontario provincial police for working out the reporting of accidents according to their schedules and forms. As I recall it, the matter was left with the TIRF people to come up with a modified form of reporting, a sheet that would be much easier and simpler and quicker for the OPP to fill in. They were prepared to discuss it with the OPP and as far as I know, neither Air Marshal Kerr or Dr. Graham has been back with it. I cannot say that they have not; but as far as I know, they have not.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I understood last year that it was under the aegis of this department that these references had been made to TIRF, as the hon. Minister calls it. Am I now to understand that his department really has no connection whatsoever with the work which TIRF is carrying on?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We are interested in what they are doing and have liaison with them, but as far as I know, there has been no further connection with them pending this information they want to collect.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, have any specific areas of study been allocated to TIRF on behalf of the department? Is there any area of the hon. Minister's department which is engaged in research work about the causes of accidents?

Mr. Chairman: I do not know whether the member was here this afternoon when the Minister did reply.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, I was, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I outlined in my remarks introducing the estimates what we were doing with respect to research, when I said:

> The department's present research activities are at present emphasizing the type of research that relates to accidents and a bibliography has been completed of all current safety research projects and we have a team employed now evaluating this material.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we have sat now for several hours through a debate on various aspects of safety of—automobiles on the highway, and yet, despite all the pleasant things the hon. Minister has said, we really have no indication that the department has any conception of the grasp it should have on the area of safety. Now, I do not think that this is the time to go over all the arguments that have been put forward this afternoon, and it has been a very interesting exchange, but the one thing that was lacking, was any indication from the department and from the hon. Minister that they really have a vital concern in this area.

Surely the assembly by this department of a bibliography, and now that they are going to study the results of studies that have been made elsewhere, is not the kind of concern about traffic safety that we would expect from the government. If there are areas other than this brief reference which the hon. Minister has finally made tonight to this bibliography, if there are specific things which the hon. Minister is concerned with about highway safety and about drivers in automobiles, instead of having it all dragged out from him, will he tell us whether or not he has got any conception himself of what should be done about the dreadful toll on our highways? So far, he has not told us. We have been here for several hours.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In introducing my estimates, Mr. Chairman, I think we outlined a very comprehensive programme by which the department is attacking the whole problem of—

Mr. Sargent: Like safety cars, and things like that.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: —safer vehicles, safer drivers, driver control—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think we must unfortunately, therefore, spend a little bit more time on this question of safety on the highways. It would seem to me that first of all the hon. Minister should tell us whether or not he, in association with his colleague the

hon. Minister of Highways, is engaged in any kind of study related to the safe construction of roads in the province of Ontario. Is anything being done in this area as between the two departments, and if so, what is being done? This is one aspect about which nothing has been said this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, in the matter of highway safety as it related to highway construction, the subject is the responsibility of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Highways, and I remember him speaking on that when his estimates were up.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think maybe I would like to say a little word on this. I recall very well when the estimates of The Department of Highways were being reviewed in this House, that a colleague of the hon. member who has just spoken raised that matter, which I thought was very sensible. He made a proposal that made a lot of sense to me and *Hansard* will record that I so stated before this assembly. It is reasonable and fair that I report to the House at this point what has been done since that time in respect, in particular, to the matter of safety of the roads themselves.

This was the issue that was raised by the hon. member, and he suggested, as I recall it, that there should be an examination into, and some consideration given to, a bureau that would bring together all the elements of highway safety. But, because they were the estimates of The Department of Highways, he covered more particularly those elements that involved the safety features of highway construction, such as the matter of accident-prone locations. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that I spoke rather comprehensively about that and I repeat, I said that I thought he had made a very valid point. So to that extent, and without pre-empting or intruding into the prerogatives of the hon. Minister of Transport, whose estimates are under review here tonight, and with the full knowledge of the hon. Minister and his department, and indeed with the full knowledge of the government, I say to the House, as I have already said privately to the hon. member, we assigned a study to the director of research of The Department of Highways into this very thing, and we suggested that he do it as exhaustively as he saw fit.

First of all, from the standpoint of the features concerning safety that can be built into our roads, or those areas of our roads which, as I referred to at that time, might involve accident-prone locations, I explained to the House at that time and *Hansard* will record it, that certainly these situations exist. There are areas of our highways that from time to time seem more accident-prone than others. I explained to the member and to the House the manner in which we review these situations, with full co-operation of the Ontario provincial police, and I am happy to tell you tonight, Mr. Chairman, that the pursuit of the exercise that was assigned following the sensible comments and representations of the colleague of the member who has just spoken, have been pursued vigorously in much depth and at some length.

I can say to you, Mr. Chairman and to the House, that very shortly now, the director of research of The Department of Highways is going to be able to present to me, and in turn to the government, a report that has surveyed this situation in depth, and in breadth, and will bring together the kind of report that I promised the House that would be undertaken. So let us simply say to the hon. member for Riverdale that this thing has been in full pursuit, it is almost completed, I hope to receive a report very shortly, and it will be submitted to agencies of the government including the hon. Minister of Transport, who is particularly interested.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few more comments while I am on my feet. I recall having said this during the estimates of The Department of Highways, that nobody in this House, certainly nobody in this province, can have anything but concern for the toll of accidents on highways, be they in this jurisdiction or anyplace in Canada. Nobody with a heart and mind can have anything but sensible concern for this thing.

The hon. member for Wentworth East made one short observation during the course of his comments before the House tonight that was very sensible. If I recall it properly, it was that this transcends politics a little bit, that surely it is the concern of everyone in the House. I suggest to you Mr. Chairman, and to everybody in this House, it is just as much a matter of concern to the government of the day as it is to anybody who wants to make a political career of it and I hope that is not what they are doing.

Mr. Sargent: All you do is talk.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why do you not sit down and listen for once—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton:—to anybody that makes a common sense statement?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The hon. Minister of Highways has the floor, please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have some more to say about this. Certainly this is one of the fundamental prerogatives of The Department of Transport, but to say that the hon. Minister of Highways or anybody in The Department of Highways, or indeed in the government, is not equally as concerned as anybody that witnesses the tremendous toll of life, limb and property in the province, is absolute utter nonsense, and certainly I think we have to, I think we must in fairness, assume that.

It has become politically popular, but I am not going to attribute that as a reason for all the comments that have been made here. I think they are sensible, I think they are contributions; I think all the comments, all the observations that have been made under these votes during the discussion that has been before the House are good, every one of them. I am sure when I say that, Mr. Chairman, that each and every one of these comments will be analyzed fully and faithfully, and dealt with by appropriate agencies of the departments that are involved. I make that statement without equivocation.

But you can belabour a thing to death, Mr. Chairman; you can pound it, you can deal with specifics, you can nit-pick at it, you can whack it from sides, up, down and sideways, and beat the devil out of it and you will not change the concept, because every person in the province of Ontario is concerned about it, and when I say that, certainly the government is concerned about it. And do not ever think they are not going to do something about it. My colleague is working on it constantly.

Mr. Sargent: What are you doing?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, really, really, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is a problem that transcends nit-picking or picking nits, as my hon. friend from Sudbury once said. It is either nit-picking or picking nits, as you like.

Mr. Bryden: You are an expert at it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You can deal with it on that basis, I say ad nauseum around here, and you will not change the overall concept of this thing.

Mr. Bryden: You never make a move, that is the trouble.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have told you one thing we have done on the basis of a very sensible suggestion from one of your own colleagues.

Mr. Bryden: When are we going to hear a report about it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now, Mr. Chairman, you are going to get a report very shortly.

Mr. Sargent: How much will this cost?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, you really waste your time trying to get through to a stone wall, or a piece of muscle. It is impossible. It is absolutely impossible.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How much is it going to cost us? I am here to tell you, Mr. Chairman, it will not cost the government one cent more than you have voted The Department of Highways. Not one copper more than was voted to The Department of Highways.

Mr. Sargent: That was too much.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And we will assemble some information that will be useful to everyone, including the hon. Minister of Transport and those officials of his department who are concerned about this thing. The hon. Attorney General is very much interested.

You see, the point is, Mr. Chairman, that these people would try to divide departments that have an interest in this thing. It simply remains to say, Mr. Chairman, to everybody, that these departments do work together much better than the hon. members realize and we will all make our contribution to the sensible answers that will resolve this problem.

But for everybody to stand up in this House and try and tag the government with a lack of consideration or a sense of irresponsibility for something that concerns everybody, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is simply an irresponsible attitude on their part, and it is not true. We are doing something about it.

Mr. Chairman: Are votes 2103 and 2104 carried?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I really had no intention of getting back into this debate on these two estimates. On the other hand, I

cannot help but reply to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Highways.

Mr. Sopha: Tirade, tirade!

Mr. Singer: Well, my hon. colleague from Sudbury says it is a tirade and that is a better description than remarks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: It is passing strange, Mr. Chairman, that whenever the government gets into difficulty, someone gets up and says, "Let us keep it above politics, let us not bring politics into it. The government is concerned, as concerned as anybody else, but let us not be politicians, and let us not talk politics." Mr. Chairman, that is hogwash. We have been getting the same nonsense from the government year after year. We have been getting the same nonsense from The Department of Transport year after year. The accident toll gets worse, and all we have got from the hon. Minister of Transport during these two days of estimates is, "I have got it under investigation, we are having a look. We are going to have another inquiry."

Mr. Edwards: We are getting it from you now.

Mr. Singer: But we do not get any answers, Mr. Chairman. We have no system of compulsory testing of drivers and apparently with this hon. Minister, we are not going to have. We have no system of compulsory testing of vehicles, and apparently with this hon. Minister we are not going to have. We have no system of research and studies, and apparently with this hon. Minister, we are not going to have.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, you are wrong!

Mr. Singer: We have no system of satisfactory automobile insurance or control of rates, and apparently with this hon. Minister we are not going to have, and yet what do we get from the hon. Minister of Highways? That we are playing politics. We are telling the people of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, that the government's performance in the whole field of transport has been a shame and a disgrace. We have told it to the government for many years and we will repeat it again tonight, and if that is playing politics, that is what we are here for.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we are all, including the hon. Minister of Highways, indebted to my colleague, the hon. member for Yorkview for the tremendous interest which he has managed to generate in this assembly in the whole topic of safety on the highways.

I think it is fair to say, and as the hon. Minister would say about politics, it is fair to say that if it had not been for his intense interest, the matter would not have generated the interest which it has generated in this assembly tonight. I think it is very appropriate that the hon. Minister of Highways should feel compelled to get up and justify the position of the government the way that he has, at this particular hour of the night.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There was no compulsion, Mr. Chairman. There was no compulsion about what I said. Nobody compelled me to stand up. I stood up because of what I know is going on, and what will shortly be revealed to this House, this Parliament, and to the people. There is no question of compulsion here. I was not compelled to accept the suggestion of your hon. colleague. There was no compulsion upon me. I accepted it because I thought it was a sensible thing to do, and it is being done. Was there any compulsion about that? Am I compelled to do what you suggest? Talk about compulsion—

Mr. Bryden: This is where politics comes in; political pressure compels you to do at least a bare minimum.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister seems to be quite upset. He felt compelled to stand up tonight. He finally, at this hour of the night, stood up to tell the House what he was doing about safety on the construction of highways.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What better time to do it than now?

Mr. Bryden: At 11 o'clock!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You brought it up.

Mr. Renwick: We could have done it several hours ago if the government had any concern about the overall effect of safety on the highways.

Hon member: That is pretty weak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, let us just deal with two or three matters. The reply of the hon. Minister of Transport on the question of the safety car was, that nobody else is assisting the state of New York in the safety

car project, therefore we are not going to assist them. This was his reply.

Mr. Bryden: Do we always have to bring up the rear?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You always will bring up the rear.

Mr. Bryden: That is what you sure do.

Mr. Renwick: One of the things that the hon. Minister of Transport would note about the automobile industry is that it is a tremendously competitive one, as between the three leaders in the field, the area of being one up on their competitor is all part of the game. This therefore means that we, in this province, are going to wait until one or other of the three main automobile companies gets a jump on their competitors on some particular safety gadget which they are finally going to install, then they are going to advise the hon. Minister of it so he can announce that with his consent they are going to install this particular safety feature.

Now this is one of the compelling reasons why there must be a safety car project, because this government cannot, with all its wisdom, detail what should be the safety components within an automobile, because they are dependent upon the three major automobile manufacturers to provide them with that information. This government cannot spend the money to set up a research foundation that will do all this work and therefore we are placed in the position that we must wait until out of the fullness of their time, we find out what the particular gadgets are going to be, and then we will start to talk about legislating it.

The only sensible suggestion that has come forward on the North American continent is for a body independent—entirely independent —of the three major automobile manufacturers, to produce a safety car, and to produce a car which will demonstratively show to governments, and to the people, what can be done in order to ensure that the toll on the highways will be cut down, and out of that knowledge, and out of that study, and out of that experimentation, governments will be in a strong position to tell the automobile manufacturers what standards of safety they expect in their automobiles.

This is the only way, and time will show that this is the only way that the people of the country, through their governments, are going in fact to be able to tell the manufacturers of automobiles what should be done.

Let us look back to the question in the 1920's when the tremendous lobbies were on to try to get governments to legislate that there would be safety glass. Now the only reason why ultimately that battle was won, was not because of the automobile manufacturing companies. It was because the glass industry had developed safety glass. They were interested in promoting the sale of safety glass and they were finally able to persuade governments to legislate the requirement of safety glass in automobiles. It took that long, and in retrospect—and the history of it must be in the files of this government somewhere — the history of it shows distinctly that it took an intolerable length of time to put in that one single safety feature, which today is part and parcel of the basic safety of automobile driving.

What we must do is support the government of the state of New York. There is no more inexpensive way of doing it than to provide a cash grant to the government of the state of New York, in co-operation with them, on their safety car project. The government of the state of New York is not going to squander it. The government of the state of New York is going to spend our money just as carefully as they are going to spend their money. I am quite certain they will be glad to have the co-operation and indeed, the close association of this government with the government of the state of New York in carrying out the safety car project under the aegis of the company under which they plan to have it carried out. Now, this is the kind of thing which the people in the province of Ontario are expecting from this Minister, they are not expecting in the course of this lengthy debate on car safety to be told that because nobody else is interested we are not going to do anything about it. Because the federal government of Canada is not doing anything about it, because in due course the United States government may not be doing anything about it, that we therefore must wait, and that we therefore really have not any interest in the safety car project.

Let us go to another area. The hon. member for Sudbury this evening spoke about the importance of law enforcement and my colleague, the member for Wentworth East, raised one question. He in substance asked the Minister whether he was satisfied with the state of enforcement of the existing laws of this province. And his only reply was, "I think there should be a few more patrols in the OPP." Now, I think we are entitled to know from this Minister whether or not he is satisfied with the laws as they presently

stand for safety on the highways in the province of Ontario. Has he any views as to what should be done? Are they satisfactory, can he say, "Well, this is one area that we are perfectly satisfied with"? It would seem to me that this is something which he can tell us, I think he can say this.

If I may turn to another area, surely in the research work that can be done, whether —I know nothing about TIRF other than what the Minister has told me, I know nothing about many of the other studies which have been done—but certainly this government should be able to institute a simple study and that is what objects in automobiles or around automobiles cause the injuries to persons when there are accidents. What are the objects?

Take one year, and if it is too late to get the information about last year, start right now and find out how many people are seriously injured because of the glove compartment door flipping open and somebody being injured by that sharp edge.

How many people are injured by the fact that there is no recessed or telescoped steering column? How many people are hurt by these knobs, how many people do suffer because they do not have proper seat belts, because they only have lap belts instead of shoulder belts?

Is this not the kind of area, without fighting this battle about whether there are mechanical defects in the automobile or about any number of other areas, all of which will come out in the wash? Can we not now, by way of study, with funds made available by this government, deal with the question of the actual physical objects which cause the injury to persons when there are automobile accidents?

Mr. Edwards: What about the drivers?

Mr. Renwick: That will all come out. If the member for Perth will just make the distinction in his mind that we are not interested about what the driver does or does not do. For every driver who is at fault there is one driver who is taking evasive action and is unable to avoid the accident. All we are saying is that physical objects cause the injury in most cases. So far as I can understand, they must cause them in all cases. Can we analyze those, can we find out and say; "Well, these are the things which cause the injuries to persons in accidents"?

Let me turn to one other field, the field of the question of the impaired driver. This is a big topic, a topic surely on which the Minister should have some comment. We are gradually coming, I think, in our society to the point where we recognize that alcoholism, for practical purposes in most instances is a disease, whether it has psychic background or there is a symptom of psychoneurosis. Whatever it may be, the fact of the matter is that we tend to treat, and we are gradually and slowly after many years treating alcoholism as a disease.

What do we do when a person is charged with impaired driving and convicted of that particular charge? We do not treat it as a disease; we impose an arbitrary cancellation of his licence for three months or six months and perhaps on some occasions the magistrate under the code will ban him for 11 months from the highways in Canada or 12 months, or whatever the period may be.

But when that person comes to have his licence reinstated, is there any effort made by the government to find out whether the man is still suffering from the disease which in most cases alcoholism is? Or do we simply say, "Well, the time is up and on proof of financial responsibility, you can now have your licence reinstated; whether or not you are still suffering from the disease of alcoholism is something, which is of no concern to us"? Surely this is one area in which the Minister of Transport along with the Ministers in the other branches of government could do some useful work in finding out whether or not the laws about the cancellation and suspension of licences for impaired driving are adequate.

I would think that it is now clear in summary after the discussion that we had this afternoon, that the Minister should now be able to go forward and speak in this House before these votes are passed through, to give the House some indication that he has some real grasp of the overall nature of the problem related to safety on the highways, some comprehensive statement of the interconnection of all the factors, construction of highways, the driver in the automobile, the mechanical construction of the automobile, the safety features which can be incorporated, the kind of studies which he is going to conduct as to what causes the injuries, the state of law enforcement, the question of impaired driving or other impairment in driving.

All these are questions of which the Minister should now be able to tell us he has a clear view after this lengthy discussion which has taken place of what can be done.

And it is because of our failure to appreciate that the Minister has this kind of perspective on the problem that makes us feel we are fighting a constant rearguard action to

persuade the government to get on with an overall view of safety on the highways.

We cannot afford to have in Metropolitan Toronto the statistics which are available for last year—123 persons killed and 14,511 persons injured by traffic accidents, with a damage figure of $13 million. In our society, we cannot afford this luxury, if we just put it on those simple terms. And if the Minister could give us some indication that the overall limits of this problem are limits which he appreciates, that he is going to initiate studies, initiate work, try to persuade his colleagues that this safety car project that the New York state government wants desperately to undertake after many, many years of study is something that they could well join with that government in carrying out.

If all these things could be focused in the Minister's mind so he could make himself the Minister for automobile safety and safety on the highways, then I think we on this side of the House would be satisfied that the debate has been well worthwhile. And, as the hon. Minister of Highways said, above politics.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Bryden: No, the vote is not carried as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman. There are many matters that bear—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Is the vote carried?

Mr. Bryden: Not as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman. I hear comments about dictators. If this matter must be raised, then I would refer to the dictation of an arbitrary government using its majority to keep the House sitting past midnight simply because the hon. Prime Minister in his childish way is miffed because this vote is going on longer than he anticipated. Is this the government's notion of how it should conduct its business? I may say I have not said anything this evening so far, but I have been waiting to raise a matter and I plan to raise it. The hon. Prime Minister imposes his arbitrary childish dictates but we will carry on all night if necessary.

I want to go over to a question of the issuing of, I believe they are called learners' permits, for people who are learning to drive cars for the purpose of qualifying for drivers' permits. I had a matter come to my attention that I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister. I am not certain that he can do anything about it, but I think it is something he could consider.

These permits must be issued with practically no requirement as to proof of identity on the part of the applicant.

What leads me to that conclusion is the following incident that happened not too long ago, Mr. Chairman, and was called to my attention. It affected a young man who is now 19 years of age, a resident of my constituency, who at the time was 18. It happened last year. Some other individual who apparently knew sufficient about him to give his name, address, occupation and place of employment, applied for and obtained a learner's permit in his name.

This individual then went to People's Credit Jewellers and used the learner's permit as identification, not for himself but for himself under the name of my constituent. He ran up a substantial debt at People's Credit Jewellers and then, of course, my constituent who knew nothing about this matter, suddenly found himself faced with the normal sort of gentle action of People's Credit Jewellers and other leeches. They immediately came after him with all the force of the law to collect from him this debt about which he knew nothing.

Of course, their attitude always is that the customer is wrong. The customer is always right while he is acquiring the debt but as soon as it comes time to collect, the customer is always wrong. He has no explanation, there is no opportunity for explanation. So they were ready to give him the business. Yet all this was done by another person using a learner's permit issued by The Department of Transport as an identification.

My constituent, finally, could extricate himself from this difficulty only by applying for a learner's permit himself. Apparently when he did that, his action created enough of an investigation that it was finally established that he was not the person who had acquired the debt and had obtained the learner's permit which was used as an identification at People's Credit Jewellers.

I am raising the matter for consideration. It suggests that it might be desirable to ask for greater proof of identity than is now apparently required when a person applies for any type of permit or licence from The Department of Transport. I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time this matter of identification has come to my attention. I suppose this is only one of many avenues through which deception as to person could occur or could take place and be used for the purpose that has been outlined. It is the first time I have

heard of it and I do not suppose it has happened very often, but I can quite see the possibility of misrepresenting one person and getting what we call an instruction permit and then using that for false identification purposes. It does lend itself to that. I do not know what we can do about it but I would like to look at that.

With respect to the comments that were raised by the hon. member for Riverdale, I think he knows very well our position with respect to the impaired driver and the problem that he causes. We have been in collaboration with the alcoholism and drug addiction foundation on problem driving for a long time. We have many drivers who have been suspended because of their drinking habits, many who are on the permanent or the indefinite suspension list because of that.

We rather welcome the development that is going on in Ottawa—where I think it is in the proper place—where the standing committee on justice is inquiring into the matter of amendments to the Criminal Code that may tie down the penalty on impaired and drunken driving and make broader use of the breathalyzer or other physical tests on blood and urine and the like. We have felt, as I have said in this House before, that we believe the right place for that determination is in the federal Parliament because it is a federal code offence.

I have a couple of notes here about the matter the member was speaking about. He mentioned the patrolling and the adequacy of enforcement. I said that we would welcome more stringent enforcement. I would be prepared to discuss that with my colleague rather than in the House, as is proper.

With regard to the matter of these items in the car that cause accidents, I think you can take it that there has been enough examination of the projections or the parts of the car which a passenger comes in contact with on the second collision, to be sure that they are all being very carefully looked into. The steering column is the most lethal of the equipment in the car which is involved in the secondary accident. This, as you know, is on the way out—that is, there is going to be either a greater measure of shock-absorption in the steering wheel, or contraction in the length of the column. These should go a long way to reducing the amount of injury and death that may result from that factor.

Projections or protrusions are being very quickly and to a great extent either reduced in size, recessed or removed. You can go back and look at the old door handles, the window cranks, the controls on the dash and they are all flattening out or disappearing. There remain the posts, the windshield, and I think perhaps the last one I can think of being removed will be the rear-view mirror. More and more the outside mirror is coming into use. The posts are almost sure to come out with some measure of padding.

I do not think you can make the glass softer, but the shoulder harness is coming into vogue. It may be hard to get people to use it, just as it was a very difficult thing to sell people on the use of seat harness. There are two kinds of shoulder harness being considered.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask the Minister a question, Mr. Chairman? How many cars now on the market are equipped for the installation of shoulder harness so that it would operate effectively?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think many of them have the anchors yet but—

Mr. Bryden: None of them have.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: —I am sure they will be available very soon.

Mr. Bryden: What is the use of talking about the passenger not using it when it would not be safe for him to use it if it was there? The manufacturer, as usual, simply refuses to put in the fittings that are required.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The seat harness is available; the lap belts are available.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, well, we got those after years of trying.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: About ten percent of the people use them and they are more effective in the American car than in the small car because there is greater distance between the passenger's body and the dash and the windshield.

But I was going to say about the shoulder harness that there are two types of shoulder harness under testing today. Chrysler is looking at a shoulder harness that anchors to the floor behind the front seat, and when it is removed, it is laid along the rocker panel on the floor. That seems to be deep enough except you may get it all covered with slush when you get into it with wet shoes in the winter, so that you may not want to put it over a fur coat or a good dress or a suitcoat.

These are problems that have to be worked out, if it is going to be laid along the floor or beside the door when it is not in use. It has certain values and has certain advantages. I do not know what will be the overriding determinant as to which seat belt is going to be used—whether it is going to be more convenient or more acceptable or more efficient.

The Ford people, on the other hand, have been experimenting with a shoulder harness that attaches at the back to the ceiling. You may say that the anchorage is not sufficient. Actually, when they crashed two white Lincolns when I was at Dearborn—one striking the other amidships, side on, and both carrying two dummies in the front seat of each, throughly done up with instruments —neither of the dummies in either car was thrown from the car or out of the seat, or apparently struck the front windshield.

I did not wait to see the readings of the instruments, but I am not surprised that they told me that the pasenger on the right side—the side of the car that was hit sideways and on the side that was struck—had a blow against the post. I do not know what kind of harness you can get to overcome that. But the harness of the dummies that were in the car that ran into the other vehicle at about 45 miles per hour, kept the dummies upright, but they pulled the shoulder harness anchor in the roof to the extent that it rippled or crumpled the roof. It did not pull out, but there was a certain amount of wrinkling and tearing. That, of course, would be useful in absorbing shock and to that extent that kind of anchorage may be more beneficial than one that was completely rigid.

But I tell you, these things are being tested, and when they can determine which is the best seat belt, I think we will have seat belts with shoulder fixtures as well. It would be foolish for us to press for them before they are ready, before the kind of testing they are doing is complete. As I say, I think that because of the way most of the projections are going, we will have padding on the corner posts of the windshield and on the side posts of the doors. Step by step these characteristics of the car interior that are regarded as producing so much of the injury in a secondary crash, are on the way out.

There was finally the matter of the New York safety car that has been raised and reraised. The hon. member for Riverdale has mentioned it again. I said that we were not undertaking any financial assistance to the project at this time, and I think that is a very sound and a very proper position to take.

Now, actually Mr. Chairman, so far as New York is concerned itself, it has not, as far as I know and I think this is accurate, moved beyond the state of bringing out the results of its own studies. It has not projected its next steps yet, and in the absence of that what would you expect us to do? That is where it stands, and I think it is a very proper place. We are interested in it. Of course we are interested in it; from the very first, and I say to the House that we knew of this before it was mentioned in this House; we have a copy of their report on the research that has been done; we have looked at it and noted some of the desirable features that have been brought out in the work. But until that safety car advances beyond where it is, until the state of New York knows where it is going, I do not think it would be reasonable, I do not think it would be responsible for us to take the next step. We have indicated our interest in it to that extent; we are watching it with interest.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question?

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry; the member for Windsor Walkerville indicated his intention to get up.

Mr. Newman: Well, if the hon. member has a question directly on the same subject I think he should ask it because mine is completely different.

Mr. Renwick: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the hon. Minister whether the government is in continuous communication with the government of the state of New York about the safety car, or is it a matter now that is left until there is a further approach made to this government? Is there that kind of interest by this government in the safety car project that they will keep in constant communication with the government of the state of New York about it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have had no further word from them, no further approach, other than the courteous letter from the senator after his visit to us.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the field of road safety I doubt if there is any municipality in the province of Ontario that has gone to the extent that the city of Windsor has. In fact in the last year they have junked over 400 vehicles. They have junked a pile of licence plates well over

10 feet high. In one month this year, they have junked 200 vehicles. However, there is still one feature of The Highway Traffic Act that does disturb them, and that is the fact that a youngster can go to a used car dealer and purchase a vehicle. That vehicle does not have to be mechanically fit at all, and that youngster can take the car on the road. All the used car dealer has to do is submit a certificate to the individual buyer showing that the car is not mechanically fit.

Now, I think The Highway Traffic Act should forbid the sale of a car that is not mechanically fit unless that car is going to be scrapped. It should not be allowed on the road, because these youngsters get right out on the road, they have no responsibility whatsoever; they get into a serious accident and we know the consequences. The deputy chief of police in the community, Mr. Gord Preston, had the following comment that I would like to read into the record because I think it certainly illustrates the weakness of The Highway Traffic Act. The deputy chief described "as asinine the legislation which keeps an unsafe vehicle off the streets, but allows the dealer to sell an unsafe car, if he certifies this car as unsafe."

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think that hon. members realize that the certificate given by the used car dealer is not a warrant, it is a statement as to the fitness or otherwise of the vehicle. This allows a car to be sold that is going to go to a handyman who can recondition a car, put on new tires, fix the brakes, and otherwise put the car into roadworthy condition. But the hon. member has made a very good point in raising this question, and he has answered himself in part by telling of the efficiency with which the new vehicle inspection programme is going ahead. This compulsory inspection programme is taking the licence plates off a growing number of cars in every location where it is operating. The hon. member for Kingston was just telling me how effective it was in Kingston. They removed the plates from scores of cars down there, they have done the same in Windsor. This compulsory inspection fleet of our mobiles will be operating in some 80 communities across Ontario this summer, and I think it will go a long way to instil in people the realization that they have got to have their cars in first class roadworthy condition or they are going to have the licence plates taken off.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister that he do something about the sale of these unsafe cars? This is the thing. Why should we put these unsafe cars back on the road? It is all well and good to say that they will go to an individual who will repair them, maybe you might require the individual to show that that car has been repaired or make him go through another safety test before licence plates would be issued to the vehicle, because we do not want that type of junk on the highways at all.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is an interesting situation, where a car is sold with an unsafe certificate on it. It should not be licensed until it has had a test.

Mr. Newman: That is right. Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: You know, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for York Mills, the Attorney-General, yourself, the hon. member for Riverdale, for Downsview, the hon. member for Eglinton and myself, we have a 14-hour day tomorrow. We start on The Securities Act at 9.30 and if the House meets until 11 o'clock tomorrow night that approaches 14 hours we will be engaged in the public service. It is a shame, it is a shame that the Premier in a state of pique will not adjourn this House so that we can go home.

Mr. Chairman: Well, shall the votes carry then?

Mr. Sopha: No, no!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: On a point of order, I am in no state of pique. My first appointment tomorrow morning is 8 o'clock. In the history of this Legislature we have sat here many times after midnight, there is nothing unique about tonight. I am in no state of pique. I have followed these debates tonight with great interest. If all these things that are said in the estimates have to be said I consider it my duty as leader of this House to provide time during which they may be said, and this I will do.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Prime Minister has just—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on the point of order?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, sir, it is on the point of order raised by the hon. Prime Minister.

He has just demonstrated the state of pique he is in. Now if he is so generous as he says, and it is a matter of great generosity to provide time, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that time should be provided at a reasonable time during the day. This is the only House

I know of that has no fixed adjournment hour, and it is absolutely insane that the House should be sitting at 12:20 at night. This is merely an effort on the part of the government to punish the Opposition for not getting the estimates through, when they want them through.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Who do you speak for?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we have until August, September, or October to meet, if it is necessary. I doubt if that is necessary and it is certainly not necessary to meet halfway through the night. I am quite prepared to do it. I have sat here before while we had the same sort of treatment from the hon. Prime Minister's predecessor—another child when it came to dealing with the business of government in a statesmanlike and responsible manner.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I have sat through it. I do not mind sitting through it again, but I think we should call attention to the childishness, the total disregard for any sort of reasonable procedure in this House, that we now see demonstrated on the part of this dictatorship on the other side of the House. This I think, should be called to the attention of everyone. Does any person think it is reasonable that this House should sit at 20 after midnight?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Has this anything to do with the estimates we are discussing? The hon. member spends little time in his seat; he has no complaint.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member please sit down?

Mr. Sopha: Now, if I may, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: No, I think each of the parties has had the opportunity of speaking to the point of order. I think we should quite respectfully get back to votes 2103 or 2104.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I am ready to address my remarks to the vote.

Mr. Chairman: On the vote?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Proof of the fact, of course, that the safety programme of this government is unsatisfactory is the demonstration put on by the hon. Minister of Highways, in feeling that he was obliged to propel himself into the debate, in the way he did tonight.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It was no demonstration at all.

Mr. Sopha: It is striking to note that this afternoon when I called attention to specific hazards on highways that are under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Highways, he sat silent. Tonight we were treated to the large ovals that emitted from him in the form of wide sweeping, generalizations talking about transcending politics, which of course was an admission of weakness.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: When are you going to take another trip south? The session went on while you were away.

Mr. Sopha: All right. Let us have that out, if the hon. Minister of Mines wants to get into personalities, then I warn him it will be a kamikaze attack, it will be a Lucien Cardin attack, if he does.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I regret the hon. member is so touchy. Could it be a guilty conscience?

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, if you want to get into personalities then it will be a free-for-all, because there is not a member in the House who is more susceptible to laying chapter and verse on the record than the hon. Minister of Mines—

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest that the members stick to the vote, please?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, please be sensible.

Mr. Sopha: —and you have taken on more than you will be able to handle, if you have started with me.

An hon. member: Why do you not go outside, both of you?

Mr. Sopha: Now if you want to get into a kamikaze situation, you just keep it up.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Pride goeth before a fall! Never forget that.

An hon. member: Sit down!

Mr. Sopha: I do not have to sit down, because I do not have to listen to dictation from lesser functionaries like you.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order!

Mr. Sopha: I speak in this House much more effectively for northern Ontario than you ever did, my friend.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to rule the member out of order if he does not stick to 2103 and 2104.

Mr. Sopha: Now let me get back to—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do you speak for Sudbury, too?

Mr. Sopha: —to address my remarks to an hon. Minister of the Crown who has—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, can you do nothing to keep the hon. Minister of Mines in order? He has been the cause of all the trouble that you have complained about.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member should remember the old adage: "Self-praise is no recommendation."

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2103 or 2104.

Mr. Sopha: Let us act like reasonable human beings, please, let us.

I said the hon. Minister of Highways—and before the hon. Prime Minister came in, he was really in a fit of frenzy in his participation in the debate and heaped quite a bit of scorn upon my friend from Windsor-Walkerville. I wish the hon. Prime Minister had seen that. I wish he had seen that demonstration.

But I drew attention to what is known as the killer crossing in Sudbury, which is under the direct jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Highways. Let me go into a little more detail. I ought to describe that intersection.

Most motorists approaching a level crossing can see a train if the road goes straight into it, but I did not make it clear that the highway, under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister, approaches that crossing at a 90-degree angle. The motorist comes down Highway 69 an ingress into that city, and then just about 100 feet before the crossing, the vehicular traffic on that King's highway has to make a 90-degree turn into it and up a grade and it has created such a hazard that I am going to look into it and see how many people have been killed, probably a score. Probably a score of people have been killed at that crossing. So the hon. Minister of Highways gets up here and talks about researches and he shows his magnanimity in accepting a suggestion from the other side. Was not that wonderful? That ought to get him a badge to sew on the inside of his shorts, that he accepted a suggestion from the other side.

An hon. member: You are so wrong.

Mr. Sopha: Such a concession to a small minority and he is going to have a report available to us. Well I say that is just so much blathergate, that is all it is. What are you doing about specific problems that exist, that do not need a report? You did not need a report to know about the carnage on the Copper Cliff underpass with its fog situation there. Why do you need a report when you are perfectly aware that immense physical suffering and even death is caused to people in hazardous situations on your highways? What can all the most highly trained researchers in the world add to that knowledge that you have to have and the impelling need to do something about it to correct the situation?

What do you need a report for to demonstrate to you that the level crossing itself should go into obsolescence? It should disappear from the highways of our province entirely.

What do you need a report for to point out to you the dangerous situations that exist on your highways where there are not adequate guardrails, and I mentioned the rock cut which we have so frequently in northern Ontario.

What does a report have, or the advice of a highly trained research assistant? So I do not think it is unreasonable that we say to the hon. Minister of Highways, do not give us all this business in terms of the large Diefenbaker's ovals that come out and float around in multicoloured whirls, and hypnotize those looking at them. Let us get down to specifics and tell us what you are doing. And let us have some verbiage from you that is not anything more than an attempt to bolster the impossible position of a Minister of the Crown, occupying an important department, who answers inadequately to Her Majesty's loyal Opposition.

We do not really need another Minister of the Crown. My friend, the hon. Minister of Mines used to be the great expert at that, getting up in other people's estimates. But we heard some information that some hon. Ministers on the Treasury benches went to the hon. Minister of Mines and said, "George, stay out of our estimates, keep your mouth shut, when my estimates are on"—

Mr. Chairman: Order. I hardly think this is in order. On vote 2103 and 2104.

Mr. Sopha: He has been chastened to that extent.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order!

Mr. Sopha: That is all I want to say.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Votes 2103 and 2104 agreed to.

On vote 2105:

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. Are you going to try and rush everything through tonight?

Mr. Chairman: No, no. Is this on 2105?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I assume that vote 2104 is carried. On that assumption I move that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, the government used their majority tyrannously tonight, I think you should know that.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on some other occasion, I would be prepared to debate that statement.

Tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of this department, followed by the Treasury, civil service, provincial auditor and the Lieutenant-Governor.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.30 o'clock, a.m.

No. 124

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Ambulance services and improve their standards, bill to promote, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4051

Cemeteries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4052

Air Pollution Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4052

Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4052

Psychiatric Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4052

Question of Mr. Simonett re survey of cottage sewage systems, Mr. Thompson 4052

Questions of Mr. Stewart re milk marketing board, Mr. MacDonald 4053

Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts 4055

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, concluded 4056

Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan 4080

Notices of motion Nos. 21 and 25, Mr. Davison, Mr. Whicher, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Singer, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Eagleson 4083

Recess, 6 o'clock 4091

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 31, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Beverley Acres public school, Richmond Hill, and Calvin Christian school, Chatham; and in the west gallery, Beverley Central public school, RR 1, Troy.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to promote ambulance services and improve their standards.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this bill, in 1964 you will recall that the government established, under the direction of the Attorney General, a committee to study the ambulance situation in Ontario. The study stressed the need for better organization of ambulance services, uniformity of standards for vehicles and better training of operators and attendants.

Many operators have since, and indeed prior to this, expressed the need for assistance with financing. Because of the nature of this service it is often difficult and sometimes impossible to collect payment for their services. The provincial study committee also indicated the need for consideration of help in financing.

After consideration of the study, the Attorney General referred this matter to The Department of Health, believing that ambulance services were properly a health responsibility. We recognize ambulance service as an important component of essential health services when vehicles are required in an emergency for the transportation of patients when considered medically necessary.

There are three important elements of ambulance services—standards of vehicles, equipment and personnel; organization and functioning of the services; and financing.

The proposals embodied in this bill are consistent with these elements. The ultimate objective, however, is to provide Ontario with ambulance services of high quality, organized in a way that will ensure efficiency and quick service with techniques to provide adequate financing.

In the matter of organization and functioning, many studies have been completed in this province and elsewhere, all indicating the need for definite recommendations on the functioning and organization of ambulance services. A careful review of these studies, however, shows that gaps still exist in our knowledge. Further information is required and, therefore, a task force will be set up immediately to report to the Minister of Health, through the Deputy Minister, on arrangements which should be established in Ontario for an efficient and effective ambulance service. The task force will be instructed to proceed rapidly with this work and to report to the Minister as soon as possible.

It will be concerned with such matters as communications, siting and availability, the number of vehicles, organization arrangements, operating procedures and financing.

Looking at financing, as an interim measure the government of Ontario will provide financial relief for ambulance services. This interim assistance will apply to the present fiscal year and will last until the long-range programme can be implemented. The long-range objective will be implemented as soon as possible, but during this interim period the government of Ontario will pay up to 50 per cent of the amount expended for ambulance services by a municipality, a local

board of health, a public hospital or a non-profit organization, as the case may be.

In the long range the financial support for an organized, province-wide system of ambulance services will form part of the government's proposals which will be made subsequent to the report of the task force.

The government proposes to move qiuckly to establish these interim measures and, as soon as possible, patterns for the organization of ambulance services which will meet standards to ensure efficiency and effectiveness.

Proposals will also be made to finance ambulance arrangements as an essential component of health services.

THE CEMETERIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act to amend The Cemeteries Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this bill makes a few changes in The Cemeteries Act. A new subsection will permit a corporation that owns five or more cemeteries, wherever located, to pass its accounts respecting perpetual care funds before the surrogate court judge of the county of York, instead of before the judge of each county in which it owns a cemetery.

Another section provides that where there is no person upon whom the duty rests of taking care of a cemetery, the plot owners may elect trustees to perform this function.

A further section applies to mausolea and this, I think, is very much a tidying-up matter.

THE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Air Pollution Control Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there have been many criticisms of the amount of the penalty provided for in this Act, and the amendment seeks to increase the penalties and to differentiate penalties between persons and corporations. The new penalty will now be a fine of not less than $100 and not more than $2,000 for a person; and for a corporation, on first conviction, a fine of not more than $5,000, and on each subsequent conviction a fine of not more than $10,000.

THE ONTARIO MENTAL HEALTH FOUNDATION ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This amendment, sir, is to make section 23 of The Psychiatric Hospitals Act containing the provisions respecting forensic clinics, applicable to the Clarke institute of psychiatry.

THE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Psychiatric Hospitals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there were certain restrictions as to residence of those being admitted to the former Toronto psychiatric hospital. We have removed this restrictive residence requirement now from the C. K. Clarke institute.

There is also an amendment here respecting the continuance of the forensic clinic in the Clarke institute.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Is the Minister aware that the Ontario economic council has recommended a comprehensive survey of sewage systems serving the province's private cottages? If so, would he advise the House whether he would consider directing the Ontario water resources commission to initiate such a survey, with the co-operation of local public health officials?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is "yes."

In the second part where the hon. leader of the Opposition says, "to initiate such a survey," I do not know what he means by "initiate a survey."

Although many of our lakes are under very close surveillance by personnel of the Ontario water resources commission, we do have a problem, especially in the unorganized townships. Many of our townships where our largest tourist and cottage resorts are

have no building bylaws, and in many cases they have no medical officer of health.

We find it pretty difficult to police these areas. What we are trying to do, or what OWRC is trying to do, is educate the cottage owners; perhaps they can do some self-policing. We are taking samples of water in most areas in which we think there would be any problems, and if we find anything there we follow it very closely. I do hope this works out. To make another complete survey is a very hard thing to do because there are so many lakes in the province of Ontario. It would take years to make a survey and we feel we can clean it up much quicker this way.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the hon. Minister of Health.

1. Why has a 10-year-old Welland boy, known as Grant, been committed to ward 4 of the Barton building, Hamilton, Ontario Hospital, a ward with 73 adult patients ranging in age to 90 years?

2. Is the Minister satisfied that this is a desirable environment for such a boy?

3. What alternative facilities within The Department of Health for such severely disturbed children are presently available in the Niagara peninsula area?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I have to take this question as notice. I was not in my office this morning and did not hear of it in time to get the information. I will undertake to have the information for the hon. member tomorrow.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I might ask the Minister whether, in the process of acquiring the information, he could also inquire into the aspect of certifying children of that age to adult mental hospitals.

I have three questions on the same subject for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Speaker.

1. As Crown guardian of a 10-year-old children's aid society ward, known as Grant, is the hon. Minister satisfied that he should be in an adult wing of the Hamilton Ontario Hospital? May I amend that, Mr. Speaker, to say that I now know that he is not a ward, he was placed in the custody of the children's aid society, which I believe is virtually the same thing.

2. If not, what other arrangements does the hon. Minister intend to make?

3. Does the hon. Minister realize that the Welland children's aid society were totally unable to find any other setting in which to place the boy?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the same position as the hon. Minister of Health. The information is not readily available. I will secure it and will take the question as notice.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions.

First, for the hon. Minister of Agriculture: Has the milk board authorized dairies to increase the deductions for hauling milk without any negotiations with the farmers; and if so, what justification is there for this unilateral action, particularly when some of the trucks are owned by the dairies?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member may be misinformed as to whether it is dairies or plants. Is it dairies that he is referring to, or plants? If he is referring to dairies the answer is "no." Now, if he is referring to plants—that is processing plants, manufacturing plants!

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is what he is referring to. There was unilateral action taken by some of the transports and the owners of the plants who also own trucks, to establish a uniform rate for trucking. This was done without prior discussion with the milk marketing board's representatives. When it reached the attention of the milk marketing board they immediately entered into discussions with the Ontario milk commission, and I would read for the information Mr. Speaker, of the hon. member and of the House, part of a letter that was sent out on May 27, having to do with this matter of transportation:

> During recent days the milk commission of Ontario has discussed matters concerned with transportation rates with the Ontario milk marketing board and processors' and transporters' representatives. This is to inform you that the commission has made the decision to write a regulation under the negotiation section of The Milk Act, 1965. Negotiations for the purpose of establishing rates and charges can then take place on a plant or a market basis, with local producers and transporters represented. Failing agreement, the commission will arbitrate. All agreements will be filed with the commission. These negotiations will replace the interim policy statement of the milk marketing board, but any agreement pursuant to such policy

approved by the Ontario milk marketing board, prior to the filing of the regulation may be recognized by the commission.

To put those matters simply, the milk marketing board's county committee will be negotiating on behalf of the producers, with the processors who own trucks or with the transporters who own their own trucks supplying service to producers in that county. Where they cannot agree on a satisfactory price to both parties, then the milk commission will arbitrate the price, but it is hoped that they will be able to work it out satisfactorily.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit a supplementary question. In instances where deductions were made by the plants, on a unilateral basis, is it accurate that the farmers will have to sue in the courts to get return of that money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I could not answer that question because I have never heard the point raised. I assume the member is referring to the fact that they took off 30 cents a hundred unilaterally for all these people and this was, in some cases, above the agreed-upon price. I think we should also be aware that there were many agreements—I should not say agreements—there were many arrangements between transporters and farmers, and between plants who owned their own transportation and farmers, which were never signed. In fact, this was not any more than service provided and the rate was set and there it was. If it went up three or four cents, it went up three or four cents, and nobody said anything about it, but when it took this jump all of a sudden and involved all the transporters and plants, then it became a matter of uniform concern. I frankly do not know whether the plants intend to refund that portion over and above the finally agreed upon price or not, I really cannot say, I do not know.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the hon. Prime Minister. What action does the government intend to take in view of the representation by 2,300 petitioners in the Bowmanville area protesting the private exploitation of the lakefront through a new quarry development?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of these representations by 2,300 petitioners. They have not been made to me. However, I will check and see if they have been made to some other department of the government and I will take the question up with the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a copy of the letter that went to the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, at the time I walked into the House I did not have it; but in any event I will check and look the petition over and see what it says, and I will deal with this tomorrow.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the orders of the day, I wonder if it would be permissible for me to raise a matter with the hon. Prime Minister with regard to the order of the calling of the estimates. My recollection of what he told us early this morning was that The Civil Service Department would come up in the very near future. I believe the government and others are still awaiting the arbitration award on a matter affecting a large area of the civil service. I wonder if it would be possible to defer those estimates for a while to see if that report might come down. I think it would lead to more constructive comment in the House if we had the report before us if it should later become available.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of when this report will be brought down. Earlier there was some suggestion, I think, that this would have some effect on all the estimates, dealing with the question of the civil service in each of the departments when the estimates are dealt with. I really do not think there is much that we can gain by waiting, because if it were a question of waiting for one week, or ten days, or two weeks, I would be quite happy to consider it, but it is an indefinite sort of proposition and I have lined these estimates up in this area: The Provincial Treasurer—and under his estimates come the civil service—is the third department to be dealt with after we have finished with Transport. If I had some idea of when the report would be available I would be able to do some timetabling, but frankly, I have not any idea of when the report would be available.

Mr. Bryden: I can understand that, Mr. Speaker; I do not imagine anybody except possibly the arbitrators would know when their report will be available. All I have heard is that they are now considering the report. They have completed hearings, so it would seem to me that there might be a hope that the report will be available in a week or two. There are a great many

other departments to go on with. We have been precluded by a ruling from the chair confirmed by the Speaker, from dealing with wages at any stage during the estimates because so many of the rates of the civil service are now under arbitration. This would be the only opportunity and, if that report is still not down I presume we will be precluded at that point too.

I can appreciate the difficulties the Prime Minister faces; he does not know when the report will come down and it may indeed not come down before the end of this session, but I thought it might be possible that he could defer that one department for another week or two to see if there is any hope the report might come down.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, let us proceed and I will take this suggestion made by the hon. member and see what I can work out. I cannot give an answer just at the moment.

Before the orders of the day, I would like to file answers to questions Nos. 5, 12 and 24 that are standing on the order paper.

The hon. Prime Minister tabled answers to questions as follows:

5. *Mr. E. G. Freeman:* Inquiry of the Ministry—1. Is the Minister considering a general health examination of the residents of Elliot Lake and surrounding areas, who were exposed to radioactive contamination with the highly toxic radium-226, to determine what effect such exposure may have had? 2. Is the Minister aware that radium-226 is cumulative in the human body?

Answer by the Minister of Health:

1. The department does not intend to recommend the examination of residents of these areas since no useful purpose would be served. It is the considered advice of the outstanding experts in this field that ingestion of radium-226 in the amounts present in the waters of these areas, over a ten-year period, would not result in a detectable amount in the body.

2. It has been known for many years that about 90-95 per cent of the absorbed radium is deposited in the bones of the skeleton. It is because of this, plus the fact that the most important radiation given off by radium-226 is very short-range, that scientists consider that the genetic exposure from radium is insignificant.

12. *Mr. K. Bryden:* Inquiry of the Ministry—1. During the 1965 calendar year, what Ministers made trips, wholly or partly at public expense, to (a) Europe, (b) the Caribbean area and Mexico, and (c) other points outside continental North America? 2. What was the cost to the public Treasury in each case?

Answer by the Attorney General:

During the 1965 calendar year, the Attorney General made one trip to Sydney, Australia, to attend the Commonwealth law conference. The cost to the public Treasury in this instance was $5,387.24.

Answer by the Minister of Economics and Development:

1. (a) Nil; (b) Nil; (c) May 21, 1965 to June 11, 1965 – Formosa, Hong Kong, Manila and Japan; October 8, 1965 to October 27, 1965—Lebanon, Greece and Turkey.

2. Total cost of above including air fare —$5,520.17.

Answer by the Minister of Education:

(a) Europe $1,985,00; (b) Bermuda $627.-00; (c) Nil.

Answer by the Minister of Health:

1. (a) Minister of Health; (b) Nil; (c) Nil.

2. $1,981.00.

Answer by the Minister of Highways:

1. (a) Hon. C. S. MacNaugton; (b) Nil; (c) Hon. C. S. MacNaughton.

2. (a) $1,390.63 applicable to Europe; (b) Nil; (c) $2,446.99 applicable to other points outside continental North America.

Answer by the Minister of Mines:

1. (a) One; (b) Nil; (c) Nil.

2. $189.65.

Answer by the Prime Minister:

1. (a) Nil; (b) Nil; (c) United Kingdom.

2. $2,368.27.

Answer by the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship:

1. (a) Nil; (b) Nil; (c) Australia.

2. $2,100.00.

Answer by the Minister of Reform Institutions:

1. During the 1965 calendar year the Hon. Allan Grossman made two trips to Europe: April—Italy and Spain—visited institutions and conferred with correctional authorities. August—Sweden—invited by the Canadian government as a member of its delegation to the third United Nations congress on treatment of the offender.

2. Cost—$2,837.10.

Answer by the Minister of Tourism and Information.

1. (a) England; (b) Nil; (c) Nil.

2. $1,390.24.

Answer by the Minister of Transport.

1. (a) See item (c); (b) No; (c) Tokyo, Munich and England (one trip).

2. $2,823.83.

Answer by the Minister of University Affairs:

1. (a) Europe, yes; (b) The Caribbean area and Mexico, nil; (c) Other points outside continental North America, nil.

2. Europe $1,985.

24. *Mr. E. G. Freeman:* Inquiry of the Ministry—1. Is Wilfred Dupont, QC, a magistrate at large in Ontario? 2. Is Mrs. Joan Walsh an employee of Wilfred Dupont, QC, Crown attorney of Cochrane? 3. Has Mrs. Walsh access to the land titles office records in Cochrane? 4. Is Mrs. Walsh's husband, Fred Walsh, engaged in mining promotions?

Answer by the Attorney General:

1. No.

2. Mrs. Walsh is an employee of The Department of the Attorney General assigned to perform the secretarial duties in the office of the Crown attorney at Cochrane.

3. Mrs. Walsh has the same access to the land titles office in Cochrane as any other citizen.

4. Mrs. Walsh's husband, Fred Walsh, advises that he is not engaged in mining promotions, although he does some prospecting.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 32nd order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. E. Johnston in the chair.

ESTIMATES
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
(*continued*)

On vote 2105:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, this is the vote dealing with the motor vehicle accident fund — oh no, I am sorry; it is the next one. I have no comment on this one.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have just one brief question which conceivably might fall into a vote we have passed, but I am interested more in the category of data processing, that I would like to put it to the hon. Minister.

Some years ago when I was on the select committee investigating toll roads or highways finance, I recall that we were informed at that time that The Department of Highways was making a survey to discover what proportion of the people who were travelling on Highway 400 were, in effect, exceeding the speed limit which at that time was 50 miles an hour, and if they discovered in the processing of this data that a significant proportion of them were beyond that, then they would raise the speed limit—in effect to legalize the normal practice.

My recollection of this was freshened last week when I learned from a news story that the department is now making a survey to discover what the average speed rate is on Highway 401. The story indicated that if they discover the average speed was 65 miles an hour, presumably they might give some active consideration to raising the speed limit from 60 to 70.

The question I wanted to raise with the Minister is that presumably their whole approach to considering speeds is in the processing of data to find out what are the norms. I suggest to the Minister, who as a lawyer must have some appreciation of the fact—

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): I am not.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, is the Minister not a lawyer?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No.

Mr. MacDonald: I suggest to the Minister that as a member of the Cabinet he must have some appreciation of the fact that a procedure which actually involves a mass violation of the law as a step towards changing the law, so that it can conform with that mass violation and legalize the situation is, to say the least, a little extraordinary.

I wonder if this is really the way this government operates and whether or not, in the considerations the Minister has indicated his department is having with regard to increased speed limits, there might be a somewhat more scientific approach to what is a safe and a desirable speed limit, rather than just the mechanical processing of data to discover what proportion of the people are violating the law before you legalize their action.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, yesterday I made reference to the request of some of the members that consideration be given to increasing the speed limit to 70 or 80 or 90 miles an hour. I said the matter might be receiving consideration in The Department of Highways, but before any change of that kind was contemplated we would want to look at it very carefully from the impact it might have on the accident record and the safety abuse of the road.

But if there is a study being made, as was intimated by a speaker for The Department of Highways at the recent committee meeting, I think, it is in the jurisdiction of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Highways, and it has not yet come to our attention.

Mr. MacDonald: I am puzzled by the division of jurisdiction between these two departments.

Vote 2105 agreed to.

On vote 2106:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on vote 2106, the Minister has promised us a statement and I will gladly yield my spot in this estimate if the Minister is going to give us a statement of the government's position.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I can follow the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: No, I would like to know, Mr. Chairman—I think this is vital to discussion of this estimate—has the government a position in this matter or has it not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would be happy to speak now.

Mr. Singer: I would like to know what the position is. Is it represented by this civil service report, is it represented by the report of the select committee, is it influenced at all by the Osgoode Hall study? Surely, the time has long since passed when the government should have answered. What do you believe, where are you going, what are you doing? Tell us.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: On vote 2106, Mr. Chairman, we had agreed that there should be discussion on the matter of the reports relating to the outstanding recommendation of the select committee on automobile insurance.

When I first looked into the recommendations of the select committee on automobile insurance, that had not been implemented, I questioned the need for compensation with regard to fault and the cost thereof. Two studies have now been made on the need and cost, respectively. The areas of need have been identified and the two major segments of that need are now disappearing. On the other hand, we have found that the cost of the scheme would be much higher than was anticipated. It would cost the drivers of Ontario over $20 million a year in added insurance premiums.

In 1963 the select committee on automobile insurance recommended that "some forms of remedy should be available to all persons injured in automobile accidents." The committee proposed that a new principle should be implemented providing for compensation, regardless of fault, to everyone injured in accidents. It suggested this coverage should be added as a mandatory part of all standard automobile insurance policies sold by the insurance companies in Ontario. This recommendation entailed a drastic departure from some of the principles that have been applied in the past to compensation resulting from automobile vehicle accidents.

Therefore, it deserved intensive analysis and study. In order to arrive at a decision that is in the best interest of the people of Ontario, responsible consideration of this subject should take into account three factors. First, of course, the report of the select committee. Second, the two special reports that have been done as a result of detailed analysis. And third, the changes that have occurred since the time of the select committee report.

I have obtained two special reports to supplement the studies of this and related matters that have been carried out in The Department of Transport, and in consultation with The Department of the Attorney General.

One of these special reports was an analysis of the financial impact on victims of automobile accidents, directed by Professor Allen M. Linden of the Osgoode Hall law school, based on a sampling of the individuals injured in 1961 accidents in York county. The second was an analysis of the potential effect, costs and other ramifications of the select committee's residual recommendations. This study was conducted by the automobile insurance technical committee under the chairmanship of Mr. W. M. Earl, who was registrar of motor vehicles at the time the committee was established.

Both the special reports have been made public and they add significantly to the body of facts on which to base a decision.

Professor Linden's report found that most compensation was received from non-tort sources and there were court actions in a very small percentage of cases. He suggested there were a number of deficiencies in the present system and he emphasized "the sorry plight of the gratuitous passenger." At the same time, he found "a number of healthy signs manifested by the present system," and he said "the majority of those who suffer loss secure complete economic reimbursement through the tort system as buttressed by the new welfare schemes."

The report of the automobile insurance technical committee investigated the effect on liability automobile insurance premiums of a mandatory additional coverage for all injured parties, regardless of fault, in the manner recommended by the select committee. The committee estimated that this clause would add about 20 per cent to the 1967 premiums for the $35,000 minimum coverage provided under the third party liability insurance.

This would mean an increase of from $8 to $57 for individual premiums on private passenger cars. The total annual cost of these additional premiums has been calculated as $22 million.

Several changes in conditions have taken place since the select committee report on this matter. The motor vehicle accident claims' fund, established as a result of the recommendations of the select committee, has come into full operation. This fund, with related legislation, has made possible a substantial increase in the number of our out of court settlements for accidents caused by vehicles without insurance; it has increased the maximums for payments in these cases; and has brought about an increase in the percentage of vehicles that are insured.

Mr. Singer: Oh, nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Ontario's present proportion of insured vehicles, about 97 per cent, compares favourably with any jurisdiction on the continent, including those with so-called "compulsory" insurance.

There have been substantial changes in hospital and medical insurance coverage. The Ontario hospital services commission now provides coverage for hospital costs for virtually all Ontario residents. As for medical expenses, it is estimated that in December of 1965, about 85 per cent of Ontario residents had some form of medical insurance.

Since that time OMSIP has come into being, providing coverage for close to 1,500,000 individuals, so that the present estimate of those with medical insurance in Ontario is now above 90 per cent.

The operation of the workmen's compensation board continues to provide benefits as a result of some accidents.

The factor of the "gratuitous passenger" has been considered separately and I have proposed an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act that will remove the present impediment that has prevented passengers from taking action against the driver when they are injured in an accident.

When all of these factors are taken into account, in combination with the analytical reports on this subject, it becomes clear that the chief areas of need are being met. If the added mandatory coverage proposed by the select committee were applied in today's conditions, the main beneficiaries would be the insurance companies. If we require compulsory coverage of this kind, we would be requiring all insured motorists to pay from $8 to $57 more on their annual premiums. Yet relatively few individuals would stand to benefit, when we consider the coverage of various forms of hospital and medical insurance and that of the workmen's compensation board, and the proposed new provisions for the gratuitous passenger.

Most of those who might benefit would be the drivers who cause the accidents.

In effect, a mandatory provision for compensation, regardless of fault, if applied to motor vehicle accidents would mean that the government had selected one type of personal calamity for special consideration. A person who caused a motor vehicle accident, or his family, would on all occasions be eligible for compensation, but the same would not necessarily be true if the person were involved in another kind of accident, or if it should be his own misfortune to be stricken by illness or disease. This discrimination would be illogical and unjust.

Under present conditions, therefore, I cannot favour the proposal for compensation regardless of fault. To make this provision mandatory would not be in the public interest. It would be unfair to Ontario motorists.

The matter will be kept under advisement, of course, but the present trends indicate that the points against the proposal will become still more significant as time goes by.

It is obvious there is a basic difference between this coverage as a mandatory provision and as a voluntary provision. Motorists now can obtain insurance to provide for compensation regardless of fault if they want to, and the hon. Attorney General advises me that he plans to introduce a new proposal

that will facilitate this voluntary method by making it possible to combine such coverage with standard vehicle policies.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I trust that when an hon. Minister of the Crown has delivered a statement like this, that it reflects government policy, I do not think we could have possibly heard a better example of small "c" conservative, reactionary, unadvanced, retrograde policy than the statement we have just heard.

It is rather unfortunate that the task of making this decision fell on the shoulders of a Minister who has distinguished himself during his tenure of office by a lack of response to the needs of the province of Ontario.

It is very unfortunate that the hon. Minister—and his colleagues have apparently gone along with it – has chosen to ignore the unanimous report of one of the most effective select committees that I think this Legislature has seen.

It was headed by no less a man than the hon. Prime Minister's right hand man, the Provincial Treasurer. It had on it the Minister of Energy and Resources Management—I have him on the right committee this time, have I? It had on it the Minister without Portfolio and representatives of this party and of the New Democratic Party. It heard representations from the All-Canada insurance group, and that is the group which speaks for the majority of insurers in the province of Ontario. It heard representations from an important committee of the benchers of the law society of Upper Canada who gave an opinion that has never been challenged by other benchers of the law society and seems to have met with general acceptance by the whole legal profession.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we reached the rather unique position, when this committee was reporting, of having the number two man in the Conservative government, aided by two of his present Cabinet colleagues, several important government members of the Legislature, several members of the official Opposition and one member of the NDP, who co-operated and joined in a recommendation endorsed by the bulk of the insurance companies and endorsed by the leaders of the bar in the province of Ontario. Then, in the face of that, we have a reactionary and retrograde Minister of Transport who casts the whole recommendation aside, "On the basis of further examinations," he said.

He made brief reference to the report by Professor Linden—the Osgoode Hall study as it is called. His reference to it makes me wonder if he and I have been reading the same report. Because certainly the conclusions he apparently draws from the Linden report do not coincide with the opinions I have formed since I read that report. It would seem to me that the substantial recommendation made—not recommendation, because, let me make this abundantly clear, the Linden report, the Osgoode Hall study, is not an opinion-making report; it is a fact-finding report. It ventures no opinions and it gives no suggestions; it gathers together, as a result of a statistical analysis, the results of accidents in the county of York in a certain fixed period of time.

It would seem to me that the one outstanding thing this report confirms is that more than 50 per cent of the people involved in accidents in the period studied and in the place studied received no compensation as a result of their injuries in automobile accidents.

If this does not shock the Minister, if this does not shock his government colleagues, I don't know what will surprise them, shock them, amaze them, into a course of social action. This is a substantial message that the Osgoode Hall study sends to the government and the people of Ontario. And for that, Mr. Chairman, the people of Ontario paid an additional $22,000 or $25,000.

The cost of the select committee, I would suggest – and I have not added up these figures in the public accounts, but the cost of the select committee was at least $50,000 and perhaps as high as $75,000. So on the select committee studies and the Osgoode Hall study, the people of Ontario have invested pretty close to $100,000.

I do not imagine there is any reasonable way of costing the report of the so-called automobile insurance technical committee, because it is a committee of civil servants and their time is available to the government at all times and their salaries go on in any event. But I would suggest that when you take – and I am glad that the hon. Provincial Treasurer is here, because I am surprised that he can go along with a statement of public policy such as the Minister of Transport has just delivered, in face of the outstanding leadership that the Provincial Treasurer gave to the select committee on automobile insurance.

If you look at those reports and if you sat with him, as I did, and as other members of the House did, all will recognize that he took the lead in suggesting to government this important type of reform. That is why I say, with much regret, that I am surprised

that the Provincial Treasurer sits on the Treasury benches at the time his colleague the Minister of Transport makes such a retrograde policy pronouncement as was made just a few minutes ago. Yes, did you want to say something?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): No, I think it must have been someone else.

Mr. Singer: Oh, fine. I suppose we are not going to be able to find out how much it did cost to take all these gentlemen, who are permanent civil servants—Mr. Earl was the registrar of motor vehicles; Mr. Bell of the motor vehicle accident claims; Mr. Cook, director of research in the department; Mr. Hachborn, a solicitor in the Attorney General's department; Mr. Humphrey, the vice-chairman of the Ontario highway transport board; Mr. Richards, the superintendent of insurance; a secretary, R. C. Cook; the printing, the binding, the studying and so on, $10,000, $20,000. In any event, Mr. Chairman, we have had an investment of the public money of pretty well $125,000 to tell us that we should maintain the status quo. That is, in effect, what has happened.

The Minister, when he tabled this report of the so-called automobile insurance technical committee—the existence of which very few of us were aware—said he announced it at one time. I have looked through *Hansard* and I have been unable to find his announcement of it. I described it as a secret committee.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Would the hon. member like the reference?

Mr. Singer: Yes, I would like the reference.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He will find it on page 1122 in the debates of Monday, March 2, 1964, and it was in response to a question he raised himself. He commented then on this technical committee in much the same terms as he is using now. He could not see the need for it. The select committee he said had done all that was necessary and there was no need of upgrading their report at all.

Mr. Singer: March, 1964. Well, this committee was appointed in February, 1964 and the hon. Minister, with an inside group of civil servants, set himself up in judgment on a report of a select committee of members.

Why, Mr. Chairman, do we have a select committee formed? Is it just to give an exercise to the members of the Legislature who might be bored with the time they have available, or is it because to all intents and purposes government is faced with a problem to which they are not sure of the answer. This would seem to me to be a logical thing.

Why would the government assign to such a committee a senior Cabinet Minister, the hon. Provincial Treasurer? Why would they assign to the committee two gentlemen who later were to be taken into the Cabinet? Why would the Opposition members spend their time on this committee, unless we all believed that there was an important series of studies to be done in the service of the people of Ontario, and unless we believed that the problem presented was not answerable on the basis of information available to government? If the answer was available and the government policy that clear, what was the purpose of spending $125,000 of the public's money?

Obviously, sir, the government felt, and the committee members felt that they were attempting to provide a real service. Well, then what happens? Then my friend, the hon. Minister of Transport begins casting around for excuses to avoid the decisions, the conclusions and the opinions of the committee and the people who appeared before it. He tried once, he tried $22,000-worth on a statistical study and the statistical study gave none of the negative answers that he was looking for. What better then to get a captive group of civil servants and say to them, sit down and give me umpteen reasons why we should not bring into effect a policy that the select committee recommends.

That is what he achieved. We now have a nicely bound book, by this automobile insurance select committee; it runs some 57 pages, and you read through it and you will find that the civil servants have decided that the recommendations of the select committee should be discarded.

Mr. Chairman, do we have in this province government by civil servants, or government by the politicians?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): A very improper remark!

Mr. Singer: Oh, I do not think it is improper at all. I think it is most pertinent, and I think that if the government is going to rely on the opinions of civil servants in contradistinction to the opinion of as prominent and as able a select committee, backed up by the representations of the majority of insurance companies, and backed up by the

representations of the leaders of the bar in the province of Ontario, that that question need be asked. I say, sir, we are discarding government by the politicians for government by the civil servants, to bolster up a reactionary approach by the hon. Minister of Transport. That is the plain and simple answer to this.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You are attacking the civil service.

Mr. Singer: No, I am attacking a government that allows itself to be ruled by the civil service when it gets into a crisis. If the government had an opinion, if the hon. Minister of Transport decided the first time he saw this report that it was no good, he should have had the courage to say, "I abandon the report and this is government policy." He should not bring in to us a document after all of these studies, a document written by six or eight civil servants, and say, on the basis of this the whole plan is no good.

The civil servants are repudiating the hon. Provincial Treasurer, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, the hon. Minister without Portfolio, the insurance companies and the legal profession, and to do that, to repudiate all of these authorities, I think he will have to have a much better case than the one that has been presented this afternoon.

Now let us look at this report and see what it says. The committee is asked: "What will the effect be on liability, automobile insurance premiums if it is made mandatory that such policies have provision for compensation without fault?" The hon. Minister makes the great discovery that it will increase the average policy by about $10. I wonder how closely he did read our report? And I wonder if he noticed that the select committee report estimated that the increase at that time would be some $7.60. Now, in 1963, the committee was prepared to accept that increase in charges because of the benefit that it was going to provide. The additional increase that is now suggested, and which may in fact be correct, of perhaps another $2, surely is not going to deter anyone from the principle behind the recommendation.

The hon. Minister tries to frighten the people of Ontario by suggesting that if you multiply the $7 or $8 or $10 by the number of people who are to be insured, you end up with the horrifying total of $22 million. It has been said, Mr. Chairman, that figures do not lie but that liars figure and there are a number of ways in pointing out any one of these statistics. Let me assure you, sir, that the committee carefully considered the cost effects, carefully cross-examined the people who came before us. The committee retained its own actuary, an actuary who came from one of the American jurisdictions, to check and recheck on the figures that were given, and the committee came to the conclusion that the increase at that time that looked like something like $7.50 on average, was not an unreasonable one for the sake of the benefits that would be provided to the people of Ontario.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): That was on minimum coverage.

Mr. Singer: Yes, on minimum—that is right. The rates will vary. This $10 figure that he picks out is calculated in the same way. At the top end of the scale it is higher, at the bottom end of the scale it is lower. The figure I am talking about is an average one. And I suggest to you, sir, that the hon. Minister of Transport makes no point at all when he multiplies this figure by the number of cars or the number of owners and then comes up with the horrifying total of $22 million. It is a smokescreen, being dragged across the trail, which is going to hide from no one—no one who thinks about it for a moment—the real picture of what is being presented.

Now, sir, why did the committee make this unusual and, in my opinion, most advanced recommendation? Because they believed then—and I at least, and I am sure most members of the committee still believe—that there should be a method of compensation without fault for people who are injured on the roads. You gainsay nothing by suggesting that this is a prejudicial type of decision.

The Minister did not get around to describing to us what is going to happen if somebody trips over Johnny's bicycle if they cross the lawn and you are not looking after him; or somebody slips in the bathtub. But I suggest to you, sir, that the purpose of this committee, the concern of this committee, as with most of the people of the province of Ontario, is those people who ride in cars. People who ride in cars have a certain need to do so; it is a part of our way of life and the government of Ontario has assumed a very important role in regulating the way people ride in cars. They license them, they test them, they do all sorts of things with roads, with transport rules, and that sort of thing. This is the reason that rejects, and

obviously must reject, the phony argument about favouring one group against another.

But the most important argument about why the committee considered at all the idea of compensation without fault is the one that has been expressed so often by lawyers and jurists. A motor accident happens in a fraction of a second and to go back and attempt to reconstruct what did happen in a fraction of a second, in a courtroom years later, is an almost impossible task.

Has my hon. friend, the Minister, looked at any of the pronouncements by people like Mr. Justice Haines both before he became a member of the supreme court of Ontario and now that he is; or the pronouncements of Mr. Justice McRuer, former Chief Justice McRuer? Has my friend ever sat in a courtroom and listened to the vainglorious attempts of counsel and witnesses to reconstruct what happened at the scene of an accident that took place months or years ago? I would suggest that it is time the Minister took a small course of study himself and began to understand what was at stake in this very important principle which, with a typical Tory reaction, he has just thrown out of the window.

I would suggest, sir, that he determine whether or not it is fair and reasonable that a man whose attention might have been distracted for a fraction of a second—by what? By a pretty girl walking down the street? By a breath of wind that blows a piece of paper against his windshield? By a new store front that has just been erected? He should consider how important it is that a man who makes a very human error of having his attention distracted for a fraction of a second, should be penalized for perhaps the rest of his life by reason of the fact that a motor accident might occur and somebody might be injured.

I would suggest, sir, that these are the type of considerations that should enter the mind of the Minister of Transport. And I would suggest, sir, that the Minister of Transport, both in seeking these reports and then in his remarks this afternoon, shows his abysmal ignorance of this whole subject. It is a shocking thing, it really is. And it is equally shocking to see his Cabinet colleagues sit there quietly and calmly and let him make such a policy statement on their behalf.

As we go through this report, there are a number of fascinating items that just have to be referred to. Before I leave this $10 figure in the estimates of cost, there is a cross-reference here to page 17, and on page 17 and page 18 and page 19 of the report, the committee has elaborated on the way it reaches these costs. The members say that they looked at the submission of the All-Canada insurance federation, they received a new submission and they made their own independent investigation.

I would ask, sir, what this independent investigation consisted of, because it is my understanding that there is not at present in government employ and in the department of insurance, any actuary who—well, any actuary at all—and if you are investigating actuarial decisions, independently investigating actuarial decisions or opinions, one would think that the best way to resort to such an investigation is to get another opinion from another actuary. This at least, sir, occurred to the select committee.

The select committee went to some lengths to try and obtain an actuary who would not be perhaps influenced by the opinions of some of the Canadian insurance companies. In fact, we imported an actuary from the state of California, one who would apparently, as far as we could tell, have no personal interest in the facts that we were discussing. What was this independent investigation done by the civil service committee? How was it done?

Let us consider the second question—1-B: "What will the cost be to the motor vehicle accident claims fund of the payment of accident insurance benefits to a like extent?"

This is an obvious question that is almost on a par with the question, "When did you stop beating your wife?" If on the present basis, the accident claims fund is called upon to pay out more money, the effect is bound to be more serious in dollars than it was before.

But did the Minister not read the report to the extent that he saw a recommendation that said if this system of compensation without fault comes in, the fees to be paid to the motor vehicle accident fund will be increased by the amount of the increase in insurance premiums? Was that figure taken into calculation when the second question was asked? Apparently not, as you read this report. So, Mr. Chairman, 1-B is a misleading question and the answer to it begs the importance of the question. The Minister was setting up a straw man so he could knock it down, so he could make his reactionary Tory statement of policy this afternoon.

On 1-C: "Are there any other matters relating to the scheme which might affect the operation of the present fund?"

The answer there is, if the addition to the $20 fee were insufficient, the extent of the

subsidization would be increased. Again I ask you, Mr. Chairman, did the Minister bother to read the report of the select committee? The select committee said if these benefits are going to come into being, and it recommended that they do, the $20 fee should be raised by the amount that the average insurance premium would be increased. So what is the purpose of question 1-C? Again, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" He sets up straw men and knocks them down. To prove what?

Question No. 2: "Will there be additional costs to the fund for the payment of claims for insured collision damage and what effect will such payments have on existing insurance premiums?"

I ask him, sir, who really posed that question? That question, I do not think, was in our final report. We did look at it on the committee, we came to the conclusion that the additional expense was not warranted and we discarded it; it was not one of the recommendations. So again the Minister sets up a straw man only to have his committee of civil servants knock it down.

Question No. 3: "What would be the effect on insurance premiums if statutes were amended to eliminate the defence of inevitable accidents?"

We did talk about that. The committee came to the conclusion that the effect in both cases would be negligible, but I have not heard the Minister seize even upon the obvious, where he does get an answer from his civil servants, that in effect it would be negligible. He does not say, "We are being bold and brave and we are going to change the law so that where there is no effect, we are going to be big heroes and we are going to remove this defence." He does not even seize on the obvious, so learned is he in the matters that are reflected in this report.

Question No. 4: "Is there any need for legislation giving the superintendent of insurance authority to control automobile insurance premium rates, and if so, what would be the costs associated therewith?"

My only comment about that question and the answer to it is, "What nerve." Surely to goodness the Minister must have some knowledge of the political process. It is not for the civil servants to decide whether or not there is a need for controlling automobile premium rates. Surely that is a political question and it is to be decided by the politicians.

What purpose is there, what object do you achieve, by asking a committee of civil servants if there is any need to control insurance rates? How possibly in seriousness, with any sincerity, can the Minister ask that question of a group of civil servants? In face of what, sir? In face of the recommendation of this very important select committee. In face of what, sir? In face of probably the loudest single public outcry in relation to any subject that I have had the privilege of talking about in this Legislature.

I have got just one file of letters here as a result of my last comments in this House about automobile premium rates. We will read just a few of these things.

Here is a letter from a squadron leader in the air force, who says:

> I wish to bring to your attention a specific case. A young air force officer was insured with X company from the age of 18 to 25. When the policy was taken out he was living near Edmonton and was a civilian student. He subsequently joined the RCAF and remained for several years thereafter at his civilian address.
>
> After he had held the policy for seven years without a claim, he was reassigned to duty at the central experimental and proving establishment at Uplands, and took up residence in the officers' mess. As soon as this address was passed on to the company, they cancelled his policy without notice because they did not insure single servicemen under 28.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the government of Ontario must concern itself with this type of discrimination, and surely this is the type of argument and the type of political decision that has to be faced—not the opinion of a group of civil servants!

A letter from a gentleman employed by a very large and well-known firm here in the city of Toronto. He writes:

> Here is more ammunition for your file. I have two driving sons. A 22-year-old, who has good driving habits, has basic $35,000 PL and PD down to $192 a year. The 18-year-old, who also bought his own car, was told his premium was $312.50 for $35,000 insurance.
>
> This is $250.00 plus 25 per cent surcharge for two convictions. Apparently, under-age drivers are allowed one accident and one conviction before the surcharge applies.

His accident—and listen to this, Mr. Chairman:

> —his accident was a crumpled fender for which I am paying $125.00 over three years on my insurance. The conviction consists of not coming to a complete stop at a stop

> street, and for driving with one headlight out. He went to court over the headlight summons and explained that it was 1.30 in the morning, he was unable to have it replaced at that time of the day; he had reported within 24 hours that the lights were fixed. The magistrate agreed that he was wrongly charged and waived the fine.

So, because he was stopped for having one headlight he pays the insurance company $62.50 in additional premium.

Here is a letter from a gentleman who lives in Renfrew. He bothered to send me his insurance policies.

> Enclosed is a complaint on my car insurance deal they handed out to me. I have driven since the '20s, never had an accident or claim against me. Have driven at least half a million miles. I am 74 years old. I have a certificate from my doctor as to fitness to operate a car. Enclosed are my policies as proof; please return them to me.

If the hon. Minister wants to see these letters they are all available to him. What happened to this gentlman, 74 years of age?

Well, I suppose, automatically, when one reaches that age the automobile insurance companies just write one off. Just before he reached that terrible age, he had a policy with inclusive limits of $200,000, and his total premium was $78; then they cancelled him out on his birthday, and they reduced his coverage to $50,000 and they shoved the premium up to $81.

Mr. Chairman, how could anyone—I could go on, I could be here all afternoon reading you the letters I have here in my file—how can anyone having some knowledge or some experience—and I know every member of this House has the same sort of letters in his file—how can anyone, first of all, ask a question such as this of a group of civil servants and then expect that an answer that they give will justify the lack of action as recommended by the select committee, not once, but three times? Because the committee made interim reports and its final report and repeated the recommendation each time.

One of the interesting observations that the committee puts forward—and this is on page 27; actually it is page 29:

> The detailed filing, scrutiny and approval of automobile premium rates would require a substantial increase in staff, which we believe is both unnecessary and undesirable at the present time. Consequently, no studies have been made of the possible cost involved.

I say, sir, that one of the strongest criticisms and most repeated criticisms that we have had to direct to the department of insurance has been the fact that they do not have a staff that is competent and able to examine these rates as they come in; that is competent and able to give an opinion about the rates and the validity of them; about surcharges; about the whole of the rating procedure. And I say we urged upon the government, and we still urge upon the government, that the department of insurance can be, and must be, so expanded to give it the competent professional advice of actuaries and others so that these premium structures can be examined, and so that there can be governmental opinions about whether or not these rates are fair, reasonable, adequate, and do social justice to the people of Ontario.

How can the government possibly begin to cope with rate structures presented to them once a year by the All-Canada group enshrined in their green book, prepared by very competent actuaries? How possibly can an untrained civil servant, without any actuarial background venture even to question what is in that green book? We asked Mr. Whiteacre—is it Mr. Whiteacre?—the former chairman of the insurance branch, superintendent of insurance.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Whitehead!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Whitehead—we brought Mr. Whitehead before the committee and we said to him: "Mr. Whitehead, in your capacity as superintendent of insurance have you ever once said to the companies, 'Rate A is too high'?" He said, "No." Naturally, he said "no," because he had no ability on which to question those rates. He had no professional advice. He was like a babe in the woods. And I am sure his successor is in exactly the same position because, what is the attitude? The attitude is that a substantial increase in staff is unnecessary and undesirable and so no study has been made of the possible cost involved.

In fairness, in equity, in justice and reasonableness, how can the hon. Minister lend his name and the name of government to that sort of a statement? It passes all understanding.

We believe—

on page 28:

> —that the existence of sections 337, 338 and 339 of The Insurance Act not yet proclaimed is a substantial deterrent to any unjustified increase in automobile insurance rates.

What balderdash! Those sections have been on the statute books for 40 years, some of them. I detailed that information. If the Minister wants to look up my previous speeches in this regard, they are in *Hansard*, I have the exact dates. But my recollection is that those sections have been there for 40 years. And a few weeks ago, when I spoke on this same subject I told him how they got there; they got there as the result of the Royal commission recommendations of Mr. Justice Hodgins. The government of the day fearfully backed away in the early '30s from going any further than to put unproclaimed sections into The Insurance Act, and there they sit. As a threat? As a threat to whom? Who are you frightening?

"We have a piece of legislation there and be careful, fellows; if you do not behave—now we do not know how you should behave —but if you do not behave maybe some day we are going to proclaim them." What do you mean "behave"? they will say. "Well, to behave means to charge fair rates." "But we charge fair rates, of course we do." And the government people say we have no ability to question whether your rates are fair, unfair, reasonable or unreasonable because we do not have any professional advice to determine that. And the Minister is content with a pusillanimous clause that reads like this:

> The detailed filing, scrutiny and approval would require a substantial increase in costs which is both unnecessary and undesirable at the present time. Consequently, no such recommendation is justified.

Is that an answer to the people who wrote me these letters? Is that an answer to the people who have written letters to every member of this House? Has the Minister no courage at all? Is he not part of this great government, that we hear so much about, which wants to advance, which wants to bring social reform. Where is his courage? I do not think he has any.

Let us go back to the report. Is there any need for legislation to implement the select committee's recommendations in regard to the automobile assigned risk plan? Then you go through the various recommendations about every insurer participating in the plan, and that is being done, so there is no problem because it is a condition of the licence.

All the rules, regulations, rate schedules and surcharges are subject to the approval of the superintendent of insurance. I ask, very simply, where does the superintendent of insurance—who I understand is not a trained insurance man at all—where does he get his information and advice, in order to question these things? Where are the staff of experts that should be advising him? They are nonexistent.

The plan is required to insure any person whom The Department of Transport is prepared to license as a driver, and then there is the interesting comment by an informal agreement, this is being done. "Informal agreement"—they gave their commitment to the select committee and at least they were concerned with the opinion of the hon. Provincial Treasurer and that is where the informal agreement was given; and it was given to the hon. Minister of Transport's colleague, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and they have abided by it.

But they said, "If we do this, we should like to challenge from time to time whether or not A or B or C should have a licence." And at this point I criticized the companies, because the companies have found that it is an unfortunate thing to deny people insurance. This brings the wrath of politicians down upon their heads. So no longer do they deny people insurance. Either they give it to them directly, or they give it to them out of the assigned risk plan. But the way they discourage people is by piling premium upon premium, surcharge upon surcharge until you see premiums of $800 and $1,000. There cannot be any more effective discouragement to somebody for driving on the road, if they are going to have to pay in an automobile insurance premium as much as, or more than, the car is worth.

This should concern the hon. Minister, but it does not.

But the additional part that the Minister has missed completely from the considerations of the committee, was that the joint undertaking was, "We insurance companies believe there are people on the road who should not be. We would like you, Government, to set up an independent body to review cases which we will complain about."

To date, and I have inquired about this on several occasions, they have not really complained once. They believe it is bad public relations. So, instead of complaining, they pushed the premium up and up and up. It is just as effective and it avoids facing the big issue.

I say to you, sir, that co-terminus with, coincident with, the control and regulation of insurance rates must come this type of appeal procedure. I think the government should determine who should be on the road, not the insurance companies, and whether they do it outright by saying, "We

will not give you insurance"—which policy has gone by the boards—or whether they do it indirectly, by putting the premiums up to close to $1,000, the effect is still the same thing. I suggest to you, sir, the only way that you are going to bring this under control is to have the government of Ontario control rates.

If a man's record is bad enough that in justice it is believed he should not be on the road unless he pays a premium of $1,000, or $1,500, then I ask you, sir, what business has that man being on the road at all? Then I say, sir, there is something very wrong; then I say that it is high time that the hon. Minister of Transport reviewed whether or not that man has any right being on the road, if he is such a danger to the other people who use the road. But we have had no initiative like this from the government. We let these premiums mount and mount and mount, and we say, hands off, it is prejudicial, it is unfair and there are other methods of looking after it.

I think I have dealt as much as I want to with the recommendations of this report. Let me turn just for a moment or two to the hon. Minister's introductory remarks, the statement of government policy.

The hon. Minister says that when he was faced with the frightening report—and I am paraphrasing; perhaps I am putting some words into his mouth that he did not utter —but a report that certainly he has found very frightening, of the select committee on automobile insurance, he questioned the need and the cost, he questioned the opinion of his colleague, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and his other Cabinet colleagues, of the lawyers and the insurance industry, and so he decided to have more studies done. Then he had the Osgoode Hall study done, and the civil service study done, and then he comes up with the fascinating figure of over $20 million, and I think he moved it up to $22 million, without any real analysis of the public need that the recommendation was trying to solve.

He says there have been changes, the position has improved—no, I am sorry; two major segments of need have disappeared. One of the two major segments of need that have disappeared, I gathered as I listened to his statement, is the effectiveness of hospital services.

Hospital services was well on its way in 1963—when did hospital services come in; 1960 was it not; 1959? So there really has not been that much of a change in that one segment. In fact, the committee report antedated the introduction of the hospital services commission by three years. So there is one of his major segments of need not having disappeared, but having certainly been in existence at the time the committee considered this.

And then he talks about OMSIP. OMSIP, the great new discovery of government, is another major improvement.

Even if these things had been brand new, even if they are as effective as the government supposed, what relationship do these matters have to the question of compensation for victims of automobile accidents, on the principle of being without fault? No relationship at all.

He talks about the gratuitous passenger amendment, as though Christopher Columbus had made a new discovery. Every other jurisdiction in Canada has already done it. We have taken a reluctant and halting step about gross negligence—and I would like the hon. Minister, whom my friend from York South thought was a lawyer, to tell us what gross negligence is, because very few lawyers or judges can really tell you. If he had any courage he would have taken out the whole gratuitous passenger recommendation entirely, but he puts it in, covering, halting, gross negligence.

I draw the hon. Minister's attention to the editorial in the *Star* today, which talks about this. The editorial is in many, many papers all across the province of Ontario, read by thousands and thousands of Ontario citizens who are really concerned.

I am not going to rehash again my opinions on rates, how they are calculated, whether or not investment income should be included in profit and loss statements. Nothing is to be gained at all in saying that in contrast to the compulsory insurance jurisdiction the costs are four times as high.

If the hon. Minister had bothered to travel with the select committee when we went to the state of Massachusetts, he would have agreed with the sentiments that all members of the committee expressed, even though we did not write it in the report, that if you compare politics and the corruptness in the state of Massachusetts with the general effect that we have in Ontario, you are comparing apples to oranges.

There is a state—my friend who was with me is smiling; I am glad to see that—the registrar of motor vehicles came up and told us, "I am the owner of the biggest taxi fleet in the whole state, ha, ha." That was the introduction that we had to the compulsory insurance provisions in the state of Massa-

chusetts. We talked to the members of the bar, who told us how they invented claims to correspond with certain things that were in their law.

So what really are you comparing? Compulsory insurance? That battle has been fought and that battle is over, because without using the nasty word "compulsory," but by increasing the fee that has to be paid into the motor vehicle accident fund from $5 to $20, we were able to convince 70 per cent of the people that it was just as well to have insurance rather than pay $20 into the fund which gave them no protection.

The hon. Minister can claim no credit for that at all. Nothing he suggested, no discovery he ever made had anything to do with that. That was one result of the committee's recommendations which made good sense. And if you put that fee higher—and I was one who suggested it should be $30 or $50, the majority of the committee disagreed with me—I think you would have had your percentage as high as you could possibly go, perhaps 98 or 99 per cent. That is the answer to that one. The hon. Minister again has made no discovery.

Where, then is the government's case? How can the government back away from this important social reform? If it does and if this statement of policy of the Minister of Transport means what it says, then the government must stand condemned in the eyes of the people of Ontario who have as good a knowledge of this problem as they have of any problem of government. Believe me, sir, my colleagues and I are going to spread this story from one end of the province to the other, and the people of Ontario will know how the government stands against this important social reform.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the hon. member for Downsview for a very powerful and lucid explanation of certain principles in respect to automobile insurance. He gave us, in the period in which he spoke, a very lucid condemnation of the present insurance setup in Ontario, and he offered certain solutions to it. I would have wished that he had done the logical thing and said, since this kind of assurance stands condemned, we are moving forward to support a public system of car insurance.

Mr. Singer: I did not go quite that far.

Mr. Young: A gentleman by the name of Walter Gordon, not long ago at a Liberal convention in this city, pointed out that the Liberal Party had to stop waffling or go out of existence. On this subject they are waffling. They are waffling and trying to be on both sides at the same time, trying to present themselves to this province as a great crusading party in the matter of car insurance, but standing foursquare for the very system they condemn. They had better start thinking about where they are headed, whether they believe Walter Gordon or not, or whether they are going to stand up on their feet and be counted for the kind of reform that they imply to the people they stand for and actually do not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to back up for a few moments the illustrations which were given by the hon. member for Downsview, and then one or two of my colleagues want to get into the principle of this vote in more detail. But I want to bring before the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, the plight of one of his customers under this vote; the plight of a customer who is in that situation because of an error that was committed by another section of his own department.

Reg McKinnon lives on Lindy Lou road in my riding. He is learning his trade at Murray Printers. He is 20 years old, and the family car is registered in his name. In March, 1965, he lost two points because of a traffic mixup, nothing serious, but apart from that has a good driving record. His insurance costs him $261 a year. Before that insurance became due April, 1966, he got the usual bill from London and Midland General Insurance Company and sent the first instalment of $62.25 to his agent, E. A. Conway of Jethro road in Downsview. A few weeks later, Reg was startled to get a letter from Mr. Conway. That letter contained a bill for $934. I have a copy of it here—or it is the original bill—$934 to cover his car insurance for the twelve months following May 9. In the letter was also a photostat of an abstract signed by the Deputy Minister of Transport, A. G. McNab, and I will send this over to the hon. Minister.

It listed dates and details of 22 points against the driving record of Reginald McKinnon of 137 Lindy Lou road in Weston. Mr. Conway began his letter:

> As you will see from this attached motor vehicle abstract, you have accumulated more convictions than we are aware of.

But Mr. Conway, being a good insurance man, interested in the wellbeing of his client, went on to say this,

> The premium charged by L. and M. is

> prohibitive, to say the least. Therefore you have no alternative but to apply to the assigned risk plan. The assigned risk will charge a premium of $504 a year, with a down payment of approximately $160 on instalments. Kindly advise if this is satisfactory, and drop into the office to draw up the papers. Your present binder with L. and M. expires May 24, 1966.

Reg knew that this was a mistake, some place there was a mistake, but Conway could do nothing. There was the record, signed by the Deputy Minister—and, of course, the Deputy Minister, to clear the record would not be personally responsible; I presume it was signed by one of his clerks. It was $504 or no insurance, and with that number of points, even the assigned risk would not be enthusiastic about him at all. In desperation the family called The Department of Transport. The record stood. They were shunted from clerk to clerk without result. Finally the father got in touch with the Deputy Minister's office. He talked to the secretary who listened sympathetically to his story. She was courteous, and she finally became convinced that this was something that should be investigated and she promised to do just that.

The next day she reported that there had been an error. Reginald actually had two points against him—not the 22 reported. She explained that the others must have been entered in error. But that did not solve the problem for Reg on May 20, four days before the insurance binder was due to lapse, the mail brought a letter from London and Midland. It told him that his insurance was lapsing and that they would refuse his payments less a $20 binder fee. That was the original instalment he had sent in. A day or so later Mr. Conway's cheque arrived for $41.25.

Reg immediately applied to another agent for coverage but was refused. He got in touch with the motor vehicle accident claims fund run by the provincial government, and paid his $20 so that he could continue driving. So he became a customer of the hon. Minister at that point. He then tried another insurance company; the agent took his application and cheque and sent it on, but so far, as of about two days ago, there was no word. It seems incredible, Mr. Chairman, that The Department of Transport should have made an error of this magnitude in the first place. Perhaps these computers we hear about have not been working as well as they ought to work and there may be an explanation.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Would the hon. member like me to comment? Those are not our marks, those are not demerit points applied by this department because they do not apply to the specific offences to which they are linked.

Mr. Young: Well, all I can say is that these are the documents that were received and forwarded. They are something between Mr. Conway and your department and perhaps—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Something happened to this sheet after it left our department, I would say.

Mr. Young: Well, whatever happened, this is something that should be investigated, and not only has this had a profound effect on a citizen of this province, it has had an effect on a whole family, it has cost him a great deal of time, money and bother to continue his right to drive in Ontario. And if what the hon. Minister says is right, and these extra points were put there after it left the department, then I think an investigation is due to find out who put those extra points there and who was responsible for this kind of jacking up of his premium that took place by the insurance company.

An hon. member: Have you the document?

Mr. Young: Well, this is it. This is a photostat of the document received, evidently sent forward by the insurance company and who can do it, is something the hon. Minister perhaps could answer.

If, in fact, it did come from The Department of Transport, then we should ask the hon. Minister whether or not a correction was made to the insurance people involved, and even after that correction was made, why would the insurance companies persist in their refusal to grant insurance to the young man? True, he had two points, but that was the only thing against his record and if this is the kind of insurance which is being meted out to our people in Ontario, then this whole matter deserves careful and prolonged investigation.

So I would like to ask the hon. Minister—he has already answered it—how this error was made and, secondly, I would like to ask how it is in a province like Ontario, that an insurance company can act in such an arbitrary manner.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me very clear that this was a report that was received by the insurance company from our department and that it has been

added to after it went out of our department. Now, the insurance company may have its own ratings, but those ratings of points are not demerit points under our demerit point system, or he would not be on the road.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the photostat is here and the proper demerit points of two are noted on March 22, 1965, as the hon. Minister sees. But in addition to that is a two points demerit on July 29, 1965 and four more points on March 22, on January 19, a two points demerit; on August 14, two points; October 8—going back to 1963—two points; March 31, 1964, four points; January, 1965, four points, for a total of 22 points.

Now, this does have the signature of the Deputy Minister stamped on it and this is something that I bring to the attention of the hon. Minister so that he can investigate it and see what he makes of it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the hon. member at this point that there is no such thing as two demerit points for a speeding offence and there are no demerit points applicable to an accident, per se, so that the record is quite out of order. It does not accord with our reports at all. The printed form may have been taken from one issued by our department, but it did not issue in that way, I can assure him.

Mr. Young: What the Minister is saying is simply that the insurance company concerned, or somebody along the line, has altered the report of his department.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It may have used its own rating.

Mr. Young: This seems an incredible thing, to use the signature of the Deputy Minister to put their own ratings on a form issued by the department. Now, it seems to me that this is a matter that calls for very serious action and a thorough investigation.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the hon. Minister just sloughing this off?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No; I am just explaining that it is not a photostat of a document in the form that is issued from our office.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not want to intervene other than to raise this point at the moment, Mr. Chairman, because there is a sequence of speakers here. But the proposition, after all the evidence that has been submitted to this House, is that the insurance companies are using the government figures with regard to the record of a person as the basis upon which they can continue to overcharge that person. And now the hon. Minister has given evidence that photostatic copies are coming back to individuals, copies which have been altered, and the person does not know whether or not the alteration is made following the signature of the Deputy Minister. Surely this is a falsification of official records, in such a fashion that the hon. Minister should rise in his seat and say, "I am going to look into this and see that it stops!"

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I shall look into it, the hon. member can be very sure of that, because this is not a photostat of a document as it went out from our office. I can assure the House of that.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, if I could just pursue another phase of this. There is still another angle of this—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps this is within the vote, but I am just wondering about it from the standpoint of the insurance coming under the motor vehicle accident claims fund, and thinking in terms of insurance coming under the Attorney General's department. That is all.

Mr. Bryden: Well, this I think—

Mr. Young: He is a customer of the department under this vote, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We are prepared to look at this whether it comes under The Department of the Attorney General or not.

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the Minister's concern but I was just reminding the members of the House of the actual vote.

Mr. Bryden: It is a rather difficult problem. I have one comment, though. I think the other aspect of this that should also be considered is that apparently insurance companies are making their own arbitrary ratings and using them as a basis for jacking up the insurance premiums people have to pay to quite an exorbitant level. We have complained about that in the past and it would appear that the same thing is happening again. But now they are giving an apparent official stamp to what they are doing by using stationery from the department in order to put down their own arbitrary ratings which the average citizen is completely powerless to appeal.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I will get a photostat of the actual letter from the insurance company which went with this and

send it over to the Minister so that he will have the full information.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If the member sends it over, I will send it right back. I would just like to see it.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): The individual who cannot get automobile insurance is forced to pay the $20 to the motor vehicle accident claims fund.

Now, I happen to have received a series of letter from individuals in my own riding, but the one that stood out very prominently was the case of a 41-year-old registered nurse who had been driving a car for 18 years and who had never had an accident in her life. She was refused insurance by four companies. She was not directly responsible for any accident. She had three mishaps when her car was parked. Materials blew off the top of a building, went through the roof of the car, and naturally a claim was made. The second time, her car was stopped and was hit by another car. The third time, she had pulled off the side of the road where a car had apparently been lost control of by the driver. Because she happened to have made three claims against insurance companies, she finds that she cannot get any insurance at all, and the four companies that have refused her are: Prudential, Home, Co-op, and Abstainers. Now, what is the lady to do?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think this is a matter that really comes under the department of insurance.

Mr. Chairman: I would just point out to the member for Windsor-Walkerville that as I look under the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General, on page 22, in the lower corner, vote 210, it says, "Office of the superintendent of insurance," and I think this would properly come under The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you, but the problem is that because they cannot get insurance they come under this item or this vote.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it is closely allied, I realize, but I would ask the member if he would give consideration to staying with the vote as it is, under 2103.

Mr. Newman: I will leave it as such, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: I have two small items that are tied in with this and I am going to attempt, Mr. Chairman, to separate what is relevant here and what appropriately might come under the superintendent of insurance estimates under The Department of the Attorney General.

The first question that I want to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister at this point is that I have in my hand here a copy of the standard letter that apparently goes out from his department over the signature of the Deputy Minister to anybody who has registered an uninsured vehicle, and I would like to read it into the record—four brief paragraphs:

> Our records indicate that you have just registered an uninsured motor vehicle and paid the uninsured vehicle fee of $20.
>
> The payment of this fee does not provide any insurance coverage; you are still exposed to a great risk of financial loss.
>
> Remember that you must pay for all damage or injury that you cause; the money will come from your savings, assets, property or future income.
>
> Remember that only automobile liability insurance will protect you.

Now, this is all very fine but if I ever heard of a classic case of back-door compulsion, this surely is it.

A man buys what you have offered and then as soon as he has bought it, you write letters to him and in effect say, "Look, what you have really got is a fraud."

An hon. member: Oh no, no.

Mr. MacDonald: "Well, what you really have is a fund not providing you with any protection at all."

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is true; but some have to be told.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore it is a fraud. It is no insurance.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, no it is not a fraud.

Mr. MacDonald: "We," in effect, "are advising you to go to the private insurance companies." Now this is a back-door compulsion to go to the private insurance companies—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If you want protection, that is the only way to get it.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the point—well, I am not going to belabour the point, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Precisely the point of this motor vehicles claims fund operation, Mr. Chairman, and allowing a driver to obtain his registration without insurance, is that we do not make the driver protect himself if he does not want to; we will take the $20 fee in lieu of an insurance certificate and so he can drive. And a lot of people assume falsely that they have protection and so for the protection of the public we write this letter. Now, you may not approve of the language of the letter but it is factual and it is true and it is honest. It tells the motorist that he has no insurance. If he gets into trouble he is going to stand the loss and it can ruin him financially.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not objecting to the language of the letter. In no sense am I critical of the Deputy Minister who certainly is informing the person of exactly the anomalous position he has got himself into, and I suspect that this letter is the product of an awful lot of people in the early stages who paid this $20, thinking they were getting insurance, and discovering to their chagrin that they were not getting insurance.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It has never been said that it was.

Mr. MacDonald: Nobody said that it was insurance, I agree. But it is difficult for the average person to distinguish between the proposition of buying insurance and paying this and thinking that if he paid $20 to the government, he was going to get some measure of insurance. There is no—

Mr. Singer: Except that when the fee went from $5 to $20, the percentage rose from 91 to 98 per cent, so on the most difficult ten per cent it had a pretty salutary effect.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure it had a salutary effect, and the Minister says they are not compelling people, that this is purely voluntary. It is almost in the category of the phony "voluntary" approach in the instance of hospital insurance where 60 per cent of your people were compelled to go into it, but it was still a "voluntary" plan. I mean, you are capable of double talk to an extent that is almost beyond description. What in effect you say to the man is that he can go ahead and not buy any insurance but if he does not buy any insurance and perchance he has $100,000 liability, we warn him that in effect he is going to be off the roads for the rest of his life, until he has repaid the fund.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of the fund was to protect the public as public people who have suffered damages. That is the prime concern of the legislation. There is no compulsory legislation in effect in this province. It is a matter of debate, a matter of opinion, as to whether there should be or should not be.

We say, and have said up to this point—and I had something to do with it when I was in that department—that we are not going to have compulsory insurance. We said this much, "If you do not have insurance then you must pay this fee." That is a fee substantially less than any equivalent insurance rate. It is not insurance, it does not pretend to be. What it does is create a fund to protect the public so that no matter who causes the damage, whether he is insured or not, the public itself is protected.

Let us come back then to the individual. He does not have insurance, he paid a fee to help create this fund, which is operating to protect the public, and there are certain, penalties that go with it if on his account the fund has to pay out a claim.

Mr. MacDonald: Not on his account. He may not be responsible for the accident.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He may very well be.

Mr. MacDonald: No, but he may be the innocent victim of an accident. He is not responsible but because he does not happen to have insurance—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, but it would not be paid out on his account or because he was the author of the accident unless there was legal responsibility involved. Where there is legal responsibility and legal fault involved, he then has to repay the fund. I think it is only fair, it is only decent, it is only cricket, put it in any language you like, that this category of people who chose to pay $20 or $25 as the case may be, be told, "Look, there are limitations on what goes with this protection. It is not you that this is designed to protect, it is the public, the general public, and if you are the author of an act which leads to a payment out of the fund to any other part of the public, you may be liable to repay that to the fund or you will not get your licence handed back."

I think that it is only fair to tell them. I think the facts that the hon. member for York South pointed out were accurate, but I do not think it was against that context, that this notion that was arrived at was a matter of putting a man—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me just clarify the situation.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Maybe we are just arguing semantics, but I think it is worth putting this side of the story on the record.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me clear this ground. I am not objecting to the fact that the letter went out. I would certainly like the man to be aware of the fact that he was not insured and at least be dispelled of that illusion, which many of them lived with for quite some time. I repeat, I suspect the letter is a product of that kind of experience and the political reaction the government got.

What I am complaining about is the whole bizarre setup. It is the equivalent in the car insurance field of your latest sacred cow, namely, the whole OMSIP setup, which is an inefficient, makeshift, piecemeal kind of situation. This government has its sacred cow before which it must bow and scrape, namely, that there is going to be a voluntary approach. To be able to maintain and establish a voluntary approach, it comes up with this kind of a thing which is certainly not defensible on any rational assessment and on any rational grounds.

However, I want to go back and underline a point. The case is not as dramatic as the one that my hon. friend the member for Yorkview has given, but is typical of the kind of thing that ordinary little people run into and then find themselves being victimized by insurance companies because of it. I have a case here that comes very close to the area of the hon. member for Downsview; it may be in his riding, because it is in North York.

A man with a family of nine children works for the North York board of education and earns less than $4,000 a year. He got into a small accident on Bathurst street three weeks after his insurance had lapsed. Now, you say, of course, why was the man so foolish as to let it lapse? Well, I remind you he had nine children and he was having difficulty meeting all the bills. But he offered to pay the bill; it obviously was not a very big accident, the whole outlay was $56. Anybody who drives a car today will vouch for the fact that if your damage involved is only $56, this is a pretty minor accident.

But the net effect of this was that he was told by this department that he would have to conform with all of these arrangements because the man involved immediately placed it in the hands of the unsatisfactory judgment fund, as he terms it here, when he discovered that he did not have insurance.

However, the point I want to get to is that here is a man 37 years of age, who had never had a serious accident, and this was his only minor accident in recent years. When he goes to get his insurance, the insurance reads: "Basic premium, $94"—what he had been paying. Then underneath it: "Two minor convictions—improper muffler, April, 1963; speeding, February, 1965; 25 per cent." They calculate this as $24, so his premium now becomes $118.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, in the context that I have argued in this House before, here is the insurance company setting itself up as a body above the law of the land, above the province of Ontario. We have our demerit system. If there are going to be penalties imposed because of infractions, even infractions as minor as this, surely it is not the right of the insurance company to automatically calculate this kind of a penalty of $24 that this man is going to have to continue to pay and which he refused to pay. Quite frankly I do not know what the solution to his problem was, because I have had no further correspondence with him.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what you have is a situation in which the insurance companies simply are not servicing the market. They are refusing to service the market, they are using all manner of dodges. Indeed my hon. friend has presented to the Minister a documented case this afternoon which suggests that they are even fraudulently using the information from this department and using it as the justification to exploit and gouge from the public further premiums.

In face of this kind of situation, how long is the government going to go through the kind of tortuous logic and thinking that is in this document that the hon. member for Downsview went through at considerable length this afternoon? I ask, how long?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What was the name of the company involved?

Mr. MacDonald: The company involved was the—well it is an independent agency—I am not sure—I can give the Minister the agency but I cannot give him the company and I have no particular desire to bring the agent's name into it.

Mr. Singer: I have all sorts of companies. Does the Minister want to see my files?

Mr. MacDonald: However, Mr. Chairman, just before I sit down—and it will be brief so that you will not rule me out of order—I listened with the greatest of interest to the case of the hon. member for Downsview. The hon. member for Yorkview was correct;

it was a powerful case. But do you know what he reminded me of? He reminded me of going to visit the Royal winter fair. I love to see these horses, the odd one of which goes rushing around, and it suddenly comes up to the hurdle, and it balks, and it falls flat on its face. That is precisely what he did this afternoon. He condemned the whole system—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He is no horse.

Mr. MacDonald: He condemned the whole system, and then he rushed up to the hurdle and instead of facing the logic of how you are going to rescue yourself from this, he took his stand essentially where the Liberal Party always takes its stand, with the Tories.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Nothing wrong with that.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know whether the hon. Minister wants to continue to shake his head, because basically he is going to stand with the kind of system which is going to produce one anomaly after another, one evasion after another, all of these circuitous ways of avoiding provision of full service and devising new tactics for gouging the public because you have not got a rational kind of approach.

And when you have stripped away all of the bombast and all of the fury that the hon. member for Downsview put into his attack on the government, when it has all drifted away—this smokescreen that he says has been dragged across the trail; that is a lovely mixed metaphor but I think it is appropriate in this instance—you find him standing with the government. And that is where they always stand when you really face up to the basic problems.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the members of the House that I would like them to stay with vote 2106 and leave matters of insurance if they will until the Attorney General's department. The member for Riverdale did indicate that he would like to speak. I know it is on the same point. Would you defer to the member for Downsview?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Yes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly in answer to the hon. member for York South. The answer is obvious: Neither my colleagues nor I believe that we should get into socialism just for the sake of being socialists; we are not socialists.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what you said on health insurance a few years ago.

Mr. Singer: I say this, sir. A few weeks ago I made a speech in the Budget debate which outlined our position and I thought reasonably clearly. Apparently it did not get through to my hon. friend for York South so let me very briefly summarize.

Mr. MacDonald: I really got the point.

Mr. Chairman: I know the members on your left are anxious to hear your answer. The member for Downsview has the floor, please.

Mr. Singer: Right. I say this, that this industry can and should continue as a part of private enterprise, but that it will not unless (1) the government takes a hand in directing it by controlling rates; (2) there is a system of compensation without fault, and (3) the insurance companies recognize what is at stake and co-operate in this direction. I say that this can be done and I say that herein lies the difference.

Our friends here believe and they believe it sincerely that government can do anything better than private enterprise. We do not share that belief. We believe that this industry can and should survive. The livelihood of many thousands of people in this province is at stake. But we say it is in grave danger because the government's attitude seems to be that it is going to let the situation continue to deteriorate.

There are obvious remedies immediately available: (1) the controlling of rates and the controlling of the industry, and (2) the provision of a system of compensation without fault. That is all I want to say and I think if my friends did not close their ears and shut their eyes to the facts of life, they would recognize that there is a substantial difference in our position and in their position; otherwise we would be sitting over there with them. We have no desire to do that, now, or at any time in the future.

Mr. MacDonald: We want you to open your eyes.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2106, the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. member for Downsview had an opportunity to express himself because he discloses again the same fault that he has disclosed in this particular field for a long time. It is that he does not have any basic understanding of how the insurance

business operates. The matter which the member for Downsview seems to pin his faith on is that the government should take unto itself the power to regulate rates.

There is no need for the government to regulate rates in an industry where they know exactly the basis on which the rates are calculated. When they know exactly what the rates are and they know very well that if they accept the premise on which the insurance companies base their rates, which they in fact do, there is no need to fix their rates for them because they will be identical with the rates that are at present in force.

The defect, of course, which the member for Downsview will not understand and refuses to understand, and which the government does not understand and refuses to understand, is that at no time in the calculation of the rates which are charged for automobile insurance in the province of Ontario do they take into account the income earned on the investment portfolio of the insurance company in fixing the rates.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Surely to goodness, I have said that in this House so many times that the hon. member for Riverdale cannot in honesty say that I refuse to understand, I do not understand. I can give you 20 references out of *Hansard* where I said exactly the same thing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my only comment is that having said it, as my leader has said, the member falls flat on his face. He does not proceed to take the steps that are required because what he is not saying to the insurance industry is, "Bring into account the income earned on your investment portfolio." This is the one and only way in which the insurance premiums in this province can be reduced.

Mr. Chairman: This is very interesting and I hesitate to interrupt the member but I would ask him, if he will, to stay with this section. I know the subjects are closely allied between the two votes.

An hon. member: As usual, put him on the rails.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I call your attention to the fact that there was tabled in this House a report of a technical committee? The hon. Minister made a statement on it, the hon. member for Downsview made a lengthy statement on it, and surely the hon. member for Riverdale could also comment on this report. Admittedly it goes a bit beyond the limits of the vote but I thought we had understood that this was the time to comment on it.

Mr. Chairman: This may be the only time under these estimates, but it may be included under an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act. It may also be discussed under the office of superintendent of insurance and I did not want the member to have to repeat his message.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we will not repeat ourselves. My remarks are related to this report. I directed them at the hon. member for Downsview because until such time as he is prepared to say to the insurance industry, "The premium income plus your investment income will permit you to earn only such-and-such a percentage," and have the member for Downsview specify that percentage, there will not be a reduction in insurance rates in the province of Ontario.

Returning to this report of the automobile insurance technical committee, which the Minister in his estimates has introduced, you will note that I am only going to comment briefly on one of the recommendations. The other recommendations, by and large, are technical recommendations. But the principal one is the one under which, presumably, this government is going to decide that they are not going to have a basis of liability without fault, and compensation without fault.

The first recommendation is that the addition, in order to have mandatory accident insurance coverage under automobile policies in force in the province of Ontario, will cost the people of the province of Ontario, in the case of a private passenger car, from $8 for the more preferred classes to a maximum of about $57 for those in certain other categories, the overall cost figure being some $10. The Minister himself has immediately said that this will cost the people of the province of Ontario $20 million.

Mr. Singer: He raised it; he said $22 million.

Mr. Renwick: If it is $20 million or $22 million, I would like to know whether or not in arriving at that figure the income on that sum of money was taken into account in determining the average rate of $10 or the spread rate of $8 to $57? I think that we have got to finally get down to the basis of the automobile insurance scheme as it is operated in Ontario.

I would suggest that in no sense is the income earned on the additional $20 million

of premium income which under this recommendation the insurance companies would receive on the Minister's own figures, is in fact taken into account in determining what the additional premium would be.

Mr. Singer: That is a great discovery.

Mr. Renwick: The other factor which I would like to draw to your attention is this range from $8 to $57. The automobile insurance industry has reached the point where it has so many categories or slots into which it places each vehicle depending on its place in the province of Ontario, depending on the vehicle classification and the classification of the driver that it is practically impossible for one person in the province of Ontario to find another person who is in the same category.

There are at the present time, if my information is correct, some 3,000 special categories for persons driving automobiles in the province of Ontario, and I would draw to the attention of the hon. Minister that it is practically impossible under categories such as these to adjust them to the risks inherent in insurance policies. One of the things which this government could do, even within the frramework as they see automobile insurance, is to insist on a basic simplification of the classifications of automobiles, depending on their residence in the province of Ontario, the make and age of the automobile, and the classification into which the driver falls.

It simply means that every time that one attempts to draw a comparison in the automobile insurance business, one is met by the immediate answer, "Well that is in a different category."

Now, Mr. Minister, I would like to turn to the other report, the Linden report. First of all I would like to say that it is an excellent report, and secondly that the basic result and conclusion to be drawn from that report is a very, very simple one. That report basically says one thing. It says that of the financial loss calculated on a very conservative basis to the people who are injured or who lose their lives or who suffer economic loss because of automobile accidents, 37 per cent only is recovered from insurance or similar schemes. Only 37 per cent of the total loss is recovered from insurance. Twenty-three per cent is recovered from other bodies, such as workmen's compensation and the like type of compensation fund, and 40 per cent of the financial loss suffered by people in the province of Ontario is not covered by anybody. It is borne entirely by the people who have been injured in an automobile accident. It is a direct loss to them.

The strange thing about those figures is that we are talking about the coverage within 37 per cent, and it is about time that this government recognized and faced up to the proposition that there must be a collective responsibility among the community of drivers in the province of Ontario to make certain that people who suffer financial loss in automobile accidents are recompensed to 100 per cent. This was the basic recommendation of the select committee, that people should be recompensed for the loss which they suffer in accidents.

The big contribution of the Linden study, so far as I am concerned, the first time it has been clearly shown, is that the private automobile insurance industry is capable of providing recompense only to the extent of 37 per cent. Other bodies provide the additional 23 per cent, whether it is workmen's compensation or the Ontario hospital services commission, or similar payments; and then a total of 40 per cent is left to those who have suffered the injury to bear.

The other strange conclusion that the Linden report brought to our attention and focuses its attention so clearly on, is that in the minor accidents, in the sample which they used, 10,413 accidents which were categorized—suffering of personal injuries in a minor way—those people received 100 per cent return of the loss which they suffered. They received 71 per cent from insurance sources.

In other words, the minor claims were settled, and these were precisely the kind of minor claims which are reflected in the type of letter which is read, year after year, into the record here. It is on the basis of the settlement of those minor claims that the insurance companies then add these surcharges, as my friend from Yorkview has pointed out, and as my leader has pointed out on many occasions.

So let us forget the minor claims. The system apparently works. Seventy-one per cent is recompensed through insurance, 32 per cent is recompensed through other forms of compensation of one kind or another, so that a person in fact receives 100 per cent and in some situations, he really receives slightly more than his economic loss, or his financial loss.

But if we move to the area of serious accidents, we find that of the 1,283 serious accidents which were studied on the sample basis in the county of York, in order to get a true picture of the effect of automobile accidents on the economy of the people who are concerned in those accidents, we find that 45

per cent is recovered from insurance. Only 45 per cent; 28 per cent is recovered from other sources, other payments to which I have referred before, such as workmen's compensation. A total of 27 per cent of that loss is borne entirely by the persons who suffer in the accident; 27 per cent is not covered by anyone.

And then of course, we move to the extreme situation of the fatal cases, and the sample which they used, 174 cases. They found that only two per cent in fatal cases, only two per cent of the financial loss was recovered from insurance sources. Eleven per cent was recovered from non-insurance sources, such as the kind that I have referred to; and a total of 87 per cent of the loss suffered as a consequence of a fatal traffic accident was borne by the persons immediately concerned with the man or the woman who suffered the loss of life.

Until we get, on the basis of the Linden report, the government to look at automobile insurance in perspective, the only perspective in which it can be looked at, that it is now such an economic cost to the people who are involved in it, that we must move to a public scheme, under which there will be collective liability, collective responsibility, to recompense everyone who suffers in an automobile accident, to 100 per cent of the cost of the loss which they suffered.

No one suggests, and this party does not suggest that in some mysterious way this is going to be done at no cost to anyone. All we are saying is that under a public scheme, you can do two things, and you can do two things only. One is, you can eliminate the acquisition cost of business. The administrative costs under a public scheme are demonstratively shown to be about 50 per cent of the cost of an administration under a private scheme. The total administrative cost runs about 15, 16, 17 per cent of the premium dollar, and under the private schemes it runs at about 35, 36, 37, 38 per cent which includes in a large measure the original acquisition cost. That is one place in which the cost of insurance can be reduced.

The only other place is to make certain that when the premiums are paid through a government-operated plan, that the income used from the investment of those premiums, subject to maintaining a proper reserve, is used for one of two purposes: one, to reduce the cost, or two, to enlarge the coverage.

This is what has to be done in this province. If not, it is no longer any good. Indeed, I know that some people until the Linden report were quite prepared to go along with the proposition that the hon. member for Downsview put forward, that we just leave it with private business and a combination of private business and government regulation will produce an effective and efficient automobile insurance scheme in the province. Well, the Linden report dramatically shows that there is no longer any single alternative but a publicly operated insurance scheme in the province of Ontario because this is the only way in which an economic scheme can be operated.

In a society which requires the highest degree of efficiency in the use of our resources, this is the only way in which people are going to have an opportunity to be recouped for the loss which they suffer in automobile accidents. If you accept the principle that a person is entitled to be recouped for his financial loss that he suffers because of an automobile accident, then there is at this time, in the province of Ontario, just no alternative to a public-operated, government-operated insurance scheme.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few further comments with regard to the technical committee's report. I will try to avoid going over ground which has already been covered.

One thing I would like to say is, although I thought that the remarks of the hon. member for Downsview were very cogent as far as they went, and very well expressed, I personally did not go along with his rather wide-ranging attack on the civil servants who produced this report. These gentlemen, as far as I could see from reading the report, merely provided certain information that they were asked by the government to provide. Whether it was proper for the government to ask them is another question. I see nothing wrong with it, frankly, but at any rate they did what they were asked to do and that is surely their duty.

I do not think it is fair to say that they, in effect, tried to overrule what the select committee had recommended. Essentially what the government asked them to do was to cost certain recommendations of the select committee. It did also ask their opinions on one or two of the policy recommendations of the select committee. I am not sure that it was appropriate for the government to ask for those opinions, in view of the fact that a select committee had already expressed itself, a select committee headed by no less a person than the hon. Provincial Treasurer. However, these were not the major points of the report.

The major point was to provide certain cost estimates in relation to recommendations of the committee. That would seem to me to be a quite proper and natural role for public servants to perform. I am not going to get into any argument with them about their cost estimates. I think there are a few places where one could question their methods.

On the other hand, I will say that this is one of the few reports emanating from government sources where we are provided with the basis on which estimates were arrived at. So often the government presents us with estimates which they tell us, Mr. Chairman, some great experts unknown have arrived at, and it is not for us mere mortals to question how they arrived at them. I will say for this technical committee that it set forth in detail the basis on which it arrived at its estimates. And in these things, who is to know for sure? You make estimates on the best basis you can. It seems to me that that is what the committee did. They could be out in their estimates; I think perhaps if there was an error to begin with in their samples, that error might be multiplied in some of the projections they did from the samples. However, who is really to say?

The substance of what the committee proposed was that there would be a fairly substantial cost in implementing what I suppose was the most important of the recommendations of the select committee, namely, that certain basic insurance should be provided regardless of fault. The government has used the estimates that the committee has arrived at — and this is not the responsibility of the technical committee at all— as an excuse for in effect repudiating the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who was the head of a committee that produced a report recommending that certain insurance should be made available regardless of fault.

I think this is a most regrettable decision on the part of the government. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer was right when he was chairman of the committee, and he is wrong now that he has got on his hat as Provincial Treasurer. He must have participated in this decision. He certainly has to share responsibility for it, so he has said no to himself.

Mr. Singer: The decision must have been made the day he was away.

Mr. Bryden: It is a rather curious position for a Cabinet Minister to find himself in, but that is precisely the position he is in. He was a Minister at the time the committee made its recommendation. He is still a Minister, so he is now saying that James Allan, in the capacity of the chairman of the committee, is being turned down by James Allan, as Treasurer of the province, and as a member of the Cabinet responsible with all his colleagues for the policy announcement that was made this afternoon.

The excuse that is being used is that this proposal, if implemented, would cost a substantial amount of money. Really, I do not think the cost is so fearful as the government seems to think. It would be a substantial cost even assuming the figures here are quite accurate but, Mr. Chairman, I think the basic point we have to consider, even while certainly making due allowance for cost, is whether or not this is needed, and I submit to the government that it is clearly needed.

I will go a little further, and say that we should go further than anything the government or the Liberal Party has contemplated. I do not think there is any secret as to what I have in mind along that line. But if we are going to continue with the inefficient, hit-and-miss system of insurance that we now have, then surely the least we should do is provide that certain basic compensation will be made available, regardless of fault.

We can no longer look upon the question of automobile accidents as merely a matter between two adversaries. Two people are seriously injured, they incur substantial medical bills, they incur loss of income, and we have a great long battle in the courts—or it could end up in the courts and that may go on for years—as to which of the two was at fault. As has been pointed out dozens of times by eminent jurists, among others, it is impossible to determine who was at fault in the overwhelming majority of cases—not just in a few cases, in the overwhelming majority of cases.

But even if we had Solomon sitting in the high court of Ontario, able to decide all these things with perfect justice, we still face the fact that two men are badly hurt. They are in need. They have lost income. Their families are in need. Are we going to determine what compensation they get purely on the basis that, "You were at fault; you were, shall we say, 100 per cent at fault; you get nothing. It does not matter about your human needs, you get nothing." What kind of a system is that? This is what we continue with in the field of automobile insurance.

Automobile accidents, Mr. Chairman, are a social problem. They are not a matter

simply of determining questions as between two adversaries. We cannot look on them in that light any longer. In fact, the hon. Minister of Health stated during his estimates, I think quite rightly, that they are a public health problem. The injuring and killing of people on the highways is a matter with which public health authorities have to concern themselves. This surely is a recognition on his part at least, that they are a social problem. They cannot be regarded as only a matter of the rights and wrongs between two individuals.

Therefore, I suggest to the government, Mr. Chairman, that it should no longer refuse to give even minimum recognition to that problem, by refusing to accept the principle of compensation regardless of fault according to at least a certain minimum scale.

It is rather interesting to review just what happened in this area. We had a select committee on automobile insurance—I was not on the committee, my friend from Hamilton East was—but as I recall it, it sat for a matter of two or three years off and on.

Mr. Singer: Three years.

Mr. Bryden: Three years. It became increasingly obvious, as the hearings of the committee proceeded, that the old unsatisfied judgment fund and the system of private insurance available were totally unsatisfactory. The private companies initially took the position that they wanted no change, that everything was fine. They initially were opposed to the principle of compensation without regard to fault. They were taking the typical line of the insurance industry: "Keep the camel's head out of the tent; do not let us get any of these socialist principles," as they are called, "into the arena because the first thing we know, the whole thing will be handled in a logical way, that is it will become a public plan."

This was originally the position of the insurance companies, but the inadequacy as it then existed became more and more obvious. The pressure began to develop more and more, and finally, in the concluding period of the committee's hearings, the insurance companies, or most of them, switched their position on the point of compensation without regard to fault, and they came back to the committee and said, "We are in favour of this idea, we think it is a good idea, and here is how you can do it." So all of the committee went along, good free enterprisers as most of them were, since the insurance boys said it was okay to be sensible on this particular point. Even the most devoted supporters of free enterprise went along.

Then, of course, the committee presented its report and the matter died down as a matter of public interest, as these things do. The interest in them rises and falls until gradually they disappear into the background as a public issue. Then we had the insurance industry came back again, changing its tack and moving in to kill the principle that it had previously said in public it was ready to go along with.

So, we have the thing costed. There is absolutely nothing in that report to justify any suggestion that we should not proceed with the recommendation of the committee on the matter of compensation without regard to fault. There is absolutely nothing in that at all, but the insurance companies are now against it. The heat is off, so they switched their position and the government, getting its cue as usual from the insurance companies, has also switched its position. It has misused a report prepared by a group of our more eminent civil servants on essentially technical matters as its excuse for ditching the recommendation of the committee on this point.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, the government has now refused to carry out what was perhaps the most important—well, there were two; I should not say the most important, there were two important recommendations in the report of the select committee. One of them, the government did carry out essentially; this one it refuses to carry out, after stalling for a couple of years. The situation we have is that, at best, the government is willing to carry out only half of a report which, in itself, was not an adequate answer to the problem. The report itself was, at best, only half an answer to the problem. So the government has carried out half of half an answer to the problem.

The cost figures, no doubt, should give us some reason to consider our position. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that they should not lead us to refuse to do what is clearly needed. They should lead us instead to do what is clearly needed in the most economical way possible. We can no longer afford the luxury —and that is what it is—of an inefficient system of providing the public with protection against the dangers inherent in the use of the automobile. We can no longer afford that.

It is always curious how our friends in the Liberal ranks have apparently been prepared to discuss the proposition that on medical care insurance, a public, universal programme is the answer, but when we come to the

field of automobile insurance—which is surely equally important in this modern society—that same principle is a vicious, socialist doctrine. I will agree that it is a socialist doctrine, but it is not a vicious doctrine; it is a beneficial doctrine as socialist doctrines are.

The socialist doctrine applied to hospital insurance we long ago discovered in this province was the best way of handling the problem; the government refuses to accept the same logic in medical care insurance. The Liberals claim that they have now accepted it although it is only a few years ago that the present leader of the Liberal Party stood up in the House and said of myself and other members of this party, that we were "doctrinaire Marxists" because we were quite satisfied that the only way to deal with medical care insurance was through a public, universal plan. However, they have now seen the light on that—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to say that if the hon. member for Woodbine would be a little more thorough in his remarks, he would recognize that I said that surely they would look at a committee, which had been advocated, to see if there were alternative approaches that could be taken to the problem of complete medical coverage.

Mr. Chairman: I think that both members will agree that neither one is in order at this time.

Mr. Bryden: I may say, Mr. Chairman, that when I have studied a matter in considerable detail, I do not need a committee to tell me what the right answer is. The hon. leader of the Opposition did and finally got the right answer on Medicare from Mr. Justice Hall. Now I wish we could get him a committee that would give him an answer on automobile insurance. Some people are able to draw their own conclusions with their own mind, but the leader of the Opposition apparently needs a committee to tell him what is the right answer.

However, I will not press that point, Mr. Chairman. Other hon. members have already emphasized it. I would like to stress, nevertheless, that we have got to find—and I think this technical committee report indicates that—the most efficient methods possible of providing protection to the public.

Our present combination of private insurance, and the motor vehicle accident claims fund is not an efficient way of providing protection. For one thing the motor vehicle accident claims fund is far from providing protection and it really imposes most severe penalities on people who undoubtedly were unwise in not buying insurance from a private company. For their lack of wisdom, some people may be in a position where for the rest of their lives they will never be able to accumulate any property of any kind whatever. They will have a debt hanging over them until they go to their graves.

This is the sort of situation that we create in the law of the province. It is true that the Deputy Minister of Transport—I think he does so quite rightly—sends out a most ominous letter to people who pay him $20, pointing out to them the serious consequences of their actions, but even in the face of that, some people do not understand that type of letter very well. It is very well expressed for an educated middle-class person, but there are some people with less education to whom it is by no means clear. At any rate even if it is clear, and the man stupidly decides not to go voluntarily, with The Department of Transport with a pitchfork behind him, to a private insurance company to buy insurance—say he decides to do that and takes that chance—why should we impose this vindictive penalty upon him? If his gamble turns out wrong, for the rest of his life he will be unable to acquire any property, his income will be attached and he will never be able to drive a car.

What sort of a system is that? Is that what the government regards as the virtue of free enterprise—that any individual, notwithstanding his own stupidity, should be put in that sort of position? Surely, the answer is to have a universal plan that automatically covers everyone. When motorists buy their licence they do not get them unless they pay a sufficient amount to cover themselves and the public. As the hon. Minister of Labour pointed out, it is the public we are concerned about in the first instance.

Surely this is the way to do it. We can then squeeze out of the cost a lot of unnecessary selling costs, which just add to deficiencies. I do not see any point in featherbedding in the insurance industry any more than I see any point in it in the railway industry. That is all that is involved in the maintenance of a large core of agents to sell insurance which should not have to be sold. It should be automatically available and every person should be required to buy it when he purchases his licence.

That is not a useful social function at all. These insurance agents are intelligent men, they can find lots of other sources of income. In fact, notwithstanding the growth of public insurance plans, and it has been quite substantial in the last 20 years, the insurance business is booming as never before, so I do not think we need to worry too much about the independent agents. They will find lots of business even though we accept our responsibilities and move ahead into a logical and sensible way of dealing with auto insurance. This is one necessary step to keep costs of insurance down.

I might say that there is another feature that is sometimes not mentioned that would help to reduce costs under a public plan, and that is the reduction in the amount that has to be paid out for legal costs. As long as this is essentially a matter of two adversaries, they both have to have their lawyers, and sometimes they even have to go to court. Costs pile up and have to be paid ultimately out of the insurance premiums of the motorists.

The experience in Saskatchewan certainly proved that litigation was reduced to practically nothing under the public plan. This is another way in which we can save costs. I would say that with the way costs are spiralling, we have to look at methods of saving costs for the motorists. This is particularly important when we realize that at the same time we also give more adequate protection to the public than the public now receives under any type of either private or public plan that is now in effect in this province.

One last point, Mr. Chairman, which is relevant I think to the accident claims fund and also to the whole question of insurance: If we are concerned about costs, of insurance and the way they are skyrocketing at the present time, we have to get back to this question of the design of vehicles. I would think that one of the major factors in the cost of insurance at the present time is the design of the vehicle; it is almost impossible to have an inexpensive accident nowadays. If you get the slightest little dent on the side of your car—the whole thing caves in. To repair a dent or a scratch you have to repair most of your car. You have to have great long sections done all over again.

I got a little scratch on the side of my car; it was not too bad and I asked them how much it would cost to fix it. The repair man said: "I would not even tell you how much it would cost to fix it, I would suggest you get some paint and touch it up a little bit. You can do that for $2 or $3 and at least prevent it from rusting, but for us to repair this scratch would cost you a small fortune."

This is one major factor that is inflating the cost of insurance and claims under the accident claims fund. I think it is time the automobile manufacturing industry, in developing all its fancy designs of cars, started to think about the poor consumer who has to drive the car, maintain it and if he gets into an accident as he does from time to time must foot the bill either directly or indirectly.

It is time we started to consider the growing costs of insurance. This technical committee's report brought to our attention the cost factor involved in one essential phase of insurance protection which is not provided now in this province but really ought to be. I think the committee is to be commended for having given us this information. It is unfortunate the government allows the cost to scare it away from what is clearly a necessary measure. But I think the government should let that same cost consideration operate on its own reason. If it does, it will see the clear logic in a public plan that will at least squeeze all the water out of insurance costs, plus some sort of a programme with the manufacturers to have vehicles built in a way that will make them less expensive to repair.

Vote 2106 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might correct a few statements that were made in the House.

Mr. Chairman: The vote is carried, and this completes the estimates of The Department of Transport.

The Department of the Provincial Treasurer, page 128.

ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, it is again my privilege to present to hon. members the estimate of The Treasury Department. With their permission, I will, in these opening remarks, continue my previous practice of expressing large amounts in rounded figures.

The gross ordinary expenditure for 1966-1967 is forecast at $200 million, consisting of $35.2 million in departmental expenses and $164.8 million for expenditure in connection with the public debt. This is an increase over the estimate for 1965-66 of $23.3 million, of which $5.2 million is for departmental

expenses and $18.1 million is for public debt expenditure.

The above amounts are gross payments on ordinary account and thus do not represent the net cost to the government. Offsetting these gross payments for 1966-67 are $1 million in reimbursement of expenditures by the province of Ontario savings office and $45.6 million consisting mainly of interest on moneys loaned, advanced or invested by the province. Taking into account these applications of revenue to expenditure, the net ordinary expenditure is forecast for 1966-67 at $153.4 million. This is an increase of $11.4 million over the estimates for 1965-1966, of which $5.2 million is for departmental expenses and $6.2 million is for net expenditure on the public debt.

Members will have noticed that the estimates for The Treasury Department are presented this year in greater detail, which is in line with the recommendations of the public accounts committee. This expansion of detail has been achieved by providing a separate vote for the Treasury board division, and by showing, by branch, the purposes to which the funds requested for each main division of the department will be put. In addition, details are provided of interest and other charges on the public debt.

Before making some comments on matters which I trust will be of general interest to hon. members, let me retrace my steps to the departmental expenses which I stated as amounting to $35.2 million. This sum includes items which would be more properly described as expenditures made on behalf of the government as a whole. I refer to the government's contributions to the public service superannuation fund, to the legislative assembly retirement allowances account, to the Canada pension plan and towards the employee group insurance plan. By excluding these, we ascertain that the estimated cost of running the department reduces from $35.2 million to $11 million.

I now propose to make some comments on the estimates for ordinary expenditure, in the order in which they appear in the estimates.

Under "general administration," we find the appropriation for "expenses for special studies." The main item being provided for in this item is the Ontario committee on taxation, whose report, together with that of the federal government's Royal commission on taxation, we look forward to receiving this year.

Under "grants," we note particularly the marked increase in the grant to the Canadian standard bred horse society, which grant now is estimated at 150 per cent of the grant to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society. This reflects the growing popularity of harness racing and the widespread interest in breeding and racing these horses. Even with the increase proposed in these grants they represent only 1⅔ per cent of the estimated revenue from the racetracks tax.

The past year has seen the completion of a number of major studies by the organization and methods services branch of the Treasury board division. One study resulted in the formulation and adoption of an integrated plan for the systematic development of electronic or automated data processing facilities for the government service as a whole. We feel that this is essential if the best possible use is to be made of these modern administrative tools. As a result of our considerations, a director of automatic data processing standards was appointed. It is his function to advise Treasury board, and to assist all departments, on matters having direct bearing on the use of computers and similar facilities in the government service.

The Treasury board also produced the first volume of a government manual of administration, thereby providing a further development of effective and standardized procedures.

The accounts division estimates for this year reflect two significant increases. These are, first, an increase of $1.35 million in the government contribution to the employee group insurance plan. This is due to the plan being in effect for the entire fiscal year 1966-67 in comparison with a half-year's activity during the year just finished. The estimated expenditure for 1966-67 has also taken into consideration direct participation by public servants to the extent of 25 per cent of the basic life insurance premiums and approximately 35 per cent of the basic surgical-medical premiums. Secondly, in order to report on the comparative increased cost of the government for contributions made to pension plans, it is necessary to consolidate the government contribution to the Canada pension plan and to the public service superannuation fund. The estimated increase over the past year is $2,542.00. Included in this increase is the cost to the province of an estimated $700,000 for the government's matching contribution to the Canada pension plan for employees who are hired on a casual basis. The balance represents increased matching contributions on behalf of classified staff.

Turning to the finance division, we have a new vote which draws together those

elements of expenditure associated with the administration of the province's capital financing and cash management. This is immediately followed by the statutory appropriation for public debt.

Under "public debt" will be found one of the matters to which I referred earlier—that is, the details now shown in the estimates of the $164. million included as ordinary expenditure in public debt. The provision of $42 million for sinking fund continues the policy established in 1962.

With respect to the provision for interest on securities, the amount of $69.7 million for interest on securities issued for provincial account include those issued under The Municipal Works Assistance Act and to the Canada pension plan investment fund.

The provision of $15 million for interest on securities issued for the hydro-electric power commission includes interest on unsecured advances to that commission, as well as interest on securities issued for that commission in the New York market. This amount of $15 million is of course fully recoverable from Hydro by the province.

As the hon. members are aware, the teachers' superannuation commission invests its funds in Ontario securities and the item of $17.5 million reflects the interest thereon. The amount of these securities at this date is $376.2 million.

The amount of $3.1 million shown as 'interest on savings office deposits" represents the interest on the sums deposited by the savings office in the consolidated revenue fund—not the interest allowed by the savings office to its depositors.

The final item of $3 million for "other" includes a number of items, such as interest on special funds, exchange, administration of loans, and so on.

During the past year, my officials have met on several occasions with officials of the federal government and of the other provinces in the course of preparation of revenue and expenditure studies for the federal-provincial tax structure committee. This work will be proceeding apace during the next year. The report of the Ontario committee on taxation, which as I mentioned earlier is expected this year, will require careful study by the co-ordinating committee of financial and economic advisers, assisted by a number of our officials.

In the revenue division, important benefits are already noticeable from reorganization of two of the larger branches. Studies of other facets of the work in this division are being made for the purpose of improving operations. Training of staff with a view to making better use of personnel and of increasing career prospects are continuing at an accelerating pace with satisfying results

The transfer of certain operations of the retail sales tax and corporations tax branches to the computer, which is planned to be implemented over a period of time, is progressing and satisfactory improvements, as well as a more efficient operation, have been developed.

In the data processing branch, development of systems on the computer continues. These involve, not only payroll and similar operations, but applications affecting welfare allowances, retail sales tax and corporations tax. This year, for the first time, the annual returns made by companies to the Provincial Secretary will be handled in part of the Treasury computer.

The estimates of capital disbursements, all of which are statutory items, have been clearly separated this year to show those which represent loans and advances and those which are classified as special funds.

Amongst the loans and advances, special note should be made of the estimated advances to the Ontario universities capital aid corporation from the consolidated revenue fund. These funds will in turn be used by that corporation to purchase university debentures. Advances will also be required for the Ontario education capital aid corporation for the purpose, as set forth in Bill 77, of purchasing debentures issued for school board undertakings. These advances, however, could not be shown in the estimates as establishment of the corporation required legislative enactment. The hon. members will recall that the funds to be used in the manner indicated by the two corporations represent funds available to the province from the Canada pension plan.

Under the heading of "special funds," members will note the Ontario hospital services commission special account. In 1964-65, a portion of the $50 million provided for subsidization of the hospital insurance plan was set aside in special funds. In 1965-66 the same action occurs again, while this year, as this item in the estimates indicates, payments will be made out of this special account to the hospital insurance plan in order that premiums may remain unchanged—as I indicated in my 1965 Budget statement.

Under the same heading of special funds will be noted an estimated disbursement of $4.1 million to the Ontario municipal em-

ployees' retirement fund. This disbursement represents funds received in the last few months of 1965-66 for temporary custody and which are to be disbursed in 1966-67 when invested in provincial debentures for that fund.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my opening remarks on the estimates for The Treasury Department. I will be happy to answer any questions relating thereto.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notices of motion Nos. 21 and 25. No. 21 by Mr. R. M. Whicher:

> Resolved: That a fund be established by the province for the payment of compensation to the victims of crimes of violence, or their dependants, to be administered by a board reporting regularly to this House.

And notice of motion No. 25 by Mr. N. Davidson:

> Resolved: That this government consider establishing a fund out of which payments may be made to compensate victims of crimes of violence, or their dependants, to be administered by a board constituted to hear applications and make awards for compensation.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): I move, seconded by the hon. member for Wentworth East, resolution No. 25 standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I move seconded by the hon member for Brant, resolution No. 21, standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Speaker, over the years we have been paying more and more attention to the criminal. Penal reform and the rehabilitation of the criminal have been a constant concern, and I do not disagree with this at all. However, a more tragic figure, the victim of the criminal, has been pushed into the background. Little or no concern has been given him. He is the one who is referred to as having been savagely attacked or brutally beaten, or suffering the loss of an eye, or being disfigured. We are shocked at the treatment he receives but we do nothing to compensate him for the agony he has suffered nor to compensate him for expenses and losses. Still less concern is given to the families or dependants of the victim.

If a policeman calls on a citizen for assistance, that citizen must respond or he is liable to imprisonment for two years. Yet we neglect to compensate him for any loss or injury he may suffer as a result of aiding the law—unless the municipality passes a special by-law.

We read many times of cases where people stood by while a policeman in the pursuit of his duties was beaten up and we think, my God, we are returning to the law of the jungle. But we must examine what happens to the good citizen who springs to the aid of the law.

I have personal knowledge of a case in a small town near Hamilton where a policeman was removing drunken persons from a hotel premises. They turned on him on the street and he was being beaten. He was certainly in no position to look around and call on anyone to assist him but this bystander voluntarily sprang to his aid and in the course of the fight he was injured. In addition to the expected bruises and cuts, he suffered a broken leg. He was a plumber by trade and in business for himself. As a result of being a good citizen, he was unable to operate his business for a lengthy period of time, many of his jobs were cancelled because his customers couldn't wait a long period for such a vital service. In addition to a considerable loss of business and a complete loss of income during this period, he had to pay for his medical and other related expenses. I wonder what his reaction would be again under similar circumstances. Well, he is a good citizen and perhaps he would do the same thing again.

Just recently John Weatherup, a 36-year-old Toronto man, was savagely beaten for going to the rescue of a girl. His face was damaged to the extent that plastic surgery was required, he lost the sight of one eye and his sense of taste and smell and he now suffers nervous disorders. He is unable to return to his regular occupation of truck driver and has been unable to continue in

the employment he had taken as a bartender, a job that paid some $30 or $35 a week less than his normal occupation. Indeed, the last I heard, he does not even have that income.

How will he raise his 13-year-old son? Indeed what attitude will that boy have toward a society that failed to look after the good citizen who defended a girl from her molesters?

Canada is not subject to scenes of running gun battles but it could happen that a stray bullet from such an event might injure or kill an unfortunate person who happened on the scene of a robbery, for instance, at the wrong time. What happens to him and his dependants?

Well, I'll tell you what happens. After you have exhausted all your resources to pay your own medical expenses and to maintain yourself and family, you appeal to public welfare for assistance. When you're stripped of your savings, you go on welfare, all through no fault of your own, just simply because you had the misfortune to be on the scene at the wrong time.

It is not a matter of choice, of course, but if it were you would be better advised to be injured by an automobile. At least you could claim against the motor vehicle claims accident fund.

Now why should this condition exist? There is really no need that it should. Other governments have seen fit to protect their citizens from the results of crimes of violence.

On January 1, 1964, an Act called The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1963 came into force in New Zealand, under which a tribunal was established to award compensation to persons injured or killed as a result of certain specified offences. In March of 1964, Great Britain enacted compensation for victims of crimes of violence.

In July, 1965, the state of California added a new section to their welfare and institution code to provide the payment of aid upon application, to the family of any person killed and to the victim and family, if any, of any person incapacitated as the result of a crime of violence.

In 1959, a memorandum on "Penal Practice in a Changing Society" was presented to Great Britain's Parliament and it suggested that any fundamental re-examination of penal methods must concern itself not only with the obligations of society and the offender to one another, but also with the obligations of both to the victim. It referred also to the view of the late Miss Margery Fry that the obligation to the victim of crime rests primarily on the society which has failed to protect him against crime and can alone effectively compensate him. Miss Fry proposed, in particular, a scheme for the payment of compensation to those who suffered personal violence.

As a result of this memorandum, the government set up a committee to examine this proposal in detail and, if the principle was accepted, to devise a plan to provide this protection. The report of that committee makes very interesting reading and resulted in the enactment of legislation in 1964.

If society fails to protect citizens against crimes of violence, society has the moral obligation to compensate adequately the victims of such crimes and their dependants.

Failure to protect society is no criticism of our law enforcement agencies. Obviously, they cannot provide around-the-clock protection for each and every person. Yet, a person who is a victim of a brutal beating, which may disable him for life, has no recourse to any compensation.

In a society which has become very compensation- and insurance-conscious, it is curious that no move has been made to compensate victims of crime. The victim of a crime of violence is not really repaid just because the offender has been punished by society by loss of liberty or life. He has been avenged but has not been compensated. The offender has been punished but the misfortune of the victim has not been eased. Once the offender has received his sentence, society tends to be more concerned with reforming him than they are with easing the lot of his victim. Now do not misunderstand me; I believe we must make every effort to reform the criminal. I am not opposed to this, but in so doing we must not neglect his victim and his victim's dependants.

It is for this reason that I urge hon. members of this Legislature to give their support to this resolution.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have my name associated with those interested in this matter. It is a different resolution, but nevertheless, the resolution that was put forth by the hon. member for Hamilton East and my own are very similar and I support him in everything that he has said.

Many times in the past, various hon. members of this Legislature and also for that matter, hon. members of the government, have spoken about the problem facing victims of crimes of violence. Without exception to my knowledge, there has been a feeling of sympathy towards those unfortunate citizens, who through no fault of their

own, have been maimed, in many instances seriously, either mentally or physically, or on the other hand, killed, in which instance the families suffer both through the mental anguish of a loved one departed and through the loss of the financial income earned by the victim.

Most unfortunately, the sympathy given in this chamber does not buy bread and butter for the dependants left behind. Neither does it pay the doctors' bills, hospital bills, and in some instances, funeral expenses, and the many other things too numerous to mention, that cost money.

It is not my intention today, to take up too much time. I will try to hit the nail on the head in just a few minutes.

When one thinks of victims of crimes of violence, there is a tendency to think maybe of a bank robber, who shoots an innocent bystander. Well, what about the rape case of a young woman, or for that matter, young children? What about the mental anguish that these victims suffer, which in many instances require psychiatric care, and in fact, many times causes a mental breakdown that requires, perhaps, even years of treatment. This treatment, this loss of life, this loss of income, costs money, money that is lost through no fault of the victim.

It is within the power of this government to look after these unfortunate people, at least financially and most unfortunate they are. Hundreds of cases can be quoted over the years. There are dozens each year. In the province of Ontario today, a criminal can shoot an innocent bystander in a hold-up, and kill another in his get-away automobile. In both instances, the victim unfortunately is dead. But the family of the man killed by the automobile could collect up to $35,000 from the motor vehicle accident claim fund; yet the family of the man shot would not collect a penny.

The same story could be told of the victims who are only hurt and not killed. Injuries, Mr. Speaker, are often more expensive than death itself.

In Saskatchewan some time ago, a mentally ill person escaped from an institution, got into a stranger's car, forced him to drive a distance, then shot him and stole the car. Question, what happens in an instance such as this to the wife and young family? Welfare? Relief? Perhaps. Through no fault of the family.

In this day of unemployment insurance, a great deal of which is subsidized by the state, of hospital insurance, two-thirds of which premiums come from the general tax rate, of medical insurance, much of which comes from taxes, of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of education benefits, much of which comes from general taxes, surely there is some government body that would help to look after the family of the man, an innocent bystander who was shot in armed robbery last year. As far as his family is concerned, at least financially, it is too bad that the robber did not kill him in the get-away car. At least his family would have been entitled to attempt to get a little financial help from a government agency.

In this instance, there was no chance. Dozens of such cases can be obtained from our records of court cases.

Another example is that of a clerk for a small firm, who was pistol-whipped and put in the hospital for months, because he tried to defend the payroll that he was carrying.

Now, what about the small firm that lost the payroll too? In this case it could ill afford the loss.

Bank robbers and sex assailants and people who live by violence are poor prospects for civil action. Just as the majority of people who have no car insurance and are at fault in automobile accidents are poor prospects to sue in court. The only difference, of course, is that the victim of road accidents are looked after up to $35,000 by the province. Victims as described in this resolution get nothing.

On behalf of those future victims, any one of which could be you or me, or any member of our families, I ask the government to accept this resolution. Crime, Mr. Speaker, knows no boundaries.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Speaker, after reading resolutions 21 and 25, I feel that anyone speaking against these resolutions would be like speaking against motherhood. No doubt resolution 25 has been placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Hamilton East, as he has indicated, because of injuries caused to people in the Hamilton area who have gone to the aid of law enforcement officers and police, in apprehending law-breakers.

There have been numerous recommendations by law associations in this province requesting legislation to compensate victims of violence as the result of doing what any responsible citizen should do, and indeed is required to do, that is, help prevent crimes and to apprehend the criminal.

Usually this situation arises when a police officer is on the scene, but is outnumbered, or otherwise needs help. Certainly in such

a situation, a citizen should be rewarded and compensated, preferably at the municipal level, and a special fund should be set up so that such high acts of citizenship be encouraged. This would be a situation, Mr. Speaker, where I would assume provincial grants, or some form of provincial subsidy, would be necessary.

However, the two resolutions before this House today are very broad in their wording and application. They say in fact, that a fund be established, and I assume that as it is not a form of insurance, the money for such a fund would come out of the general revenue, and therefore would be a general charge on the taxpayers of the province.

Then we would have to decide what is a crime of violence, and also when a person would be considered a victim of such a crime. If some hon. member of this House beat up his mother-in-law, for example, in a violent fit of temper and the mother-in-law suffered substantial injury, would she be covered? Furthermore, would the particular member of this House write a letter to the department administrating this fund and ask that consideration be given to this poor, unfortunate woman, or would the hon. member help fill out a form whereby she would apply for compensation because of her injuries resulting from a momentary lapse of consideration by this member? How would her injuries be assessed? Would a government-appointed doctor call on this woman as a result of the complaint and if the event occurred in eastern Ontario or western Ontario—or even in Halton—would he be the local doctor appointed by the government? Would the Crown attorney, or some member of his department, or of the local police department also be in attendance, with the doctor, when these injuries are assessed and treated?

Further, if during the course of the investigation, the hon. member in an effort to explain the incident and try to minimize his culpability, and with an eye on his political future or professional status, suggests that it was the good lady's own fault; "She brought it on herself; she nagged and criticized me, and I had no alternative but to let her have it!"

Now after having had a preliminary report from the local doctor on the scene and from some member of the local constabulary, we would have to wait until the hon. member's victim remained in hospital for a period necessary to treat the injuries and if it was found necessary to call in a chiropractor, a dental surgeon, a physiotherapist or a psychiatrist, the cost of such treatment and care would also have to be assessed and included in the victim's application.

Mr. Whicher: He is calling a chiropractor—

Mr. Kerr: After tonight it may be different.

This, of course, would mean that it would possibly require added effort on the part of the hon. member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hon. members who have placed these resolutions on the order paper, were possibly not considering this type of situation that I have just outlined. They were probably considering, for the most part, a situation where someone is injured as a result of being on the scene during the commission of some recognizable crime, such as robbery with violence, rape, child beating, and the like. The fact that the words "crime" or "crimes" are included in both resolutions would mean that the offender in such a situation would have to be apprehended and convicted.

In other words, this resolution would not apply to the type of civil wrong where someone would be involved in a scuffle or injured as the result of an argument over some difference of opinion, and we also assume that it would not apply to someone injured by an automobile, although the driver may be subsequently convicted of a driving offence under the Criminal Code. It could well apply in a situation where a person driving an automobile is charged, for example, with attempted murder as a result of intentionally trying to run down and injure the victim.

We have certain facilities, Mr. Speaker, and social legislation in this province which will aid people injured by crimes of violence, as well as any other type of injury or sickness. I am referring, of course, to our hospital insurance scheme, to Medicare and to legal care. The victim's stay in the hospital would be covered and also attendance by a physician would be covered. There are psychiatrists now in the employ of the provincial government who may be called to aid the victim, if necessary. The physiotherapist and possibly the dental surgeon would also be included, but as yet, not the chiropractor.

If a lawyer is required, this will now be looked after as well. If the crime was so violent, such as rape, that the victim is mentally affected, we would hope that Ontario Hospitals and staff psychiatrists could be of benefit. Whether or not private insurance would be available for situations as set out in these resolutions is beyond my

knowledge at the present time. The field of liability, health and accident insurance is an ever-widening one.

The hon. member for Bruce compared the situation with automobile insurance. There is some difference in this analogy in that violence, of course, is not always present, nor is there always a criminal act involved. The very nature of the automobile and its great use in this province requires government supervision and laws if for nothing else than the number of injuries which do occur and the number of types of injuries.

Some consideration, Mr. Speaker, should also be given to the situation where there are a number of people involved in a scuffle or some type of gang warfare, where one or two are accused and convicted of assault. I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, for example, of that area of Toronto where the young intelligentsia, the clean-cut leaders of tomorrow frequent—Yorkville village—would this be considered a crime of violence? Would the person who in some way was injured in this situation be compensated, although he or she may be carrying a weapon of some type which was not used? Or would the person eligible for compensation be just an innocent victim?

The degree of innocence may be important, as well as the degree of violence, or the seriousness of the offence. Most crimes are committed without witnesses. Therefore, establishing the facts may be a problem and the amount of injuries attributed to the particular crime itself may also be a problem. The word of the victim would have to be accepted, unless the culprit happens to be apprehended and corroborates the victim's claim, which would be very doubtful.

Under workmen's compensation, for example, when an employee is injured on the job there is usually a witness and the accident is reported immediately. The immediate evidence of the injury is usually apparent in some way or another and sometimes the employee is treated at the scene, and eventually an accurate estimation of the injury can be made. Workmen's compensation, as hon. members know, is a form of insurance and contributory.

Mr. Speaker, having said this, I believe that under certain circumstances, compensation for victims of a crime and their dependants could work, particularly where death occurs or prolonged hospitalization and treatment is necessary. It would mean still another board or agency and a further proliferation of bureaucracy, but possibly in a violent society, it is an acceptable form of social legislation. Certainly the kind of legislation necessary would require at least another select committee to ponder.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in recommending compensation for persons injured as a result of trying to prevent a crime or apprehend a criminal.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to each of these resolutions, I would like to suggest to the House that the time has come when a study could very well be made along the lines of the study which was made on compensation for victims of automobile accidents to determine what the cost would be to the province of Ontario for carrying out the provisions of the intent of these resolutions.

The only basic information which happens to come to hand at the present time is the report for 1965 of the Metropolitan Toronto police that shows that during that year 24 persons were killed by criminal acts; 3,092 persons were injured by criminal acts and $6,146,118 worth of property was stolen.

Now, using and applying to the persons who were killed a relatively arbitrary figure based on a rough calculation of the figure which is a result of the automobile compensation study of $30,000 to cover the economic loss to the family and dependants of a person killed in an automobile accident, using the figure of $30,000 and with 24 persons killed in Metropolitan Toronto, we would have a total charge of about $750,000.

Using again, the same very rough and, I am certain, inadequate figure of $1,000 for the compensation to be paid to each person who is injured by a criminal act, we would have 3,000 persons injured and compensation of $1,000 per person would make a total of $3 million; so for those two items we would have a total economic loss of $3,750,000.

If we add to that the value of the property stolen, if it is intended to provide some restitution for property lost, we would have to add another $6 million, which would make an outside figure of about $10 million for the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious, of course, that a substantial part of the property which is stolen in the metropolitan area is either recovered by the police or is covered by insurance carried by the person from whom the property is stolen, so I do not think that in any sense the $6 million figure for a charge for the purpose of providing such a

a fund is at all realistic. Indeed, there may not be a very great charge but let us assume for the moment that of the $6 million worth of property which was stolen that $5 million of it was either recovered or covered by insurance costs, we would then have a net charge to such a fund, if it is intended to provide for the restitution of property of about $1 million.

For the persons who are killed and for the persons who are injured, we either would use, without a means test, figures substantially along those which I have indicated, which would mean a $3 million charge to the fund for those who are injured and a $750,000 charge to the fund for the dependants of those who were killed; making a total of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $4 million to $5 million as the fund which would be required—if there were no means test to determine the amount of compensation to which a victim of crime or his dependants would be entitled to receive. However, I would think that that figure in itself is not a realistic figure because undoubtedly whether or not a compensation fund is established to the extent that either the victim himself, because of disability, or his dependants, because of the disablement of the head of the family or the loss of life of the head of the family, to the extent that those persons would become a charge on public welfare, there would be a substantial cost to the province in any event.

I realize that there is no point in speculating on what that amount might be, but this would, in my view, undoubtedly reduce the fund which would be required, from something in the neighbourhood of $5 million, if one looks at it realistically, to perhaps $2.5 million to $3 million for the metropolitan area. However, Mr. Speaker, I think in this particular area it would be proper to take into account the actual means of the persons, or the estate of the person if the person was killed, which was available to support his family or which was available to support himself if he were disabled. I think we would find if a study were carried out that a very substantial amount of the fund which would be required would in fact be covered by life insurance or accident insurance of one kind or another.

And some other element — a substantial element, I would suggest—of hospital charges and of medical services charges would be, at the present time, covered one way or another either under the OMSIP plan or under group medical coverage schemes throughout the province.

There is no point in pursuing as you can see the elements which would go into the financial costs of the province of such a fund without a study. I think my only purpose in speaking in this debate would be to ask that the time has come when the Attorney General might well commission a study in conjunction with the Osgoode Hall law school, or some other suitable law school and The Department of Public Welfare, or some other suitable welfare facility, to study and analyze in the metropolitan area, or in some other selected area throughout the province exactly what the elements would be that would require to be compensated by such a fund, if it were established by the province, and to find out whether or not it would be feasible to establish such a fund on a capital endowment basis to provide that the income from that fund, if segregated from other provincial moneys, would be used for the purpose of compensating victims of crime.

Mr. Speaker, I need not refer to the humanitarian aspects of the resolutions. They have been commented on by each of the persons who introduced the resolutions and by others who have spoken on such a topic. But I think, with the brief and very inaccurate and very hazy estimate which I have been able to make of what the charge would be to the province of Ontario, that a study would show that it is within the framework of the kind of fund which could be established by the province to fill a very real social need and to fill a very real dramatic loss that a person or his family suffered if he is involved in or suffers from a crime of violence. It should not be difficult for this province to bear the costs of providing the kind of compensation which is envisaged by these two resolutions.

I think, however, there must be a substantial study and consideration given to the basis on which compensation would be paid and the basis on which tests would be provided by welfare authorities, or others to determine on a continuing basis what those needs of families or dependants of persons who suffer from crimes of violence might be over a period of time.

I think there is one area where there is some information available right within the metropolitan area in the handling of the Hurricane Hazel relief fund, where the very same problems of the sudden dramatic loss of the breadwinner of the family, or of a sudden disablement, left women and children, or the person who suffered, disabled or under a handicap as a result of that hurricane. And the Hurricane Hazel fund was able on relatively sound principles and in a reasonably

generous framework to provide for continuing compensation over a long period of time both for children and for widows, and for persons who were disabled as a result of that disaster in this area.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, would urge that the government would give consideration to carrying out this kind of a study in the metropolitan area to ascertain exactly what the best possible estimate would be of the charge to the public Treasury if such a fund were established in order to meet the very laudable and necessary object of these resolutions.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, in joining briefly in this debate on these resolutions, I do so for the purpose of agreeing with the principle behind both of them. This matter has been debated at some length by the Canadian bar association. It is certainly not a new matter, it has been discussed in England; in New Zealand there is, in fact, a bill that exists. It is a recent innovation and perhaps still in the experimental stage. I am a little disturbed by the hon. member for Halton and by the trouble he is having with his mother-in-law but it sounds, when you strip away his domestic difficulties, like a Tory explanation for not doing anything: "If we had a system of compensation for victims of crime, did you ever think what might happen about so-and-so and so-and-so?"

I say, sir, there are many instances that come to our attention at regular intervals where people are injured through no fault of their own; where people suffer damage through no fault of their own, and we just do not seem to be able to cope with this unfortunate situation.

The classic case in this field happened perhaps in my own riding, in the riding of Downsview, where the Santa Claus bandit—I think they call him—was in the process of holding up a bank and shopping centre and a gentleman named John Blank took over the pursuit of the robber, who subsequently shot him and killed him. Mr. Blank's wife and family unfortunately were put in the most difficult position of having to rely on the charity of their friends and neighbours and of the community in order to carry on a reasonable mode of living. Certainly anyone thinking at any length about this sort of an incident would agree that the state should provide some sort of relief for this type of very serious family injury.

There are, we see from time to time, many people who get arrested, who spend a certain amount of time in jail, who are later acquitted. Once in a while we hear of persons who are found guilty and spend a few years in jail and eventually certain additional facts come to light and the law finds that a mistake has been made and the person who has spent time in jail by mistake is released and the state pats him on the head and says, "Sorry, we made a mistake, we have taken some of your life away from you, but there is really no system of doing anything for you." There was a case just recently featured in the papers where a conviction had been obtained against two brothers here in the city of Toronto. They were sentenced to jail and began serving a rather long sentence and one of the senior Metropolitan Toronto police officers was not satisfied with what had been presented before the courts and continued his investigations and eventually came upon the real culprits in this incident. They were later brought before the courts and tried and punished and the two gentlemen who had originally been wrongly convicted were released. These things do happen. And I think that where the state has made a mistake in this sort of thing, there should be a system of compensation. There are all sorts of people who are injured as a result of crimes, who are really put into a pretty desperate financial situation and should have some recourse to someone for some sort of a remedy. As has been pointed out, the potential in litigation against the average murderer or bank robber is very little and there is hardly any point in going to common law to attempt to extract the remedy in damages.

It would seem to me, sir, that since this matter has received very substantial consideration in other jurisdictions, and that since New Zealand has an active statute which it is having some experience with, the time has come when the province of Ontario could and should look with great seriousness at this important problem. I would agree that a committee to investigate this field should be set up and I would think the sooner the better. If we believe in Ontario that we are a fair and a just province, if we do not want people to suffer through no fault of their own, I would think that the government of the province of Ontario should have a real interest in making sure that people who are the unfortunate victims of crime through no fault of their own, are not unnecessarily and unfairly penalized.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate only because I feel that something should be said for the officers who have been abused from

time to time by young hoodlums who are out looking for trouble late in the night after taking part in some of the events that they do in summer resort areas.

I remember very clearly in the city of Niagara Falls where an officer or two tried to persuade the young men to be on their way after they were being entertained at a party, they just turned on these officers, and citizens would not take part or offer to assist the officers themselves, and for very good reason. These young men were looking for trouble, they were there to defend themselves and they knew how far they could go because there was no one who would assist those officers. The police officers were badly beaten; as a matter of fact the clothes were ripped off the back of one of them and I can readily understand why the officers need protection from that kind of abuse.

I can readily understand what the hon. member from the NDP mentioned, that one man was blinded. Their teeth are knocked out, their ribs are kicked in, and yet no one will take part in assisting the officers who are trying to enforce the laws.

It is my opinion that the government is falling short of the mark and I cannot agree with our Conservative member down here who says this is a municipal problem and the municipalities probably should provide the protection. This is nothing short of buck-passing. I say that it is the provincial government who should bring in legislation and bring it in now, not a year from now. It seems that the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, are of a type that when a private member brings in a resolution and especially a member of the Opposition, then the government says it is very good but someone else should do it and as another year passes more people are abused and naturally the citizen who would like to help and in many cases would help anyway, will suffer financially and his family will suffer with him.

There is no chance, in my opinion, for that man to recover his health and his financial losses. There is no use of the government saying that they will look at it through a committee. Mind you, a committee will do if you do not pass legislation, I think the experience of our citizens up to this day is sufficient to advise this—yes, your executive council—the hon. Prime Minister and the Cabinet—that now is the time to bring in legislation. We will be here, I understand, for quite some time and for that, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared, because I have been well rested for the last few days, so I do not mind if we go on until August or September or whatever the length of time.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Not that long.

Mr. Bukator: I guess perhaps the doctor has given me the wrong kind of pills. But legislation should be brought in and brought in in this session, Mr. Speaker. It is not a difficult bill. If a private member were to bring in a private member's bill, it would get the same treatment that this resolution is getting or these two resolutions are getting. It is about time that some type of compensation should be set aside or a fund be set aside to assist the people who want to help us enforce our laws. I do not believe under any circumstances any citizen of this country would complain about that kind of taxation.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, in standing to speak on this, I must say that I support wholeheartedly the comments of the previous speakers. We have the indication recently, as recently as last weekend, in Yorkville, wherein a group of young hooligans—and I think that is the best description you could give them—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this matter is raised judicata. It has not been tried, it is sub judice, it has not been tried in the courts and I so fiercely believe in the policy of letting the courts decide that I think you should prevent a member from prejudging these people before they have had a fair trial in a competent court.

Mr. Speaker: The member, I assume, is only referring to the event and not passing any remarks on the merits of the case.

Mr. Eagleson: I had presumed that my hon. friend would know me a little better than that.

But in any event, I was referring to the instance in itself. We had an example of certain people, certain members of the public, finding themselves standing on the sidelines and not helping the officers, police officers, in a matter of a problem for the community. Similarly, we had one person at least make an attempt to assist the police officers. For his assistance, apparently from what I read in the newspapers and from what I have heard from police officers who investigated the matter, there was some suggestion some of the crowd even attacked him for assisting the police officers.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, as the previous speaker mentioned, that the time has come for this House to take steps along these lines. There should be legislation drafted and presented before this House that would result in the protection of the individual from attacks of this kind.

Recently in my riding, there were a group of young men involved in what is termed a "rumble" on the Lakeshore boulevard, which resulted in two or three of them being hospitalized and two or three of the police officers and people who had entered the fray suffering similar bad effects. The difficulty is that it was impossible to determine who had thrown which punch, who had caused what grief to the other. As a result, some members of the public found themselves financially out of pocket, with hospitalization expenses, because of this incident.

In addition, some of these people, I am led to believe, were left out of work, and found themselves even further out of pocket, as a result of such an altercation.

I would think that it is obligatory, and it should be strongly supported, that the government do set up some type of fund for such victims of such accidents. We often have found in many situations, I am sure, with which all of us, as individual members are familiar, incidents that happen in our particular areas, similar to the ones I have described, and similar to that in Yorkville. I had a discussion with a police officer on Saturday afternoon, who indicated that he was just about on the verge of leaving the force as a result of an altercation in which he had become involved, in one of the hotels, in the township of Etobicoke.

Apparently, at that time, he attempted to arrest an individual, to lay a charge against him, and as he was walking down the main lobby of the hotel, he apparently was attacked by two or three other gentlemen, as a result of which the accused person, or the person who had originaly been charged, got away, and at that point, no one knew who he, in fact, was.

One or two of the patrons in the hotel, one of whom was an employee, came to the assistance of the police officer and for his troubles, received nothing other than a fat eye and a cut nut, but again this is another example of the type of problem that results.

I suggest that it would be better for the community if such a fund were available, because all too often, and I blame myself as much as any other person in the community, when one sees an altercation, whether it involves a policeman or anyone else, one hesitates to go to the aid of either party, or the officer, for fear of what might happen physically to the person himself. There is no protection at the present time and I suggest, as this motion reads, the fund should be established, out of which payment could be made to compensate victims of such crimes of violence, or incidents, as I have described.

One can foresee, and one can imagine quite easily, what one would do, had the opportunity arisen, as came to Mr. Blank, in the recent Terry Smith matter, wherein Mr. Blank took it upon himself to go to the assistance of the bank manager, and as a result of which he was killed. Again, this is the type of action and the fact that there is no compensation for such interference on the part of the individual, that bounces it back to the individual and almost inclines him not to take part. It is very much easier, the way the legislation is today, to stand back and do nothing, than to attempt to interfere and step in to the assistance of someone in distress, or in this resultant crime of violence.

I think with those comments and those particular descriptions of incidents, I feel that it is obvious that the time has come for such a fund to be established.

Mr. Speaker: The debate being concluded, as provided by our arrangements for private members' hour, these orders, numbers 21 and 25, respectively, are discharged from the order paper.

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

No. 125

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday May 31, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 31, 1966

Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan, continued 4095

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 4125

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 31, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and tonight we welcome in the Speaker's gallery, the junior business and professional women's club of Hamilton.

Clerk of the House: The 32nd order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

(*continued*)

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I have to apologize in one sense to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I was not able to be here to hear his address, but he was kind enough to give me a copy of it, and I had the opportunity to go over it during the supper hour.

May I say it still confirms the feeling that I had before he even started, and that is that today there are innovations, there are challenges and it is a changing world. It seems to me that "big" government could look at "big" business and the "big" labour unions and get some ideas for new approaches. In this age of knowledge explosion, of automation, computers, cost analyses, efficiency experts, I think that this government is being left very much behind.

I think the government has to modernize itself to meet the problems not only of today, but of the future. It is always healthy to be suspicious, I think it is a good suspicion not only for an Opposition to have, but for the people of the province to have that the cost of government may be increasing needlessly. The thing that worries us is that we cannot help feeling uneasy about the way the Budget is made up, and particularly the way it is presented; the way that government programmes never seem to die no matter the changing situation. You never hear the Minister say: "Now, cut off a certain programme in government." Parkinson's law seems to be shown in almost every area.

Of course there is the question, is it possible by a rational analysis or by comparison to assure that we are getting the greatest benefit for the dollars that the government is using? Are we going to determine a limit to one programme over another?

How can we be satisfied when a programme is not giving the benefits it was originally intended to give? Is there an analysis that can be made on a rational basis after a programme has been instituted? Is the government inefficiently implementing its own programme? Is there a duplication of services? Are we getting better research by doing it one way with one department or another? How do we compare parallel activity into separate departments?

It seems to me that in business what you look at is the estimated profit, the risk, the saleability of the product on a short or long term, the initial costs, the continuing cost and so on. In managing the public business I would suggest that we should be adopting some of these methods. I suggest that it requires courage and leadership and thought for a government to become hardheaded and practical in its methods. In government, in the field of politics, because there is a public clamour, it is easy to institute a stopgap programme, not caring for the real benefit, or the ultimate cost to the taxpayer.

I cannot help thinking that with this government, when a crisis which becomes clear to the people of the province, it is only then that you move, and you do not move with a great deal of thought.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Be specific!

Mr. Thompson: I will be. I think, for example, of the St. John report on libraries which came out indicating decay and disinterest on the part of government towards library services around the province. A shocking indictment.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): What has this to do with these estimates?

Mr. Thompson: I am answering that question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Within a week, the hon, Minister of Education said that he was going

to put so much into the estimates. I suggest—I am going to go into this further—I suggest that there are three areas in which the hon. Provincial Treasurer is sloppy about his pick.

Mr. White: Is that your example of improved—

Mr. Thompson: I will go through a number of these. I will be glad to go through them around the country, which I intend to do as well.

The sloppy expenditure of tax money. That is the first area. The second is the ill-timed construction of government buildings; building at a time when the country is in an inflationary period, rather than in a recession when costs are down and more jobs are needed.

The third way that the hon. Provincial Treasurer gets his money, and in our terms, wastes it, is the mismanagement of the affairs of government and the retardation of growth.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing I enjoy more than to hear some of the comments, and I know where they are coming from. I heard comments last year from the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: It was probably the best bonus we had to show the arrogance and complacency of government, and we used it. I welcome your bickering and your narrow little remarks, and from over here—where the other bickerer is—we heard his remarks. May I say they were—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The leader of the Opposition has the floor; without interruption, please. I will ask the member if he will proceed under the estimate.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that you recognize there should be a certain decorum in the House, and I hope you will try to maintain it.

Let me take the first area, sloppy expenditure. In Ottawa, they had a Glassco commission report on government efficiency. In Saskatchewan, they had the Royal commission report; and in Ontario, as the hon. Minister suggests to us, they had the Gordon report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: But the peculiarity of this government is that when you have a report, you ignore the recommendations. How many of the recommendations have been implemented?

In 1964, the government spent more than $300,000 getting legal advice from Toronto legal firms. Is not that flabbiness in spending? Why not beef up the hon. Attorney General's department—and we have been arguing about this—to get a bit of lean approach to government. I think it is most appropriate that I look at the hon. Provincial Treasurer as I say this.

Let me take another area of government. You have 2,000 expropriating bodies throughout the province. Has it ever struck you that there might be overlapping, apart from abuse to the people in the province? Have you ever thought of the Krueger report about all the overlapping in administration, and the lack of definition, the cost and waste that is involved because of this? This is why you need the sales tax, and so on—because of inefficiency in government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): We will change that.

Mr. Thompson: Let us take the mental health area. Ontario's mental health agency has been called a "disjointed, entangled jungle," and you hand out money to them.

Our hosptials have been criticized for wasting manpower, overlapping facilities and permitting high staff turnovers, and I could go on in that area.

Take Medicare, which we just brought in. Medicare which is OMSIP. May I say—

Mr. McKeough: On the estimates.

Mr. Thompson: May I say I refer to you bringing it in. I do not want to have the shame of being associated with bringing it in. But the cost to the government—the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows this—the other yahoos do not, but he does—of this medical service insurance programme which you have devised; the fact that you do not have groups but individuals coming in, the cost of that in courts. You know that OMSIP is a term—

Mr. McKeough: Back to the estimates.

Mr. Thompson: I am getting a little bit tired of the yakking, and I request that this man over here, who has never been able to say anything constructive except to yell—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I am going to suggest to the leader of the Opposition that some of his statements are rather provocative, particularly when they refer to members of the House as "yahoos."

Mr. Thompson: It is a good parliamentary word.

Mr. Chairman: Under the circumstances I would ask him, if he will, to speak to the estimates and I will try to keep control within the House.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.

May I say that another area of flabbiness in government — and the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows it — is in the more than 100 boards and commissions and the government members who sit on them. Here are you coming and presenting yourself as the Treasurer and the man who will cut costs, and yet when we ask about the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin, what a pale kind of excuse you have to give for the amount of money that you are giving to him.

This is the kind of thing that we want to say to you—get tougher with respect to expenses. It is the people's money.

Building projects at the wrong time; I think you are beginning to realize the lack of planning of this government in this area. The Queen's Park complex — $50 million — could have been started five or seven years ago when men were walking the streets looking for jobs. Mr. Chairman, although there is just weak criticism; some inane remark from over there; may I say that that should be recorded in *Hansard* because one of the things that I feel most strongly about is in my own riding.

I walked the streets four or five years ago with men who were desperate for work, and now we find that when there is an inflationary period, when there is almost full employment, it is now that the government is coming in with these building projects and public works projects. The hon. Provincial Treasurer knows that the timing for that was four or five years ago, to give men work then, and it would not have cost as much.

The Centennial centre of science and technology, which will not open in time for the centennial, but we are still going to have to pay for it — first $14 million and now up to $21 million!

Look at the carefree abandon with which you just told us that you need another $7 million on this, and how is it described? In the Toronto *Daily Star* it was described over the weekend as a "hole in the ground" and a "pile of junk." Yet at this time you are asking $21 million from us when it will not even be ready to celebrate the centennial. We have talked about that before, but that is, in my terms, bad planning, and using the money incorrectly.

Ryerson—the hon. Minister of Education should have planned it ahead of time. The Minister of Education announced recently that there would be an extension to the institute. It is estimated that in the short time from 1963 to the present, construction costs of Ryerson have risen more than 20 per cent. Surely that could have been planned. It is not hard to see the age of children and realize that they will be moving up and should be ready to go into technical schools, such as Ryerson. That could have been planned four or five years ago.

What about water pollution?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What about it?

Mr. Thompson: Twenty million dollars was set aside in the 1965 fiscal year and look at the problem that we have, and all our community is aware of it. Look at the aggressive zeal with which the Minister went after it. He was given $20 million to work with and what did he do?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I can hardly hear the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: He spent $7 million, and now the costs are obviously higher in this area.

Let me take the third area—the hon. member for London South asked for examples, so I am just giving him some. Retardation of growth. The province did not build schools when they were needed, and we have the Provincial Treasurer himself admitting this. I quote:

Some hon. members: Order!

Mr. Chairman: I interrupt to ask why some members may be calling order to the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Thompson: It does not hurt them.

Mr. Chairman: It seems that we are dealing with all departments, and I know as far as you are concerned you are trying to show the financial connection of the various departments with the Treasury.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Exactly. The fact that some of them squeal a little bit with the pain of it and with being a bit uncomfortable does not bother me, Mr. Chairman. The

government did not build schools when they were needed. Let us have a look at this, and I quote from someone who surely should know and should have done something about it. This is it:

> The limiting factor to Ontario's growth in 1965 was not capital but qualified managerial, professional and skilled labour.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Who said that?

Mr. Thompson: It happens to be the hon. Provincial Treasurer, my friend, who said that. Why could you not have been working on that before? This is your responsibility, education. Now there is another crisis you are starting to build schools. Four years ago when the thousands of young people graduating today were first entering high school, the government was running a surplus of $1 million.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might not have a ruling on the point of order that was raised. It does not seem to me that a general review of government policy in all departments is appropriate. I would suggest that this is the place for the Budget debate which, theoretically relates to the Budget as a whole, or dealing with the estimates in particular. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the estimates of the Provincial Treasurer relate to The Department of the Treasury as such, and not to the total operation of the government.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: I would be inclined to agree with the comments expressed by the member for Russell. As already pointed out to the leader of the Opposition we appear to be skirting all departments in connection with this vote. I know that what he is trying to do is to point out the financial end and the part that The Department of the Treasury has in connection with all the departments. But I ask him, if he would, to try to confine his remarks to The Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I will confine my remarks to the areas for which the Provincial Treasurer is responsible, and that would include, for example, the corporations tax branch—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Thompson: The gasoline tax branch; the hospital tax branch; legal branch; retail sales tax branch—surely, in those areas we have got the Provincial Treasurer. I realize that some of them are not interested, but we are. We are interested in what these taxes are for, and how they are being spent, and how we could save money on these taxes. I am not concerned about the yelling to stifle this because it is good for this government to hear it.

For years, Mr. Chairman, when the thousands of young people graduating today were first entering high school the government was running a surplus of $1 million a year. I went to Premier Frost when he was the Provincial Treasurer and he argued that this is what he would like to have every year, to have a surplus and let us fix it up in a phony way. As the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows, he is the greatest cooker of the books, and when he leaves here he can get a job as a chef at the King Edward hotel—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Instead of going into deficit financing then, they could have built these schools. Once again we have these crash programmes. We are going to have crash programmes for the community colleges, and a variety of others, and you are going to be building these at a period when the cost of labour and construction is high.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Thompson: Apart from all that, not only are you trying to bleed the people with the money, but we would hope you would have the highest standards in education across Canada. You do not. The most recent national survey shows that Ontario is behind B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan in keeping young people in school.

Mr. Chairman: Once again I remind the leader of the Opposition that the standards of education have nothing to do with this particular vote. Most of his remarks so far have been on the Public Works department. I would ask him, if he will, please, to try to review the department before him.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in the United States there has been a revolution in recent years in the management of the public's business. You might recall that in The Department of Defence of the United States, when Robert McNamara, formerly president of Ford Motor Company, became Secretary

of Defence, he adopted business methods and techniques new to the public business. Before he became Secretary of Defence it was the consensus that The Department of Defence was a mammoth bureaucracy and you could not cut it down into a tightened organization and show where the flabbiness was in government expenditures. It was suggested that the Pentagon was an octopus and could not be controlled.

But McNamara, courageously and single-mindedly, at once brought his business methods to the government's business, not to lessen the benefits and protection that the public were entitled to, but rather to get the best possible use of the actual dollars that were being spent on behalf of the public. So great was the effect, Mr. Chairman, of McNamara's programme and approach to The Department of Defence that last summer President Johnson directed that all government departments and agencies adopt—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Thompson: —adopt a new and revolutionary system of planning, of programming and of budgeting throughout government so that through the tools of modern management they would get greater benefits to flow to the citizens at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about trying to cut down the excessive flabbiness in government and they can shout and yell their heads off, but the people are concerned about this and, believe me, we will report to them the kind of attitude that is adopted in this House by some of these lesser minds when they talk in this vein.

McNamara did a job for The Department of Defence. Surely it would be worthwhile on the part of some of this government to have a look at what this man did and some of the ideas that he had. Under this new system which was brought in, each government department and agency was required to set up a special staff of experts, who, using modern methods of programme analysis, would define the goals of their departments for the coming year. Once these goals were established, the system would permit the government to find the most effective and the least costly alternative or option to achieving these goals.

This programme was designed to achieve three major objectives. First was to help find new ways to do the public business faster, better and less expensively. Second, to ensure that much sounder judgment with more accurate information would be brought to bear, pinpointing things that ought to be done, and spotlighting those things that ought to be done less. The ultimate objective was to make the decision-making process as up to date as a space exploration programme.

This was all done, Mr. Chairman, with the view that there was a great burden upon the government to manage the taxpayers' dollars in the best possible way. It also had the immediate benefit of forcing the government to identify publicly their goals with precision, so that not only could the government plan its activities, but private industry would be able to see what government was doing and arrange its affairs accordingly.

Can this be done in Ontario? Of course, it can. I could go through a number of examples of just how this could be done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say this, that I and my party believe that it is the duty of government in managing public affairs to be able to allocate the limited public resources to the highest needs. If government is not approached in this way, the only alternative is to spend on everything. This approach not only increases taxes and is wasteful, but it is unsatisfactory from a quantitative and a qualitative aspect. Surely we have not enough money in the public coffers or from what we can take from the public for everything that one feels that government should ultimately do. Therefore, we must clearly identify the goals of government so that we can agree or disagree on the government's policy.

Second, we must allocate the public funds and priorities of the competing claims. Third, we must institute programmes so that the progress of any programmes introduced by government can be measured as to their success or failure, not only in terms of costs, but also in terms of benefits. This, for example, would also enable private industry and business to govern its affairs in a meaningful and non-wasteful way. In the end, using business methods encourages and assists in rational decision-making by government in the public interest, not only in the initial stages, but in the operational and final stages.

Now, I would like to go into my understanding of how the hon. Provincial Treasurer works in connection with developing his budget. May I say that as I understand, in June the Provincial Treasurer sends

out to the Ministers of departments a request saying that he would like to have the estimates in by the fall from each department. The traditional method of presenting the estimates from each department to the Provincial Treasurer used to be that you would have the amount of salaries, maintenance and so on down the line.

But as I understand, in 1963-64 Treasury board decided that this was such an inefficient way of presenting estimates that it was demanded there should be a further breakdown. The hon. Provincial Treasurer demanded that there should be a breakdown which would reveal various projects and programmes, and which projects the departments wanted to give priority.

The irony—and I just want to mention this—is that what the hon. Provincial Treasurer sees from the departments he does not present before the Legislature in a similar breakdown. I want to emphasize that. The very approach that he took to be able to have a clearer picture of the estimates of the departments, the approach he took in 1963-64 estimates, we in the Legislature still do not have the benefit of such a breakdown.

When all of the departments' estimates are in in the fall, as I understand it, there is a compilation into a consolidated statement of all the estimates. Then you give an approximate financial position of the province from this consolidated programme that you get.

The next thing I understand that happens is that through the Treasury board a paper is developed on the economic situation and the outlook for the coming year. Again, we do not get this when the Budget is presented. There is a statement of projected revenue, there is a statement prepared for the hon. Provincial Treasurer on the impact of the public debt of projected revenue and expenditures.

Out of these overall factors that come to you, decisions are made by the Treasury board. You can look at the general financial framework for the ensuing fiscal year.

At this point may I say that I do not know at what time you should have a closer co-operation with Ottawa. I congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer that there is at least some discussion between the provinces and Ottawa that has come about fairly recently. I think this is extremely vital because I am convinced that particularly in a wealthy province such as this, that when you have decided after looking at a broad picture, the revenue and expenditures which you intend to follow, you are developing a form of a fiscal policy, and I would be concerned that you could be out of tune with Ottawa unless you kept in close co-operation with them.

We recognize in Ottawa that the spending and taxing decisions of the federal government have a highly important effect on the size of the national income. A surplus, as we know, tends to take funds out of the private sector, and a deficit tends to add to the funds of the private sector. These changes in private resources will either slow or will stimulate private spending.

Now, the decision as to whether the financing of specific government programmes through taxation or through borrowing must be made within the context of a particular overall ceiling on spending. And it is becoming more and more apparent that the province of Ontario has a very great responsibility for the same kind of decision.

Without my having to list the figures for the current fiscal year, we are all aware that jointly and singly the major provinces exert a fiscal power which is compared to that of the federal government. Thus the provinces should ideally consult with one another and with the federal government prior to making budgetary decisions in order to arrive at a consensus about fiscal measures. The hon. Minister nodded at me when I pointed out the need for co-operation, and I would hope that he might clarify more for us just how he knows the decision that Ottawa may take on fiscal policy and how it dovetails with his.

Let me follow through on the steps, as I understand, of the Treasury board in deciding on estimates. I understand there is a staff analysis after you have arrived at an overall picture. You then go to work on each department estimate which was presented. He takes a hard look at the attainment of the programme in the past, at staff requirements for the future — for the coming year compared with the past year—and he looks also at the fundamental purpose of the progress. The other thing that he does is he separates existing programmes from new programmes.

Again this is brought before the hon. Minister. It is analyzed and broken down. It is brought before the Treasury board. Let me add again, we have never had the courtesy of such a breakdown in order that we can have the same kind of a hard look and knowledgeable look at the estimates.

After this is done—where the staff analyist goes and examines the estimates and breaks them down—the hon. Minister himself appears before the Treasury board and decisions are

made. He battles through to get as much as he can for his department.

Let me say, and this I think concerns us here, the hon. Provincial Treasurer I am sure wants to have the most thorough examination of the money which he is asking through committee of supply. I would like to say on this, and I think this is important—I hope you will not rule me out of order on this, Mr. Chairman — but I am very concerned about the approach we are taking to the estimates. I think that some of the unrest on all sides of the House at the examination and scrutiny of the estimates—we discussed that in the previous private member's hour—I think some of the concern may be because we have not thought of using committees, departmental committees through the Legislature here, to examine departments.

I was interested during the supper hour to see where in the United Kingdom the period of time they take on committee of supply is 26 days. I believe that we should be looking at the departmental committee system, where we can take a thorough look at an estimate, rather than that it should always be in the House itself, in the committee of the whole.

Mr Letherby: Do you mean we could clean up all of the estimates in 26 days?

Mr. Thompson: No, I think we should have committees. For example, an education committee; and, as they have in Ottawa, a defense committee, where those hon. members who are interested, might examine the estimates closely. Then they would come before the Legislature to be passed, but I think that a great deal—

Mr. Letherby: If I were the leader of this government I would pin the Opposition down to 26 days.

Mr. Thompson: One of my concerns, sir, is that we are not having the opportunity to scrutinize the estimates properly, because of the fact that they are not presented to us clearly. Again, with the "ohs," and "ahs," Mr. Chairman, let me turn to a legislative study which was commissioned by this government, and read to these deaf ears exactly what the report says there. The first one was the matter of rotating the chairman, I may say, Mr. Chairman, which he thought was bad for the thorough examination of estimates in committee of supply. But I may say for my part, I hope that you will not be rotated, because I think on the whole you have been very fair. I think that you have experience in this. In determination of estimates we have, through you, the opportunity of having a thorough study.

The second criticism made by this man, commissioned by the government, was, and I am quoting:

> The estimates that are tabled in the House do not contain all of the information that is submitted to the Treasury board by the department, and which is made available to the Treasury board analyst who first studied them.

Mr. Chairman: To show you how unbiased I am after those kind words, I would ask you to get back to the Provincial Treasurer's vote.

Mr. Thompson: I think this is very important. This is part of the Provincial Treasurer bringing the estimates in. He is suggesting that, in fact, sir, the committee of supply is labouring under even greater disadvantage than those disadvantages that were experienced by the staff of the Treasury board, before the changes introduced in the 1963-64 estimates. The estimates give no description. This man, who was commissioned to examine the Legislature, states, and I am quoting from him:

> The estimates give no description or explanation of programmes and no figures for previous years. No indication is given as to whether a proposed expenditure is for a new project, or for a project that is already in existence.

That is why, sir, I could not help looking with amusement—

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition a question?

Mr. Thompson: Certainly.

Mr. Dunlop: What study are you referring to, and commissioned by whom?

Mr. Thompson: I am referring to the study by Professor Schindeler of York University. I should say that when I quoted before from his study, the hon. Prime Minister said, "Why can I not get that study, from the point of view that the government commissioned—"

Mr. Dunlop: Commissioned by whom?

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Prime Minister's words. He said, "Why can I not get that study, because the government commissioned it?" And I said, "You can get it if you go to a library."

Mr. Dunlop: Commissioned by whom?

An hon. member: The government of Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: I referred to you, that the hon. Prime Minister said, "Why can I not get that study, because the government commissioned it?" I referred to the hon. Prime Minister's words. Ask him about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: And this was obviously with respect to—

Mr. Chairman: On that point, I do not know whether the Prime Minister had indicated—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The Chairman cannot intervene like that.

Mr. Dunlop: No, but, Mr. Chairman, that question has not been answered.

Mr. Thompson: I do not have to answer the question, first of all—

An hon. member: You do not have to answer the question—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You are way out on a limb with this.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say that I am quoting right from this study by Schindeler, and I think I will read it again, just so that you can understand it.

An hon. member: A report that was issued by the government.

Mr. Thompson: I quote from the study:

> The estimates that are tabled in the House do not contain all of the information that is submitted to the Treasury board by the department and which is made available to the Treasury board analyst who first studied them.

I want to say in this connection with that, Mr. Chairman, that one of the reasons, as I said before, for delay in the Legislature, and the difficulties of Opposition in examining and finding out how the money is being spent, is that the Treasury board and the hon. Provincial Treasurer refuse to be open about how expenditures are made. I turn again to the authority of Professor Schindeler to state this.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer has referred to the public accounts committee, and in the far too few remarks that he made he said that he was going to be more open about his own Treasury department in giving us the estimates, because of the public accounts committee report of 1964. Well, let me say this: In this 1964 public accounts committee, there were these recommendations.

They recommended that for a better appraisal of the estimates by the Legislature, they should include the following: The approved estimates for the current fiscal year; the interim forecast for the current fiscal year, in addition to the proposed expenditures for the forthcoming fiscal year, which is normally given.

The public accounts committee also recommended that the estimates and the accounts of the province should show a more detailed classification of the items included under the heading, "maintenance," so that the cost of office equipment supplies and other categories of expenditure would be clearly defined. I recall the hon. member for Woodbine, in estimates just about a week ago, talking about the absurdity of this vague term, "maintenance." Your public accounts committee asked of the Provincial Treasurer to do far more than he is doing with respect to opening up for the eyes of the Legislature, exactly how your expenditures are made and what you are going to make them on.

May I come to one other area which makes it difficult for us, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer appears before us, to really take him very seriously, when he refers to the fact that he was doing what the public accounts committee asked and that he wants to be accountable to the Legislature. The hon. Provincial Treasurer comes before us with his estimates, and the problem is that when he has brought these before us for a number of years the government departments have consistently asked for more money than they have spent. Although the supply voted must still be spent only for the purposes specified in the estimates, the individual votes are broad enough and the surplus amounts large enough to leave the government a good deal of leeway as to how it will dispense the public funds.

When you look at the amounts of the discrepancy that the government has—let me take 1955. The excess of estimated over actual expenditure: 4.5 per cent; 1956, 10.8 per cent; 1957, 7 per cent; 1958, 8.8 per cent; 1959, 10.3 per cent; 1960, 9.1 per cent; 1961, 8.4 per cent; 1962, 10.8 per cent, and so it goes on. And what does Professor Schindeler say about that? He says it means that the discrepancy between the estimated

and the actual expenditure on certain other votes is even greater than the average percentage given for each year. And then he adds this:

> Of course, all these discrepancies may be simply the result of poor forecasting on the part of the departments and the Treasury board. But the consistency of the pattern would seem to suggest some other explanation.

And the explanation that he offers is:

> That it may be the desire to have extra funds to dispose of without too close supervision.

Let us take the fourth factor as far as the Treasury board is concerned. This is that time after time the government permits financial matters, estimates, to pile up towards the end of the session. Let me read Schindeler on this for you.

Mr. Dunlop: When did we start?

Mr. Thompson: The situation—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Who is Schindeler? When did he get to be an authority?

Mr. Thompson: —in this regard is much the same as that which existed in regard to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Let us take the 1964 session. Four votes were passed in the first third of the session, 95 votes in the second third and 86 in the last third of the session. In the last 15 days of the session, 35.7 per cent of the votes were passed and 13.5 per cent were passed in the last week of the session. Votes totalling $33,846,000 were passed on the 67th day of the session, just two days before we prorogued, and the same trick is being played on the public in this session.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: They are coming up again at the end of the session to try and ram them through without a proper scrutiny by the people.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The Opposition is not going to let the public down like that!

Mr. Thompson: Now, I would like to come to another area, because I do not like the piety with which this government tries to cloak itself by suggesting it believes in public scrutiny of Treasury. And let me say this —and I want to quote Schindeler again.

Hon. Mr Stewart: Who is Schindeler? Nobody ever heard of him.

Some hon. members: Who is Schindeler?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Schindeler and his report—

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): That is not a government report, it is a man's speech that he wrote for a doctor's degree, and it has nothing to do with the government at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, special warrants, Treasury board orders and commitments! Any government sensitive that the people and, indeed, the Legislature, should be able to examine the expenditures which they were exposing would never use special warrants, Treasury board orders or commitments unless it was imperative.

Now, let us turn to Schindeler. The important thing to notice here, he says, is the fact that these instruments of the executive, not the Legislature but the executive, the arrogance of government, these instruments of the executive actually create appropriations which have never been approved by the Legislature. They are not subject to any kind of formal legislative review. The executive has usurped the part of what has been historically considered the key power of the Legislature. The Legislature has not been left with even the opportunity to review the executive's use of the power.

Furthermore, the executive has not been hesitant to resort to the use of these instruments, and he asks me to look at table 5 on 468 of this illuminating document by Professor Schindeler. And what do we find? In spite of the fact that the estimates have exceeded actual expenditure—an average of 8.1 per cent each year for the past five years—the government has found it necessary to create and spend new appropriations to an average amount of $14,793,519 in those same years.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Total budget of what?

Mr. Thompson: Let me tell you this. This to me is probably one of the greatest insults to a Legislature. Surely the very rights of a Legislature over the centuries has been that the Legislature would examine the purse strings of the King and try to control the taxes which he was trying to impose.

This is the great strength of our democracy, parliamentary democracy. Then it is with the government. If they are using Lieutenant-Governor's warrants and orders, then surely they would not abuse this Legislature unless it was an extreme emergency. And what do we find this this Provincial Treasurer doing? Year after year to the tune of over $14 million he bypasses the Legislature.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Thompson: The estimates themselves —and I want to sum this up—the arrogance is displayed with shouts and yells. It is also displayed with the actions which you permit in this Legislature.

To sum up Professor Schindeler, let me say this, and this is on page 470. He says:

> The estimates themselves do not include enough information to make intelligent assessment possible, and invariably they call for larger amounts than are actually required. No estimates committee has been established to assist the House with its review of the government's proposed expenditures.

He goes on about the fact of the public accounts committee having handicaps. I would say the handicaps that they have is that there is a Provincial Treasurer who would ignore any of their recommendations. He talks about the provincial auditor who is supposed to serve as his key source of information. The fact, of course, is that it will come to this in the provincial auditor, that he has to function for two masters. The provincial auditor should be the servant solely of the Legislature; he is an agent of the executive, of the Cabinet, of the Treasury board, and the committee's reports are not distributed much beyond the Clerks' vault.

Professor Schindeler states it and so do I — he does a post-audit, and he does a pre-audit and that, sir, is unwarranted in our society and in this Legislature.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: Finally, Professor Schindeler, an objective man, in an impartial report has this to say:

> Finally, the executive itself appropriates large sums of money without reference—

I hope that this sinks in and shames you! This is what he says:

> —the executive itself appropriates large sums of money without reference to the Legislature, and these appropriations are never even reviewed by the House.

You know that. You know how you bypass the House with your Lieutenant-Governor warrants, and how you get your money. Even three days before the Legislature met in January, we had the effrontery of the hon. Minister of Education getting emergency funds that moved up into thousands and thousands of dollars, rather than waiting to come before this Legislature and have them examined.

Here are the final words of Professor Schindeler:

> Mainly, then, much remains to be done if the legislative branch of government in Ontario is going to exercise its proper degree of control over public expenditure.

May I say this, sir, that as the Treasurer comes before us year after year he has that genial smile. He reminds us of the saying—is it a "wolf in a sheep skin"? A "sheep in a wolf's skin"?

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Thompson: It is hard to distinguish because you change. But I want to end this because I would like him to know first that we are fond of him. But I want him to know that we still consider that there is no one more able to cook the books than he. Let me say further, that year after year he has come before us, like a knight in shining armour, with his Treasury board report and his estimates, but we have found him out, and with the help of Professor Schindeler—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I will tell you this, that you had better start getting reform not only in your department but in the Legislature.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to make a few comments that are relevant to the estimates of the Treasury department.

I would like first of all to say how happy I am that my friend, Fred Schindeler, decided to choose the study of the relationships between executive and Legislature in Ontario as the subject of his Ph.D thesis in the political science department of the University of Toronto. Apart from the undeniable merits of the study he produced, I am afraid that the hon. leader of the Opposition would be extremely impoverished for material both for speeches and for newspaper articles if Schindeler had not produced his study.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bryden: There is one point, however, that should be cleared up, in fairness both to Schindeler and to the government. His Ph.D thesis was not commissioned by the government; I believe the subject was selected and he undertook his work in the normal way in which these things are done in consultation with the relevant department of the University of Toronto, and he was awarded his Ph.D on the advice of the appropriate examiners appointed by the University of Toronto.

I believe that during the course of his endeavours, the government was good enough to give him certain financial assistance. The hon. Prime Minister made a reference to it and I have a recollection of Professor Schindeler himself telling me this, that they did provide some clerical assistance to him in accumulating some of his statistical and other material.

It was not, however, a study commissioned by the government. If the hon. Prime Minister said that—and it is not my recollection that he did; I remember the occasion to which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred but it is not my recollection that that is what the Prime Minister said—but if he said that, he was mistaken, Mr. Chairman. I think that matter should be cleared up in the interests of all the parties concerned.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, could I clear the matter up? My information is that the government had nothing whatever to do with Mr. Schindeler's thesis, either by helping or by finance.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Then I was giving the government a certain amount of credit, Mr. Chairman, that apparently was not due to them. I thought it was rather a good thing that the government had provided a certain amount of financial assistance for an academic study of administration in this province, sight unseen with no strings attached. I was ready to give the government credit for that, but the hon. Provincial Treasurer disclaims the credit. At any rate, the study was an independently conducted study in conjunction with the University of Toronto and I think that point should be clearly established. There is nothing wrong with studies commissioned by the government. Many good studies have been commissioned by this and other governments, but Schindeler's was not one of them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to avoid, if I can, going over any of the material that has been dealt with by the hon. leader of the Opposition—some of which was relevant to the vote and some of which was not and some of which I agreed with and some of which I did not. Let us say that, acting as spokesman for Schindeler, he made what I thought were a number of valid points with regard to the management of finances and accounting for finances in this province. I may say that some of these points have also been made by the public accounts committee. The Minister has not necessarily been prepared to listen to the distilled wisdom of the public accounts committee—well, I will not say that he is not prepared to listen to it, but he is not always prepared to do anything about it.

Some rather important recommendations that they have made he has not acted upon and may never act upon. It is, of course, his responsibility and the responsibility of the government to make the final decision. One or two of them have been referred to already by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I may, on another occasion, make further references to some of the reports of the public accounts committee.

There is, however, one suggestion—at least I take it that it was a suggestion—the hon. leader of the Opposition put forward that rather alarmed me. He made reference to the practice in dealing with estimates in the United Kingdom. As a matter of fact, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that he is extremely ambivalent on this subject of the handling of estimates. On the one hand, he objects to the government—and I think with considerable merit in many respects, because of the failure to provide information to the Opposition and the lack of complete and adequate opportunities afforded to the Opposition in dealing with the estimates. He does that on the one hand, and then on the other hand, he seems to imply that we ought to be cut down to 26 days in committee of supply.

I want to make it clear that I dissociate myself entirely from that second idea of his. The United Kingdom is a totally different parliamentary assembly from this one. This one stems from the Mother of Parliaments and its basic structures and procedures are similar, but there are a great many differences. One of them relates to the method of dealing with estimates. As a matter of fact, they do not deal with estimates in the whole House at all in Great Britain. They have an estimates committee broken up into a number of subcommittees that deal with the estimates. In Great Britain that is the most

satisfactory procedure that is possible. The estimates are in five different parts and any one part makes our estimates look like small change. It is simply impossible for the British House, with more than 600 members, to deal with the estimates presented by the U.K. Parliament in the committee of the whole. Therefore, they have necessarily had to remove them from the committee of the whole into a special standing committee to be dealt with. The time spent in committee of supply in the British House does not really constitute a detailed review of estimates at all. It is a period that is really comparable to our Budget debate. That is when they have their Budget debate.

That is a necessary thing in Great Britain, but, good heavens, I hope it is not being seriously proposed that we adopt a similar procedure here. I suppose if we did, we could wind up the sessions of this House in a month, or six weeks. But I do not think that is either necessary or desirable. In a House of this size, with the amount of business we have to transact, it is quite possible for all the members of the House to sit in on the scrutiny of the estimates. As long as that is physically possible, and it seems to me it will be physically possible for the foreseeable future, then I think that is the procedure that should be adopted. I think we should scrutinize estimates right here in this House, with all the members either present, or at any rate having the opportunity to be present.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Do you think the hon. leader of the Opposition should send Professor Schindeler to the U.K. to prepare a speech for him?

Mr. Bryden: I think that Professor Schindeler is quite familiar with practices in the Parliament of the United Kingdom and the Parliament of Canada.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: You know, there have been quite a lot of quite distinguished books written both recently and over the years, with regard to various phases of procedure and other management of business in Great Britain. Schindeler was writing about the province of Ontario and I would like to say again that he produced an excellent piece of work. I understand—I have no authoritative information, but I understand it is likely to be published with some revision and updating in the not-too-distant future and I look forward to seeing it as a book.

Mr. Dunlop: Most of it was published in the Toronto *Daily Star* over the signature of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Bryden: Only a very small portion of it was published in the Toronto *Daily Star* over the signature of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but it is quite true that certain relevant extracts have been published in that form.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order, I must say that certainly I think that Schindeler has said some very hard things about the arrogance of this government and I was glad as I am on any occasion to use any expert—and he certainly is. I was glad to acknowledge him when I wrote an article in the Toronto *Daily Star* and referred to him. Indeed, I wish the government would use the opinions and the statistics of experts itself, instead of lashing at others who use them.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I am not sure of your point of order.

Mr. Thompson: May I get up again on what is to me a point of order, and that is that the hon. member for Woodbine is a very fair man, and I think when he reads *Hansard* he will find he has taken the fact that I said that in the U.K., 26 days are given to committee of supply, but I did not suggest that in this Parliament it should be only for 26 days. I want to just say that, because I think when he reads that, he will see what I was referring to.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I really do not know why the reference to the 26 days in the U.K. was made, but at any rate if it was not intended to imply that we should do that here, I accept the explanation.

What I am always afraid of, however, is that somebody over there on that side might hear about this 26-day business and keep us sitting here 24 hours a day for 26 days to get the estimates through. I do not think he should say things like that in here, they are liable to be taken seriously.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go into procedures for controlling expenditures in the province beyond saying that in my opinion the development of the Treasury board, or more particularly of its staff, in the province in the last number of years, has been a most welcome development. I concur with the hon. leader of the Opposition to this extent, in that I believe that there should be a continual effort to

eliminate inefficiency in government, and waste of money.

I think that the Treasury board division is accomplishing this with increasing efficiency. I think it is a good division, I think it is doing good work, and I think it is improving its performance all the time. In fact, I am satisfied that this is the best technique for ensuring efficiency in government. I am now talking purely of administrative efficiency. I will not get into the question of policy efficiency, which really does not relate to this vote. I think in any case we have already gone over most of the points that the hon. leader of the Opposition made along that line in other debates where they were more relevant to the subject under discussion.

But in terms of administrative efficiency, I think that this is the best way of developing efficiency in the government. I never feel very happy about mammoth investigations, such as the Hoover investigation in the United States, and the Glassco commission investigation in Canada. I get particularly worried when I hear people talking about the need for having business efficiency in government. This worries me for two reasons, Mr. Chairman, first of all private business is not nearly as efficient as it is cracked up to be. It is loaded with inefficiency and waste. I may even mention one or two phases of that on some other occasion.

Second, and this is perhaps more important, the canons of business efficiency are not necessarily applicable to government, and if you try to apply them to government, I think you may end up by emasculating your programmes, and thereby reducing, rather than increasing efficiency.

For example, one of the tests of efficiency in a business is to compare inputs with outputs. Now how do you compare inputs with outputs in a welfare programme? That sort of method is liable to end up with a welfare programme that is of no benefit at all to the people who are supposed to be the beneficiaries. There has been actually too much application already of that narrow, truncated version of efficiency to government policies.

I am always alarmed when I hear suggestions for applying the canons of business efficiency to the business of government. I think everything possible should be done to make government efficient, both at the administrative and at the policy levels, but I think it has to develop its own canons of efficiency, in relation to its aims and objects which are, or at any rate should be, much greater and broader than those of any private business.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn to the other side of the work of The Treasury Department, and that is to the revenue side, the taxation side. I have on a number of occasions in this House called attention to what I consider to be the disturbing trend, both in Ontario and in Canada, of shifting the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor. I am not going to go into that now. I have stated my position on it in the Budget debate, which I think is a relevant place to state it. I have stated it on other occasions where it appeared to be relevant. I think hon. members, or at any rate, those who are interested are familiar with my argument, and I will not go into it any further here.

I would, however, like to refer to certain problems that arise in relation to the collection of taxes, which in my opinion intensify this trend towards the shifting of the burden of taxation to the poor.

One of the problems in the collection of taxes is to develop an efficient system that collects all the taxes that are properly payable. There are a great many loopholes in the administration of our taxation through which many taxpayers escape. Of course, these are always the rich taxpayers. The poor man, he pays his taxes right to the last nickel. If it is a matter of sales tax he obviously has no escape from that and sales tax bears particularly heavily on him. If it is a matter of income tax, he has no escape from that either, it is deducted at the source before he even gets his hands on the money. Frequently, more is deducted than is actually payable by him. Some time later when he puts in a form, he will get a rebate from the government without, of course, any interest. The government pays him no interest for using his money completely involuntarily as far as he is concerned, for a period that ranges up to more than a year. If too much is deducted at the source it is deducted throughout the course of the whole taxation year and some time during the course of the subsequent year, he gets a refund of that amount. But he never escapes, he pays everything that the law prescribes right down to the last nickel.

When we get further up the income scale, of course, this does not become nearly as ineluctable or as efficient a process as it is for the little fellow. This is a matter that I think is, or should be, of great interest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It is true that he does not, through his department, have anything directly to do with the collection of personal income taxes. His department does collect corporation income taxes

and when I talk about income taxes I am more or less including both. He does collect corporation income tax, but not personal income taxes. Nevertheless, he raises a substantial amount of revenue through personal income taxes. It happens that the federal government is good enough to collect those taxes for him, but any loopholes in the federal tax laws as far as personal income taxes are concerned that result in the loss of revenue to the federal government, also result in the loss of revenue to the provincial government. This is a matter that I think we have to be concerned with.

The holes in the tax barrel that have been bored by skilful lawyers and accountants in the pay of corporations and rich men have, over the years, been permitting an escape of revenues from that tax barrel that is getting to be a veritable torrent. When I am talking about the evasions, legal and otherwise, of the tax laws, I am not talking about small potatoes, I am talking about big money that has an influence on the capacity of the government to finance programmes. The loss requires it, indeed, to shift a considerable part of the burden to the small taxpayer.

There are two types of evasion that take place and I quite consciously call them both evasions. There is a wide range of legal evasions. We saw an example not long ago in the case of the Rt. hon. Robert Winters. He was badly in need of an extra hand-out from the federal government and quite legally he got a very large one, he escaped a large amount of taxation, personal income taxation, because of a little bit of legal trickery. We do not have to go into it, it was quite legal. This sort of thing is going on all the time.

Then we go beyond that type of evasion which, as the law now stands, is quite clearly legal into another field that is, if not illegal, at least questionable. I am talking about the area of entertainment allowances and expense accounts where large sums of revenue are lost to our taxation authorities because of practices that are little short of plain cheating. This is getting to be an epidemic in the business world. It hardly ever happens that two or three business men are gathered together than one of them orders some cocktails and an expensive meal and charges it up to the firm. And it occurs not only in small gatherings, but in large gatherings too. Cocktails and meals of the very best, everybody living high off the hog at the expense of the firm.

Apparently business transactions cannot be transacted without a few drinks and an expensive meal. A customer comes to town, you have to take him and entertain him all over town. No business transactions can be conducted, apparently, in our society any more without the participants getting their heads into the trough for free meals and free drinks.

Apart from the contribution that this practice makes to the alarming development of occupational alcoholism among the people concerned—and I may say that the addictions research foundation has been noting this trend over the years—apart from that, it means that the public Treasury is being cheated of a lot of money. What happens? When this is charged up to the firm, the firm pays no corporation income tax on it and the individuals who benefit pay no personal income tax on it. It is straight gravy for them, if I may put it that way, it is a straight bonus, income in kind, but it is not declared as such. They pay no income tax on it at all, and the government is losing a large and increasing amount of revenue as a result.

Mr. Letherby: The hon. member did not mention the striptease.

Mr. Bryden: I was going to leave that to the hon. member to tell us about, I thought he might know more about it.

An hon. member: Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. Bryden: However, that is sometimes involved too; I can remember an inquiry conducted in the United States a few years ago that found that one of the entertainment expenses charged up for business deals consisted of the services of call girls. I have no doubt that that is involved some of the time, but the normal sort of run-of-the-mill type of entertainment allowances are much less exciting than that. They just amount to payment for food and drink.

An hon. member: How about the teamsters union?

An hon. member: Either they or some other union.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I will say to the teamsters, that they have acquired some of the bad habits of North American business. I believe that they were properly thrown out of the official trade union movement, and I hope they will stay out, at least until their organization is cleaned up. It is undoubtedly true that Mr. Hoffa learned a lot from his business friends and he has imitated them with very great skill. He knows all their tricks just

about as well as they know them. I do not condone it one bit. If this sort of chiselling goes on in the trade union movement it is just as bad, in fact in my opinion worse than if it goes on in the business world. It think it is wrong any place. I do not see why it is necessary. I think the people involved are well-to-do people. If they want drinks and expensive meals and entertainment, they can well afford to pay for themselves. I decry the increasing trend towards this practice in business.

But I am talking of it now in terms purely of loss of revenue to the Treasurer of this province and to the Minister of National Revenue at Ottawa. It is leading to a large loss of revenue because the money should be declared as income by the recipients or, alternatively, it should not be permitted as a cost for the firm that is footing the bill. If a change of that kind were made in our tax laws and, more important, in the enforcement of our tax laws—this is where a lot of the difficulty arises—the amount of revenue obtained from the personal and/or corporation income tax could be substantially increased. I think it is time that there was a crack-down on this practice.

As a matter of fact, a few years ago, in the United States, the late President Kennedy indicated that he was going to crack down on it. I may say the business advisory council lowered the boom on him a little later and there was no crackdown. But during the period when it looked like there might be, there were the most piteous cries of pain from the entertainment industry and the catering industry—the expensive restaurants, the expensive shows. They claimed they would go out of business if people had to pay their own way into those places. No, they charge it up to the firm, and in charging it up to the firm, they are charging half of it up to the government.

The other half is also charged up to the people. They pay for it through the prices they pay. And who pays? The little fellow. The little fellow making $4,000 or $5,000 a year. The little fellow, who never gets to take his wife out for a nice expensive meal, without saving up maybe for three or four months to get the money. He pays for these guys to go and stick their heads into the public trough.

Apart altogether from the ethics of the matter, I am thinking of it in terms of the taxation revenue that is lost. I think it is time that we took steps to make sure that it is not going to be lost any more.

Another phase could be considered, namely the old swindle sheet, the expense account. The old fashioned type of swindling, where a fellow went to Montreal and put down on the expense account all sorts of things that he did not actually spend—he was allowed $10 for meals, so he put down $10 for meals even though he only spent $7.50. That sort of petty chiselling I suppose one can do nothing about. But it is going far beyond that now.

Senior business executives take joy rides all over the world and charge it up to the firm. They have a holiday in Europe. They call in on the European branch manager and say hello to him. That makes it a business trip, so the whole thing is charged up to the firm, and no tax paid on it either by the individual who receives the benefit or by the firm.

In fact, I have been told—I have not had the opportunity to investigate it, but I have been told—there are Canadian firms now which have small offices in Nassau and in various points in the Caribbean, just so that the winter holidays of the senior executives can be charged to the firm. They go down to Nassau or to Ocho Rios, or one of those places, look in at the local office and charge the thing up to the firm on their expense account. So again, the income tax, both at the corporation level and at the individual level, is evaded. For the benefit of people who are well able to afford their own trips to the Caribbean or to the Bahamas. There is absolutely no reason at all why they should not pay their own way and pay their taxes in the same way as other people who are not in the position to get that sort of benefit for themselves. Even the Cabinet Ministers of the province of Ontario are getting into this travelling act.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What about the private members getting all those dinners?

Mr. Bryden: Last summer I read so often about hon. Ministers of the Crown being over in Europe visiting the Pope and seeing the sights of Montmartre, and that sort of thing, that I decided finally I would like to know how many of them had been tripping around. So I put a question on the order paper asking about this matter. It happens the answer was handed down today. I asked the question actually in terms of Europe, the Caribbean and Mexico and other points outside continental North America. I did not ask about trips to Miami, Chicago or New York, or prosaic places like that; I asked only with respect to trips outside of continental North America. There must be something the matter with the people down in Mexico, because none of the

hon. Ministers got down there at all during this past year, apparently.

There was, however, a veritable parade of them over to Europe, headed by no less than the hon. Prime Minister himself. Some of them also got around to Asia and Australia and Africa. The hon. Minister of Transport showed his capacity as a transportation expert by taking in, in one trip, Tokyo, Munich and England. So I do not know how you classify that one. In total, about 11 hon. Ministers were involved. I do not know what is wrong with the other peasants over on the Treasury benches there, but about 11 of the hon. Ministers made the grade. Together, the cost to the people of Ontario was about $31,000, just for their personal trips.

The hon. Attorney General took a trip to the meeting of the Commonwealth Laws Association in Australia. I think the meetings of lawyers are usually referred to as bar conventions, and I am told with very good reason. But this one must have been a real humdinger, Mr. Chairman. The cost of sending the hon. Attorney General, looking after him while he was there and fetching him back here was $5,387.24. This is more money than most of my constituents see in a year. The hon. Provincial Secretary seems to be a bit of a piker; he went to Australia, too, and it only cost him $2,100.

Mr. Letherby: He paid his own fare.

Mr. Bryden: While I am on this, I should call attention, Mr. Chairman, to one notable example of self-denial. The hon. Minister of Mines made a trip to Europe and the total cost as shown by the answer was $189.65. I assume he went by cattle boat and stayed in youth hostels while he was there. At any rate, that is the amount shown in the answer that was given to me today.

I will not proceed with this any further, Mr. Chairman. The answer is now in the hands of the Clerk and I suppose will be published in *Hansard* tomorrow.

I may say I asked it as one question, but the government gave it to me as, I think, 12 different answers. They did not even take the trouble to total up the amounts for me. However, the individual figures by hon. Ministers were there.

One thing that always surprises me, Mr. Chairman—and I am not now necessarily talking about the Cabinet, I am talking about the practice generally that I have been referring to—is that it is always necessary to take business trips to Europe in the summertime and to more salubrious climates in the wintertime. I do not know how it is that the business always seems to work out that way, but that is almost always the case.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Good management!

Mr. McKeough: Good planning!

Mr. Bryden: That is planning, says the hon. member for Kent West. That is about the only planning the government seems to engage in.

However, Mr. Chairman, when I see a businessman or anyone else going to Jamaica in August, I am prepared to believe that he is on a genuine business trip. But when I see him going in February, I have considerable doubt about it.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Like taking coals to Newcastle.

Mr. Letherby: I wish they would send me on one of those jaunts.

Mr. MacDonald: They know better.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, my reference to the answer tabled this afternoon was, I have to confess, a bit of a digression, and not in accordance with my original announcement that I intended to make comments strictly relevant to this department.

However, I think everything until that point was strictly relevant; it is of the greatest importance as far as I am concerned. All this waste—and that is what it is, in terms of entertainment and expense allowances, high-class trips to Europe, and so on—is ultimately charged up to the little man. Half of it is charged up to the government right off the bat, and comes back on the little man. The other half is charged up to him by another route. He who has to pay every copper of his own taxes could not dream of taking a trip to Europe, except perhaps by saving his pennies for 15 years. He pays for the trips for all these other people, too.

I think personally it is time a stop was put to it. I think a stop would be put to it if we would put some teeth into our taxation laws, enforce them and eliminate these phony expense and entertainment allowances. This would also mean a substantial amount of revenue to the government. It does not matter what happens. If you discouraged the trips, then you would get the money because more corporation tax would be payable. If the trip took place, then it should be charged up as income to the person concerned, and you would get the revenue through the income tax.

Whichever way you do it, it would improve the position of both the hon. Provincial

Treasurer here, and of the federal Treasury. With the obvious need for economy in the spending of government funds, and with the obvious need for economy in the collection of funds, I do not think that we should continue to allow large volumes of tax money legitimately payable to pass through our hands in this manner.

Mr. Nicholson, when he was Minister of National Revenue, said that he was going to do something about this abuse, but I never did hear anything much about it after a few flurries in the newspapers. Nothing was ever done that I know of. The practice not only continues, it is getting worse all the time. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it ought to be stopped. I will not at this stage attempt to make any other comments on the Treasury department. It is a department that covers a wide range of activities. I suppose one could talk about a great many different subjects in dealing with its estimates. I have selected the problem of taxation as the main point in my lead-off remarks, because I think at the present time it is the most important problem we have to deal with that is relevant to the work of this department.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the hon. leader of the Opposition has left the House; I have to state, when he is not here, that I find it very difficult to think that the hon. leader of the Opposition is not keen enough to understand that the books of this province are not cooked. I cannot think that he is speaking in good faith—

Mr. Bryden: He got a headline, too, for that one.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He got a headline for it once, probably, but—

Mr. Sopha: He always gets a rise out of you!

Hon. Mr. Allan: He did not get any rise out of me tonight, but I am very sorry, since I have a high regard for the leader of the Opposition, to hear him make a statement that is as stupid as that.

Mr. Sopha: Do you not budget for a surplus?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have stated many times in this House that any surplus that appears is a surplus on ordinary expenditure, and after having taken the surplus, we accept the few odd dollars—less than $1 million—that exist as a result of the revenue exceeding ordinary expenditure and that is applied on capital account.

Mr. Sopha: That is cooking the books.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is not cooking the books; that is applied on capital account and the shortage, or the deficit, is the amount that the revenue does not provide to cover the cost of capital expenditures. Now if that is cooking books, I—

Mr. Thompson: You cook the books.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am very sorry that you are not man enough to admit the truth as far as this thing is concerned; I am very sorry.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to say that I am man enough, and I will not admit to this kind of threat from the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, it is only an indication of your intelligence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, as I witness the effort of the leader of the Opposition, it reminded me of the elephant that strained and strained and strained and brought forth a mouse.

Mr. MacDonald: It was even a borrowed mouse.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. members of this House know that the expenditures of this government are watched very closely and I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine because I believe he was sincere and I agree entirely with his statement—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this is about the third personal remark that the hon. Provincial Treasurer—and he usually does not do this sort of thing—has made. His last one was when he said that he does not think that the hon. member—

Mr. McKeough: What is the point of order?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am rising on a point of order, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer suggested that the hon. leader of the Opposition was not sincere; I think that that remark should be withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I object to the statement in this House that I cook the books.

An hon. member: That is right, yes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is a personal—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I was assuming that the hon. Provincial Treasurer was not suggesting that I was insincere. May I ask him was it his suggestion that I was insincere?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Thompson: Were you suggesting that I was insincere by emphasizing that the hon. member for Woodbine is sincere, with the reference being that you are leaving me out—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, by way of explanation—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would ask the members of the House to deal with the vote before us and, if possible, refrain from personalities, please.

The Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Allan: As I was about to say, I am in complete agreement with the hon. member for Woodbine—

Mr. Bryden: With what I said about taxes?

Hon. Mr. Allan: With what you said about the work of the Treasury board and especially the staff of the Treasury board. This is so, and there has been very great progress made in the dealings with the estimates. Although some of my hon. friends opposite have doubts that I am sincere when I say I listen to everything that the public accounts committee offer in the way of remarks and advice, so perhaps I might give you this bit of information to show you that I listen very attentively—

Mr. Singer: And with sincerity.

Hon. Mr. Allan: —and with sincerity. In connection with the format of the estimates —and this is what was being discussed—I should like to state that the standing committee on public accounts has made some excellent recommendations in this area.

In the first place they requested that the number of individual votes be increased. An examination of the estimates of the various departments will reveal that this has been carried out. In the estimates of Treasury department, we have increased the number of votes by two, and have shown much greater detail in respect of proposed expenditures of the Treasury board division, the accounts division, the finance division and the revenue division.

In the second place, the public accounts committee suggested that the estimates should include, in addition to the proposed expenditure for the forthcoming fiscal year, the following: the approved estimate for the last completed fiscal year, the actual expenditure for the last completed fiscal year, the approved estimate for the current fiscal year.

Now, as I pointed out to the committee when I appeared before them on March 1 of this year, it is difficult to provide meaningful comparisons when the range and scope of government services are expanding and improving rapidly from year to year and when at the same time, the format of the printed estimates is changing from year to year, partly as a result of recommendations submitted by that committee.

This problem may be illustrated by comparing the estimates for my own department this year with those of 1965-66. Last year the Treasury board expenditures were included in general administration. This year they are shown in a separate vote. The savings office now forms part of the finance division where as in 1965-66, it was shown separately. In 1965-66 the securities branch was included under the accounts division. As a result of an organization improvement, it is now in the finance division.

We are aware of the desirability of making the estimates as full of significance as possible for the hon. members, and we will continue our efforts in this regard. In fact, a study is now under way to determine the feasibility of presenting the estimates to the Legislature in what is called a programme form. I have here a mock-up of the way in which estimates might be presented in a programme form with an explanation opposite the various votes. Under this system, which is gaining increasingly wide acceptance in other jurisdictions, a description of each programme is shown in the estimates, together with the pertinent cost information. Without going into detail at the present time, let me say that the programme budget emphasizes the ends to be achieved and translates them into the cost required for the accomplishment of those ends.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, too, that the remarks which were made concerning the consideration of the estimates—and I am afraid that I have gained the impression latterly that in the consideration of the estimates in the House, we are getting away from the consideration of the estimates; that is, there

are very few questions asked regarding the amounts of money or how it is spent.

Mr. Thompson: You do not tell us.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We are not asked.

Mr. Thompson: Well, why is it not put down—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am endeavouring to inform the House—

Mr. Thompson: In New Brunswick, there is—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Oh, sit down!

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister does not tell me to sit down. Let me make that clear. The House leader does not start running this place.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister should just restrain himself.

Mr. Chairman: The Provincial Treasurer has the floor and we should listen to his reply now.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Right, and show a little courtesy.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister had better not tell anybody to sit down—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: A little courtesy!

Mr. Sopha:—not in this House, this is a democracy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that I am afraid the temptation to make speeches overbalances the more desirable action of studying the estimates. Personally, I am very anxious to explain any votes that are in any of the Treasury estimates and that is why I am here, to explain.

Mr. Sopha: Was the Provincial Treasurer here last night?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: We asked question after question of the Minister of Transport and got no answers, he had to look it up.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He gave you answers.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to answer any questions to the best of my ability. I am anxious that you give these estimates consideration and I will do everything I can to co-operate.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer about an economic report prior to the estimates; to give some clarification about why you have decided on certain estimates? I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer will admit to me that he has far more to go on in deciding whether he will pass estimates, whether the Treasury board will pass estimates of a department, than we have in this Legislature. I have mentioned some of the background by which the Treasury board decides if it is going to approve a department's estimates. One of the first things that is there—

Mr. Chairman: Will the leader of the Opposition permit an interruption at this time? I think we have finished with our lead-off speeches and if you do not mind we will start with our vote numbers at this time, and 2201 is before us at this time.

Mr. Thompson: It is on this vote. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. Why does not the Minister put some form of an economic review, which he himself gets, either in the estimates or before the Budget?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, there is an economic review before the Budget. The chief economist prepares an economic review and it is included in the Budget speech.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask, is this related to the Budget? Let me ask two questions. First, is that the economic review which the Treasury board gets? Or is it a different one?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The Treasury board sees the review and that has an influence on the size of the Budget, that is, the amount of money that it is decided to ask for and the extent of the expenditures. I would agree that I have had the benefit of that which everyone has not had, but as I state again, I think it is my responsibility to explain anything that is in these estimates.

Mr. Thompson: Surely, Mr. Chairman, is this not the very crux of the thing? The Minister is saying that the Treasury board has an economic review which the rest of the Legislature does not have. And the purpose of the economic review is in order that you can assess the size of the estimates. Are we not entitled—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The overall estimates.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, but there are individual estimates as well. Why should not the Legislature be permitted to have the same review?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The economic review does not affect the individual estimates as such.

Mr. Thompson: I look to the hon. Minister as a very competent man, and I would feel that one of the things that would affect each individual estimate is an overall review that he has of the economic picture. Certainly it would. You are not going to ignore that economic review and just—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not in the estimates as a whole.

Mr. Thomson: Mr. Chairman, all I simply say is that as my hon. colleague has said, for example, if the economic review is saying that there should be more housing why should not the Opposition, indeed the people of Ontario, be entitled to know what that economic review said? Why should it be kept in the dark secret corners of the Provincial Treasurer's office?

Hon. Mr. Allan: There are no dark secret corners.

Mr. Thompson: Well, we do not see it.

May I ask my second question? As far as co-operation with the federal government is concerned, the hon. Minister admitted that the province, this wealthy province, could be having contrary influences in fiscal policy, in methods of taxation and methods of public work to that which the federal government might prescribe. I ask actually what are the concrete discussions that take place between the federal government and the Treasurer relating to the harmony between the two budgets?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that there is the greatest co-operation between the federal government and ourselves. A continuing committee sits regularly between conferences and, of course, the tax structure committee meets on certain occasions. We endeavour to work together. I would have to tell hon. members that the federal government does not tell us what they are going to do by way of taxation when the next Budget is brought down, but there is, I think, full co-operation between the federal government and ourselves in this area, as far as possible.

Mr. Thompson: The federal government does not tell you, and I presume you do not tell the federal government what your Budget is going to be. I can understand that there is obviously a certain amount of confidence which you have to maintain with respect to your own Budget, as the federal government does. But I could not help thinking that with your Budget, this last Budget, it seemed to me that you did have an emphasis in public works despite the fact that the hon. Minister of Public Works is going to hold back to some extent and is using rented quarters. You are spending $40 million for example, on the extension here—the Ryerson Institute. You are spending a great deal of money on that and the centennial. I just mention three.

On the other hand, in the federal government there is a slow-down with respect to a number of public works. Was there any discussion about slowing down on your public works programme?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, there was discussion. Now, we want to be sort of reasonable and sensible about this discussion.

The complex you mentioned was begun before the real shortage of skilled labour became apparent. Naturally you cannot stop that in the middle of it, but our Department of Public Works has been letting tenders at a slower rate than they would do otherwise. I remember looking over a report of the building programme of the federal government and the building programme of our own, and the federal government's building programme had increased by a greater percentage than had ours. But we have been withholding contracts of buildings that would have been underway because we do want to co-operate with the federal government.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, what puzzles me is the theory behind these budgets. Does the government have a theory, or do they just produce a booklet that has a bunch of figures in it? Are you trying to achieve any economic purpose with your Budget? Are you trying to give the economy a boost, or are you trying to slow it down again? Are you trying to hold it on the level?

This information surely must be before the Treasury board when you come to your decisions, and when you bring your Budget before us. Surely the people of Ontario should have some idea of what your objects are other than the platitudes we get all the time about having a greater Ontario.

Now, this is fine. We all believe in a greater Ontario. But you have at your command a most important weapon that can affect the lives of all the people of the province of Ontario, and very probably affect the

lives of all the people of Canada, and how you use it, and the judgment with which you use it, is most material. But we do not get that information.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure you remember that when Mr. Diefenbaker took over as Prime Minister, he went into either the economic files or the Treasury files and discovered some secret report with some prediction about what was going to happen. He stood in the House of Commons and said: "I have in my hand a document which proves that you fellows who preceded us do not know what you were doing." Surely to goodness, that sort of advice, whether accepted or not, is made available to my friend the hon. Provincial Treasurer and to his colleagues on the Treasury board? To enable us to understand these estimates, to enable us to understand these figures, surely it makes good sense that we know what direction you are trying to move in? When you are asking for $2 billion, it is an awful lot of money in this country. When you are spending $2 billion, you are going to affect the lives of every person in the province, and the lives of most of the people in Canada. Your effect of raising taxes, borrowing and spending is going to effect our whole economy. Surely we are entitled to know in Ontario, in this Legislature, in which direction you are attempting to move?

What are you trying to do with this Budget? What are your theories? What advice do you get? What advice are you accepting? Perhaps you will not tell us what advice you get, that is your privilege. But what advice you are accepting, and with what ideas in mind do you bring in your Budget?

As my hon. leader said, it is important to the economy that the Ontario housing corporation build and buy more houses, or should that be decelerated this year? Is it important to the economy that because of the number of schools that are being built all around the province, this is where we concentrate our efforts? Should we concentrate them on highways? Or should we withdraw government efforts and slow down for a bit and let the private sector do certain things?

We want to hear from you, and are entitled to hear from you, the theory on which you present a Budget, unless we are to come to the conclusion that this book of 146 pages is nothing more than a collection of figures designed to tell us no story.

Mr. Bryden: Of course that is all it is.

Mr. Singer: My friend from Woodbine says of course that is all it is. Well, it is not nonsense about cooking the books. We can go into that one. It seems to bother my friend, so we will leave it. The point has been established.

Mr. Bryden: I will say that when I criticize the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I try to be at the points that are relevant.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am not through yet. I think we are not only entitled to, we must know the direction in which the province intends to move through this very important document. We must know the reason for which the hon. Provincial Treasurer comes to the conclusion that we need all of this money. But it really does not mean very much in the broad sphere of things. I open the book at random, and in vote 907 of The Department of Labour, whether or not the travelling expenses for the human rights commission is $9,000 or $9,500. That is not the issue. The issue is: In what direction is government attempting to move? We do not get that information from you, sir; you have never given it to us, and this is the plea that we are making tonight. To properly budget, you should tell us and the people of Ontario what you are trying to do with this budget.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, this budget was prepared with the very greatest care to keep the expenditures as low as was possible, having regard for the state of the economy.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad to see my friends on the Liberal benches for the first time, in my memory in this House, trying to get at the government from the point of view of the overall planning of its budget. It is a matter that I have been raising for years.

Mr. Thompson: So have we.

Mr. Bryden: But I do not ever remember the Liberal Party raising it. They used to scream for years about how we were going head over heels into debt. That was their line for the longest time. When that became a little out of date, they got on to the next line, which was cooking the books. But in terms of trying to get at basic economic policy in this province, I cannot remember them ever having anything to say about it.

I will not say that there have never been any occasions. There may have been, but I think that the questions that were raised by the hon. member for Downsview, which the hon. Provincial Treasurer does not want to answer, can nevertheless be answered very simply. The government has a good procedure in administrative terms, but it has no basic policy at all nor any overall policy.

What happens is that the various programme departments bring in their demands for money, and on the basis of the economic forecast made by The Department of Economics, the Treasury people make an estimate of revenues for the coming year.

The demands of the programme departments are added up. I have no doubt that invariably they are a lot more than the estimates of revenues. So the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the Treasury board work away at them until they get them within about $100 million of the forecast revenues. I mean $100 million in excess. The hon. Treasurer usually forecasts a deficit of $100 million or so. This has never alarmed me. It has always alarmed my friends to my right here, but it has never alarmed me.

It usually ends up that he has underestimated his revenues. This has been especially true in the past few years. Since we were in quite a bouyant period, revenues have been higher than anybody figured every year, so that his deficit—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That was not unexpected, as things turned out, that they had been underestimated.

Mr. Bryden: You did underestimate your revenues, and as a result, you overestimated your deficits in the past few years.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: But that is what it amounts to. It is an exercise in arithmetic.

The programme departments have plans within their terms of reference. I do not think there has ever been the slightest indication of any overall planning in the provincial government. The only overall planning is merely a summation of various individual programmes and an equation of them to anticipated revenues. There is no evidence that I have ever seen that the government ever considers the impact of its budget on the economy, or considers it too seriously. I raised this matter with the hon. Minister of Public Works. I asked him for a policy statement on behalf of the government in relation to public works, construction generally and the impact of provincial government construction upon the total picture. We got nothing from him and we have never had anything from the hon. Provincial Treasurer on these matters, I do not think we ever will have anything from them, because I just do not think that they think in those terms.

Unfortunately, the federal government does not think in those terms to any significant degree, either. It tinkers away with fiscal policy to a limited degree, and that is about it. The provincial government does not really pay very much attention to what the federal government is doing in the field, although I do not recall it doing anything that could be said to have undermined any limited efforts the federal government might be undertaking. The federal government, which has the main responsibility in the field, has done very little. I suspect that it has never consulted the provincial government in the realm of even fiscal planning, much less of general economic planning. I doubt if it has ever made such a proposal to the provinces, although I think it would be sensible for all levels of government to co-operate as far as they can in deciding what objectives we wanted to achieve, what level of employment we wanted, and so on, and the methods of achieving them. I think all this would be desirable, but I do not think that it has ever been tried and the result is obvious.

We continue to bounce up and down in the trade cycle as we have always done. It is not as bad as it used to be before World War II because we now have a great variety of income maintenance programmes which act as stabilizers in the economy. These were all resisted by our salaried and monied people as they were introduced, but they are there and they have been of genuine economic benefit as well as of social benefit. They tend to level out the trade cycle, but we still bounce up and down with it and I see no evidence at either the federal or provincial levels of any concerted government effort to level out the cycle and to try to work toward some sort of a programme of continuous controlled expansion.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I may say to the hon. member—and I think that he will agree with this, that our government is not in a position to have any great control over the economy, as a whole, in the country and even in the province.

Our public works programme and our highways programme are the two construction programmes and these may be varied slightly, but it is impossible to vary them to an extent great enough to have what you might call an impact upon the economy.

With respect to the other expenditures—for instance, it is easy to have figures to lead one astray in his thinking—I think it was the hon. leader of the Opposition who mentioned tonight what percentage of the

money that was voted was voted in the last few days of the session. Well, supposing the school grants were included in that—the school grants are around $500 million, and grants that are determined not by what is done in the Legislature here but by the grant schedule that is set up. So much of our expenditures are set, as it were, and although I listen tonight to my hon. friends opposite and hear them say how we should cut back in times like this— and yet, if my recollection is correct, we have been criticized for not spending enough.

Mr. Bryden: The Liberals criticize you for going into debt.

Mr. Sopha: My friend, the hon. member for Woodbine, one would often think with more than a certain measure of conceit, if not arrogance and self-righteousness, makes the didactic assertion that the Liberal party suddenly began to make reference to the method of budgeting adopted by The Treasury Department. As long as I have been in this House—now seven sessions—I remember perennially both the former leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bruce and others, time and time again making reference, and I am thinking particularly of one rather lengthy speech—and I do not criticize the length—made by the hon. member for Bruce, into which a great deal of research went. I recall the preparation of that speech in which he attempted to expose for the hon. Provincial Treasurer, the method of underestimating revenue so that there would be a surplus in the ordinary account, to which my friend, the hon. member for Woodbine has just referred, and I was rather surprised tonight, indeed, I was, after my good friend from Bruce—and he is a good friend of the Treasurer—had said these things three or four or five years ago.

Then suddenly, as if by delayed action, the hon. Provincial Treasurer raised his hackles tonight and demonstrated a very great sensitivity to a charge that has been made perennially. The phrase "cooking the books" at least has a beard that is four or five or six years old in this House; and the fuse set off by the hon. Provincial Treasurer tonight is indeed delayed action.

Now to pass on to the personality of Professor Schindeler; we apparently discovered Professor Schindeler. I do not know the man and I would not know him if he hit me with a baseball bat on the street. I just have no knowledge of him at all and that seems to bother the hon. member for Woodbine who calls him "my good friend, Fred Schindeler."

Mr. Bryden: He is a good friend of mine.

Mr. Sopha: "My good friend." Well, if there is evidence, there is evidence that Mr. Schindeler, sir — Professor Schindeler — Dr. Schindeler, if he was awarded his Ph.D—is a member of the New Democratic Party.

An hon. member: No, no!

Mr. Sopha: I saw a press report of a small item about some meeting of the NDP and the guest speaker was Professor Doctor Mr. Schindeler, and I drew that inference.

Mr. Thompson: He went to teach them, I think.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, he went to teach them; I am glad to hear that. I hope they all learned something from him because from what my leader reads to the House, as he has on a couple of occasions, he is a man who is gifted with a very deep insight, I would say, and he discovered some of the secrets of maladministration in this government and has put them down to paper and that very reputable institution, the University of Toronto—my university, which does not flail Ph.D's around like coupons from a cornflakes box, I hope—awarded him his doctorate for the exposé of which he has been the author.

Now, to turn to a specific item in these votes, and that is item 6. There is nothing, really, to quarrel about in the first five, so far as I am concerned. I am rather surprised, though. I see in passing, the expenses for federal-provincial conferences is budgeted at $10,000 and at the end of fiscal 1965 they had only spent $5,600 in change.

That surprises me and it enthuses me and it increases my optimism, because the entourage that they take with them—the veritable army that descends upon Ottawa where it is held yearly. Well, perhaps the federal government is the host and they pick up the tab; I do not know, but maybe they do—

An hon. member: Charged to other departments.

Mr. Sopha: Charged to other departments. Oh, yes I see; this is only for the Treasury contingent.

Mr. Bryden: They use it for perquisites.

Mr. Sopha: I am not going to tarry. I am going to go on to item 6 and at the end of fiscal 1965, we had spent the handsome sum of over $300,000 on this committee on taxation. And there is an item of $135,000 budgeted in these estimates, a portion of which of course, will go to the expenses of the

Smith committee. Part of it, if it ever reports, will go to the printing of its report.

Perhaps, whether it reports is a matter of a very sore point with a good many people in this province who hold responsible political positions—and I refer especially to elected municipal politicians, many of whom have been brought to a very anxious state concerning the financial help of their communities for reason of the oft-repeated reply, or statement of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that we cannot do anything about municipal finances until the Smith committee reports — and bouncing off the walls, ricochetting off the walls in this bill being here while we hear various dates as to when it is going to report. The select committee on mining was told, and we were concerned about it, that we might expect the report towards the end of April. Well, April has gone off the calendar, May is just about done, and there is no sign of the Smith committee report yet. Then the other assertion made is that the Smith committee cannot report until the Carter committee reports. It is a sort of a little game, if you will pardon a little bit of bilingualism, "Après ous, mon cher Gaston," "Mais non, après vous, mon cher Aphonse."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, is that parliamentary language?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, all of it is parliamentary. And, particularly in the mining municipalities. Now I am happy to report that the mining municipalities, those that get mining revenue payment out of this government, they are met with that standard reply from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs about this committee. But I am optimistic, on this night, because never in my own community has there been such a concerted co-operative onslaught by so many responsible groups of people on the government about the mining revenue payments. The Prime Minister has graciously set aside the afternoon of June 10 to see a very responsible group from Sudbury about the problem. Now, it is interesting to note that this business of delaying the report, and after all let us get it on record that the Smith committee finished its hearings a long time ago. In fact, I may be safe in saying—and I will stand to be corrected—that all of the hearings of briefs and presentations were completed during calendar 1964; certainly the brief of the association of mining municipalities was presented in the early spring of 1964 to that committee. My friend from Woodbine says they had a lot of research to do. That is probably true, but surely with the staff and the very handsome sum at their command, they might have completed the report at this time or the government might be urging them to complete it. If there is any truth at all to the fact that they are waiting for the Carter commission to report, for my own part I do not see that as a valid excuse for delaying the report at all.

The Carter committee has extremely wide terms of reference, dealing with the whole of Canada. Comparatively speaking, the terms of reference of the Smith committee are very narrow and confined to financial matters, taxation, revenues and expenditures within our own government. I took the trouble to see how long the Porter commission took; it reported fairly quickly. It did not hear a lot of briefs; a lot of them were presented in written fashion with no oral presentation as I look over the list. But the chief justice who chaired that committee, which is having its impact in the House of Commons right now, or will be shortly with the banking legislation, managed to get through a very complex and abstruse subject in a very moderate amount of time. This has not bothered other jurisdictions, this business of waiting for another report. I am assuming that that category is correct. The New Brunswick Royal commission on finance and municipal taxation, the Byrne commission, reported in early 1964. Several of its recommendations are being carried out by that very enlightened government under that very dynamic young man, Louis Robichaud. The Manitoba Royal commission on local government and finance reported in mid 1964. The Saskatchewan Royal commission on taxation reported in the fall of 1964; no doubt those governments have the benefit of the recommendations of experts and are in the process of carrying those recommendations into legislation.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Quebec has reported.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you very much. You will recall that the Quebec commission has reported. I say courteously to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that the public affairs of this province would necessitate that he say to the Smith people: "You have expended $300,000 of our money; now we want to see in really solemn formal fashion what we are going to get for our money. Let us have a report so we can examine it and we can correct inequities where they exist, improve our method of finances, adjust our taxation, if we, the government responsible

for these things through the public, and politically liable for the decision, see fit to agree with your recommendations." In the meantime, communities like mine are suffering. I think there is no question about that. I would not expect some of the lesser ministers who are not on the Treasury board to have much knowledge of these things, but even the Treasury board, I think, realizes that the mining municipalities are not getting a fair shake. There is going to be some adjustment before this Parliament or this Legislature is over, I would hope. We have had a ten per cent increase in taxation this year in Sudbury. Public school supporters suffer less than separate school supporters. The burden on separate school supporters has become almost intolerable. It will be intolerable, I say on their behalf, unless there is a substantial increase in wages at Inco and Falconbridge. I do not want to intervene in the bargaining and conciliation, but I would think that there will have to be a substantial increase in wages at Inco and Falconbridge or they will just be unable to support the tax burden that they have to bear. I want to progress to item 8. I say nothing about the vote to the St. John ambulance association, which does tremendously creditable work. People make many personal sacrifices of their leisure time in order to be in a position to go to the need and succour of those who are stricken, particularly at public events. I was very pleased in my own community this weekend to see that they had their annual inspection of very fine people very well turned out. The community had the opportunity to see them in person and offer their respects for their contribution.

I want to deal with item 8, the Ontario society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, $20,000. When I was reflecting on this one I was thinking about the way in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture flails around money to various groups. We have the opportunity of public accounts this year to examine the grants that the Minister of Agriculture gives to small groups. Really, there is a startling array. I am not going to go into the details, but the Minister of Agriculture gives money away by way of grants for some of the oddest purposes and to some of the most exotic organizations. He even gives money away to fall fairs, if it rains before two o'clock, I believe it is, so as to interrupt the fair festivities in the rural areas.

In that light, I said to the Minister of Agriculture: "When you come to the Judgment Day and you stand before He who judges us all, you are never going to be faulted for lack of generosity." That will not be one of the sins that will descend upon his head. Then I compare that munificence, that benevolence in which he engages himself, with the $20,000 given to the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. Of course, that grant of $20,000 is, so to speak, given to the head office of that society, which is probably located in Toronto. The various offshoots of the head office in the other parts of the province, of course, do not get a cent. I do not have to stand in the presence of reasonable, intelligent people and go into a description of the important work that the society does in our community in being vigilant to prevent cruelty to our dumb friends.

An hon. member: Who is the member referring to?

Mr. Sopha: I wondered about that. Not all my dumb friends are animals; some of them are homo sapiens. But this refers to—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is not a homo sapien an animal?

Mr. Sopha: He is. This refers to the lower vertebrates, I say to my friend, the Minister of Labour.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The four-legged vertebrates?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, the four—well, the hon. Minister started that, he provoked me into that, and I am willing to retract it.

All right, now, I have a letter that I want to read into the record which shows the plight of people trying to struggle along in this important and very worthwhile, very creditable activity out in the provinces and the secretary of our local chapter, staffed by volunteers entirely—and you must realize as probably in the communities of all hon. members, that if they hear a report of cruelty to animals, they will often go at their own expense and make an investigation to see if the report is founded and then will take the necessary action, whether it be through the courts or making suggestions, giving advice, leading, coercing or anything else, to improve the treatment of the animals. He says:

> The Sudbury and district society for the prevention of cruelty to animals was granted a charter by the Provincial Secretary prior to the enactment of the Ontario humane society act.
>
> As you are well aware of the difficulties

of providing service, any kind of service, in northern Ontario, you can see that we are justifiably concerned over the predicament that we as a humane society, must face. When you consider the large area we must cover, Sudbury and district, and the higher wages offered to humane inspectors and staff in southern Ontario, the competition and obstacles almost totally negate the efforts of a conscientious society in the north.

To be frank and just, it is necessary to request assistance from the provincial government. The general public on the whole takes humane societies for granted and criticism is always aired indiscriminately. However, the bulk of the work and effort is left to a few dedicated people interested in humane work. We in the north are fully aware that the Ontario humane society receives a grant from the province to assist in their operation. In recent months a concerted effort to affiliate to the Ontario humane society was made by our board. However, because of conflicting policies, fruitful results did not occur.

Humane work is and has been conducted by the Sudbury district humane society here in the district of Sudbury but the time has come to face realities and we urgently request you do all in your power to assist us financially through the province.

Your efforts in this regard, etc.

Yours very truly,

R. Parisotto, Secretary.

Now, I merely say this to the hon. Treasurer, that it is a question of weighing values and making a determination in the light of the social policy to be advanced. He might look at it from the point of view of the various grants that the province makes. I feel confident that if he put this one in the scale and weighed it in that way, the grant to the humane society might well be very significantly increased from the $20,000 that appears in these estimates. In that regard, the amount spent—I notice in the fiscal year 1965—was the sum of $20,000, so it must be just the issuing of a cheque to the society.

On many occasions—and not always consistently, I am the first to say—we have referred to the grants to the Canadian standard bred horse society and the Canadian thoroughbred horse society, which I treat together. I am one who has opposed making these grants and I would gladly vote for the reduction of them to the sum of $1. I do not think in this enlightened age, that we are justified in the handing out of public money, to give the sum of $200,000 to people who can afford to own horses. Nobody forces an individual to own a thoroughbred or a standardbred horse, that is a matter of decision. They are owned for recreation mainly and if a person wants to be a skindiver, if he wants to ride a surfboard, if he wants to get a trailer and enjoy the great outdoors, that is his own business and we do not subsidize him in that regard.

Just because an individual or a group decide that their form of recreation will be the driving or the ownership of a horse, that is no good reason, there is really no rationale that the public purse should be used in any form of subsidy. Now, I am somewhat shocked to see that there is a significant increase in the amount estimated. In 1964-65, the amount actually expended was $80,781 to the standard bred horse society, $73,519 to the thoroughbred horse society. In 1965-66, we budgeted $70,000 for each of them, that is to say, items 8 and 9. This year the amount for the standardbred is increased to $120,000, an increase of $50,000, five-sevenths, 70 per cent increase. And one notes that the amount for the thoroughbred horse society goes up $10,000.

Now, I want to make this statement and I make it very carefully. I think it is in the public domain, it is a statement made in the public domain, and that is all it is. Frankly, I am bothered to see an increase of 70 per cent, to see so many members on that side of the House who are members of the Canadian standard bred horse society or are connected with standard bred racing. Who are they? The Minister of Public Works is one who racehorses, owns a number of them, some of them, I might say, not very good. There is one that brakes all the time on the track.

The hon. member for Scarborough East. Until recently the brother of the hon. member for Victoria, was also connected, but I understand that the member for Victoria has sold out his interest, and no longer has a financial interest, but the interest remains in the member for Scarborough East. The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich, sir—there is another who is a member of this group, these standard bred horsemen. I was told by a person upon whom I rely, that the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Windsor Sandwich took the hon. Treasurer on a little trip to the track last fall, at Mohawk. They took him on a little trip, and this informant said that when the hon. Treasurer went into the paddock area he knew all these standard bred people, it is "hello Jim, hello Bill, hello Don, hello Harry" all on a first-name basis.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Why should he not?

Mr. Sopha: I think in the public domain we are entitled to know. This is the expenditure of public money and we are entitled to know what representations, if any, at any time, have been made to the hon. Treasurer by members of the government side, that are connected with standard bred racing. We are entitled to know.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I can tell you now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He does not want to know.

Mr. Sopha: You will have an opportunity. We hear of a meeting that was held here last year, at which was present the former chairman of the racing commission, and a number of representatives of the standard bred people, at which big discussions were held about the attitude of the chairman towards standard bred racing. Tempers were not always kept at that meeting, it is said, in the way that the gentlemen usually keep their tempers.

Hon. Mr. Allan: What meeting?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I have that on good authority, that there was such a meeting held here last fall, or late last summer.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: A secret meeting?

Mr. Sopha: At which the chairman of the racing commission was present. There was a thorough discussion about standard bred racing. Frankly I repeat that I am bothered, and I say again, and I say on my own responsibility that with so many members on that side of the House that are connected with the sport—

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): How is your thoroughbred horse doing now?

Mr. Sopha: I do not like to see the increase of 7 per cent being made in the vote.

An hon. member: Do you own a thoroughbred horse?

Mr. Sopha: None that races.

An hon. member: What does it do?

Mr. Bryden: This is not for racing, it is for breeding.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. Minister of Public Works' horse does not race, he only goes through the motions.

Mr. Sopha: I know. Yes, I have a filly, out of a good mare that is not yet old enough to race and I do not know if she will ever race, but if she does, I do not want a cent of public money. I do not want a cent out of any grant from the public purse, such as is envisaged in votes eight or nine. I am saying to the hon. Minister of Public Works that these two votes should be eliminated entirely. There is no justice to give money from the public purse to the well heeled people, who have racing stables.

I do not know too many of the standard breds. The Armstrong Brothers, with that excellent three-year-old, is it Armbro Flight?

An hon. member: A good horse!

Mr. Sopha: Yes. And the money that that horse has earned means they do not need a grant. And the good chain of winners that they have had. I do not know many in the standard breds, but in the thoroughbred, Mr. Taylor, the Chris's of Kitchener, George Gardiner, the former president of the Toronto stock exchange, R. A. Dew, Mrs. Churchill Mann, the wife of Brigadier Churchill Mann, and a whole list, they do not need the public money. They will survive without it. They get along quite handsomely without it. The purses in thoroughbred racing of course, make the ones in standard bred racing look infinitesimal in comparison to the money that can be won by these people entering their horses at the track, from the purses. $75,000 from the Canadian championship; $50,000 added for the Queen's Plate; $25,000 added for the Niagara Handicap.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Think you will ever win one?

Mr. Sopha: Many $10,000 purses. Every day there is a $3,000 purse for allowance races and you might have one twice a week of that size at the standard bred.

If it is a matter of gain to them, then let them get their money by performance at the track, not performance on the stud farm, at the expense of the public as this $200,000 entails.

I think that is quite a reasonable proposition, and I am willing to defend that proposition any hour of the day or night and we will reserve to the vote of the racing commission to go into other details of this sport. But it is very apposite to treat of the expenditure of this money, and my friend from Scarborough West time and again points to areas involving humans and children, and those that are not as providentially endowed with the ordinary faculties of human existence like the

rest of us, where there is a need for money, to improve their conditions. In each case that he draws attention to, and the wide knowledge that he has of human suffering, then any—as The British North America Act uses the word—eleemosynary grant like this one might be used for the prior claim of the relief of human suffering first.

That is the first charge upon our revenue. And the moral demands of people who breed horses, be they standard bred or thoroughbred, in the scale of human value, come 10,000 rungs down on the 11,000-rung ladder. That is where they fit in the scale of human values. This is nothing more than a sop to a group of people who I sometimes think have more influence in this government than they deserve to have; and I have referred to the possible influence that several members of the House might have in that regard, and I repeat, we are entitled to an explanation.

Now, one final thing. My hon. friend from Woodbine referred to the junket to Australia of the hon. Provincial Secretary and frankly I say that ever since I read in the paper that he had gone, that that bothered me.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Attorney General was there. If the hon. Provincial Secretary was there, I do not know anything about that.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. They both went to the law conference.

Mr. Edwards: The hon. Attorney General was there for the province of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I wanted to ask the hon. Treasurer whether before the hon. Provincial Secretary—I can understand the hon. Attorney General going to the law conference, as he did—

Mr. Bryden: He went for $5,400 worth.

Mr. Sopha: He went for $5,400 and I make no criticism of that. He referred to that. But I understand the hon. Provincial Secretary went to the same law conference.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, are we considering the estimates of Treasury, or the Provincial Secretary?

Mr. Sopha: Well, there was nothing in the estimates of the hon. Provincial Secretary for the junket.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There is nothing in this either.

Mr. Sopha: Where does he get the permission to spend the money, I am asking; does he get it from the hon. Provincial Treasurer? That is a simple question. The hon. Provincial Treasurer said, "Ask me questions," and I am asking one.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is not in these estimates and I am not interested at this moment.

Mr. Sopha: Well, this is your department.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. Provincial Secretary is the man to have asked for that.

Mr. Sopha: There is a refusal to answer the question. I am asking politely where does the hon. Provincial Secretary get the authority for the warrant if it is not from the hon. Treasurer, for more than $2,000 that he spent in going—I do not know if he went with the hon. Attorney General, but I suppose he did.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, it will be answered. You can ask the hon. Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Sopha: I am not going to ask him.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: But it is certainly not the hon. Provincial Treasurer's responsibility.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am asking if the money came out of his department. It did not come out of the hon. Provincial Secretary's department.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The money came, I would presume, out of the hon. Provincial Secretary's department.

Mr. Sopha: That is where it came from. All right, that is the answer. Thank you. I wondered why my hon. friend for Woodbine raised it.

Mr. Thompson: Are you going to answer some questions?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Sudbury as far as the desirability of receiving the Smith report is concerned. I have urged the chairman of that committee to have the report available.

I think the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out to him the desirability of having the report presented as soon as possible and I can assure the hon. member that we are doing what we can do to have that report presented.

I would again point out to the hon. member when he again accused me of "cooking" the books, that the federal government, in

the estimate of the amount of money that we would receive through income tax collections, underestimated the amount by $36 million. Now it is for reasons such as this that I object to the term, "cooking the books".

Mr. Chairman, I would like to apologize to the hon. leader of the Opposition in saying that he was stupid—

Mr. Thompson: "Insincere"—that is another adjective you used—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, I do not mind the "insincere" part.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order—I do mind the "insincere" part. Surely a Minister is not to impute motives to you, and I ask that he withdraw—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You said he cooks the books.

Mr. Thompson: I am saying he did cook the books.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I ask that the hon. leader of the Opposition withdraw the statement that I cook the books.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is illegal.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would say this to the hon. Minister, if the fact that year after year he overestimates the amount of each department—and I have categorized that, I have shown that it is going as high as 1 per cent—that, first of all—

Hon. Mr. Allan: How about this $36 million?

Mr. Thompson: If the hon. Minister will tell me that it was because of an inability to plan that he, therefore, has always overestimated on the costs for each department up to 1 per cent when he brings this before the House, if it is because of his inability to forecast, then sir, I will say that he did not cook the books and if, on top of that, he can justify that year after year—apart from the estimates he wants us to approve—he goes outside the Legislature and asks for as much as $14 million through Lieutenant-Governor warrants, and so on. If he says that he is such a poor forecaster that he has to go for another $14 million, that he is so inaccurate, then I will say first, he says he has an inability to forecast, and secondly, that he cannot judge how much money he needs here, and he is going to the extent of $14 million. In this particular area, if he admits those two weaknesses, I will say that in those two areas he does not cook the books, but let him face it. This little idea of your little surplus over the years. The Treasurer before you, when we would bring this up—and as the hon. Minister has said, year after year we have brought it up; you know that wily smile on his face as though he knows that we know—and therefore I am not going to back down on something which we have said to you year after year. This has been a little play that you put on about your Budget.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Choice of language.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I can assure my hon. friend that the estimates were made as carefully and as wisely as it was possible to make them at the time. The statements that the hon. member makes are ridiculous, and show how little he understands.

Take, for instance, when we were nearing the end of last year and certain moneys were due from Ottawa on the school programme, whether it was $7 million or $1 million—for order was put through for—I have forgotten whether it was $7 million or $1 million—for working capital until the money came back from Ottawa—

Mr. Thompson: I accept that, but there are other votes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There is a large part of the $14 million.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, let me ask the hon. Minister this, then: Let me take—and I repeat this to you—the discrepancy that takes place, the excess of estimated over actual expenditure, and take from 1960. It was 10.3 per cent; in 1961, 9.1 per cent, and the next years 8.4 per cent, 10.8 per cent, 7.1 per cent and in 1964, it went down, I admit, to 4.1 per cent. The conclusions arrived at by someone—and I refer again and make no apology for referring to it—a man who has studied this closely and objectively and impartially, Professor Schindeler. He says:

> Of course, all these disrepancies may be simply the results of poor forecasting on the part of the department and the Treasury board, but the consistency of the pattern year after year would seem to suggest some other explanation.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Could I ask the hon. leader—

Mr. Thompson: Let me quote further. Do you mind if I just finish this?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, but you could clear up what you have already said. Did you say

that the expenditures were greater than the revenue?

Mr. Thompson: I am saying that when you bring the estimates before the House and ask us to pass on them, that you do not need all that money. Professor Schindeler points out that the excess of estimate over actual expenditure "year after year" averages something in the number of years between 1958 and 1962, of 9 per cent. Let me add to that that you have this in spite of the fact that the estimates have exceeded actual expenditures, an average of 8.1 per cent each year for the past five years.

The government has found it necessary to create and add new appropriations to an average amount of $14,793,519 in those same years. Now I would say that—

Hon. Mr. Allan: May I ask you a question?

Mr. Thompson: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Do you know, or does whoever he is—

Mr. Thompson: Dr. Schindeler.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Schindeler? Do you know, or does he know, that the money that is in the estimates cannot be used for other than the estimates for which it was provided?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Although that money was there, you could not use that in a place other than where the Treasury board orders it used.

Mr. Thompson: Surely, Mr. Chairman, do you not think it passing strange if—I refer to something else—my wife said: "Look at the amount of groceries this year; I want $100" and I find out year after year that all she needs is $30—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Do not get into that—

Mr. Thompson: All right. But what is the reason for this? Is it because at the end of the year you want to look thrifty? You come before us and say: "We did not use all the money." There must be some reason why you are so badly out, year after year after year.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We are not badly out.

Mr. Thompson: The other reason why you are so badly out is that in your needs at the end of the year, obviously you find that in the estimates that you have brought before the Legislature, either you have done this job so badly in asking for an amount and you suddenly find that you need as much as $14 million on an average a year, and you go and get it through Lieutenant-Governor warrants.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I thought I had explained to you—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He did not understand it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I guess the "stupid" stands.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider second readings and House in committee and the Budget debate, in that order.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Second readings of anything on the order paper, including the legal aid bill?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Second readings.

Mr. Singer: Is the hon. Attorney General planning to call the legal aid bill tomorrow?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): It is not certain that we will be able to give it second reading tomorrow; it may be possible, but I cannot assure the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I would hope that the hon. Attorney General would not. Then I might—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is not a question of rushing anything. If there is a reason for the bill being held, then that will be fine. There is no objection to that.

Mr. Singer: It is a very important bill—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are not trying to rush—never have and do not intend to!

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): There will be no estimates tomorrow, I take it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No estimates.

Mr. Bryden: Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, does the House leader know

if the hon. Prime Minister has been able to give any further consideration to the point I raised with him this afternoon about the estimates of the civil service department?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, he spoke to me about the matter and there is no date known to us when that report will be in. For my own part, I see no reason why the estimates should be held up on a matter which has to do with current negotiations. There is quite a separate principle involved in the matter before the judge than is contained in the estimates of that branch.

Mr. Bryden: What is before the arbitrators, Mr. Speaker, relates to about half the jurisdiction of the civil service department and we presumably are going to be precluded from discussing any of that subject matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, the Chairman's ruling at some earlier point was that if we did not have any decision by the time the estimates came down we would be free to exercise the normal right to discuss them here, and I submit to you that this is what we will do.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I missed that.

Mr. MacDonald: If the arbitration award is not down by the time the civil service estimates come before the House, we will be free to exercise our normal right to discuss them. In other words, the wraps are off. The wraps have been on up until now so that we would not have discussions in various estimates—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is right. And in making that decision, you would want, I assume, to take into account the commonsense aspect of it and the desirability of prejudicing the position of the civil servants or either side in those negotiations. I assume you would take that attitude.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the government might take into account the commonsense element that there is a good chance that this award will be made before this House adjourns. Now, why do we have to go ahead with those estimates when there are half a dozen others that could be proceeded with? That is not commonsense at all. I would—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am afraid we are getting into a debate on this subject now.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 126

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, June 1, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 1, 1966

Questions of Mr. Dymond re facilities for emotionally disturbed children, Mr. S. Lewis 4129
Question of Mr. Haskett re Sarnia heavy traffic bylaw, Mr. Thompson 4131
Question of Mr. Dymond re air pollution, Mr. Thompson 4132
Questions of Mr. Grossman re detention of juvenile offenders, Mr. Thompson 4132
Question of Mr. Rowntree re collective bargaining for nurses, Mr. Trotter 4132
Question of Mr. Wishart re coroner's jury verdict, Mr. Renwick 4133
Questions of Mr. Wishart re compensation for expropriated property, Mr. Renwick 4133
Statement by Mr. Roberts re Winisk river flooding 4134
Questions of Mr. Cecile re children's aid society ward, Mr. S. Lewis 4135
Question of Mr. Robarts re Bowmanville quarry development, Mr. MacDonald 4135
Charitable Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading 4136
Representation Act, 1966, bill intituled, Mr. Robarts, second reading 4136
Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading 4144
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading 4144
Department of Agriculture Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 4144
Edible Oil Products Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 4145
Abandoned orchards, bill respecting, Mr. Stewart, second reading 4145
Marriage Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading 4146
Artificial Insemination of Cattle Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 4146
Plant Diseases Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 4146
Weed Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 4146
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, second reading 4147
Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 4148
Municipal Franchises Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 4148
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading 4149
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading 4149
Local Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 4149
Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 4149
Confederation Centennial Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading 4149
Parks Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading 4150
Licensing and regulation of nursing homes, bill to provide for, reported 4150
Public Health Act, bill to amend, reported 4151
Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, reported 4151
Public Hospitals Act, bill to amend, reported 4151
Medical Act, bill to amend, reported 4152
Territorial Division Act, bill to amend, reported 4152
Private Sanitaria Act, bill to amend, reported 4152
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Boyer, Mr. Racine 4153
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Racine, agreed to 4166
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Allan, agreed to 4166

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, in the east gallery the following schools; Carrying Place public school, Carrying Place; and Clairlea public school, Scarborough.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West asked me a question yesterday, the answer to which I did not have, and undertook to get it for him today. The question was:

> Why has a 10-year-old Welland boy been committed to ward 4 of the Barton building, Hamilton Ontario Hospital, with 73 adult patients ranging in age to 90 years? Is the Minister satisfied that this is a desirable environment for such a boy? What alternate facilities within The Department of Health for such severely disturbed children are presently available in the Niagara peninsula area?

This boy was committed to the Ontario Hospital on the certificate of two doctors attached to the Welland mental health clinic who saw him independently, certified that he was mentally ill and recommended his admission to the Ontario Hospital.

He was admitted to the assessment ward of the hospital, a ward to accommodate 75 patients which, I am advised, is divided into cubicles. All patients on admission are admitted to what we refer to as the admitting ward and are kept there until the condition has been diagnosed, at which time they are allocated to the area best fitted to meet the needs of their illness.

Now, to number two, am I satisfied that this is a desirable environment for such a boy? It may not be the most suitable and desirable place for the continuing care and treatment of the patient but, as I have already pointed out, all patients are admitted first to the admitting ward of any hospital. It must be emphasized, however, that all decisions with respect to professional matters in the hospital are within the power and authority of the superintendent and his staff.

As stated on frequent occasions in this House, central office does not dictate procedure in any way in professional matters. This is left entirely to the judgment of the superintendent whose responsibility it is to manage and direct his hospital. In this case, the resources of the hospital have been available to assess the child's needs and on completion of this assessment when the diagnosis has been made if alternative arrangements are desirable, the boy will be transferred to that place best equipped to meet his needs.

The third part of the question; psychiatric services for adults and children living in the Niagara peninsula are currently provided by a psychiatric unit with an outpatient department at St. Catharines hospital, and an outpatient service in Welland. The Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, is a mental hospital serving the area. CPRI in London also serves this portion in southwestern Ontario.

I believe the hon. member added a question as to whether I would look into the committal procedures. There are three methods of admission possible, and these, of course, depend upon the judgment of the physician first seeing the patient. The boy could have been admitted informally. If he were at his home he could be admitted at the request of his parents. Since he was a ward of the children's aid he could have been admitted on their request. He could have been admitted in the way that any patient is admitted to any hospital, on what we call the certificate of one doctor. This is good for 30 days, but the doctors who saw this boy, apparently in their wisdom and judgment, decided that he should be committed in the formal way as laid down, or as provided for in the Act.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question,

but perhaps in view of the two other questions I added today it would be wise to have the hon. Minister answer these if I may ask them now. They are directly related.

One, since it has now been reported that there are 12 children, 16 years of age and under in Hamilton Ontario Hospital, will the hon. Minister consider a personal intervention on their collective behalf to find alternative placement; and, two: How many other children, 16 and under, are presently in the Ontario Hospital system exclusive of the hospital schools?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am advised by contacting the superintendent at Hamilton that there are 14 patients in the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, under the age of 16 at the present time. Only two of those are under the age of 15. Patients are placed in the accommodation most suitable to their needs. Special educational programmes, recreational and social activities and other particular attention is given to them. As already stated in reply to another question put by the hon. member and one which I have just answered, the admission of patients, regardless of age, lies within the authority and jurisdiction of the superintendent of the hospital. He may organize his hospital as, in his professional judgment, is best. He may chose to segregate patients according to age or any other standard. It is only expected by us that he exercise his prerogative in the best interests of the patients.

In view of this, and repeating that I believe it would be a great mistake for the department to dictate professional procedures, I am not considering any personal intervention. Indeed, yesterday, when the hon. member put his question and I discussed it with my psychiatrists at head office, I found that not one of them agreed with me when I suggested children should be from the very start put into a ward by themselves. Here is the difference in professional opinion. I thought that children should be segregated completely from the outset, but the psychiatrists whom I have on my head office staff did not agree with me. This, I think, explains in part what I am trying to put in formal language.

As I stated, in view of this I believe it would be a great mistake for the department to dictate professional procedures and I am not considering any personal intervention. I have complete confidence in the wisdom and judgment of the staff.

At December 31, 1964, the total number of children under age 15 in all hospitals for the mentally ill, excluding those in the Thistletown hospital, was 20. The figure for 1965 was 19, excluding those at Thistletown again, and in addition children placed in an assessment centre for the retarded which was established at the Ontario Hospital, Port Arthur. That was an additional unit established last year. The figures in that hospital are excluded. The total number was 19, so the average—

Mr. S. Lewis: Nineteen children, aged 16 and under?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right—15 and under; I was just going on to say that. Because the numbers are so small in the younger age group, our statistical records by age distribution are grouped in categories of under 15 years of age, and then between the ages of 15 and 24. This is standard procedure and therefore I am unable to provide for the hon. member the additional information as to the numbers of patients aged 15 and 16 in these institutions. Now, these are not our current statistics, Mr. Speaker, because I have not been able to contact every hospital in the province and find out the sum total, these are figures from our last annual report.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have two or three supplementary questions in relation to the questions I have asked. I can put them quickly.

Is the Minister aware that the superintendent of the Ontario Hospital has himself expressed the opinion that it is undesirable to have a child of 10 in the Ontario Hospital for such purposes? And, what particular attention can be given to children in the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, in view of the staff shortages which have been revealed in this House?

Third, when the Minister speaks of alternative continuing facilities, what does he have in mind in view of the fact that all present facilities as we know them have waiting lists? Is the department satisfied in its policy that 10-year-old children should be certified mentally ill by physicians in this province and consigned to such an institution?

And finally, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister think it would not make sense in view of the numbers involved, to have the government erect another centre, akin to Thistletown, to provide for just such numbers of children who are severely disturbed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not sure that I got all the questions, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the first question is no, I did not know the superintendent had thus expressed himself. I can say unequivocally, sir, he has not so

expressed himself to me. I would find it very difficult to understand why he should so express himself to others before he tells me, his so-called boss.

What attention to children in the Hamilton hospital because of the shortage? I think it should be made eminently clear, as I tried to point out during my estimates, that the superintendent of every Ontario Hospital, if he has not got adequate professional staff on his payroll, can call in any outside help he can get. The superintendent of Hamilton knows he has this authority as does every superintendent of all of our hospitals, but the great difficulty lies here again that even privately practising psychiatrists are so busy that they have no more time to give. There are just not enough psychiatrists available in Ontario, in Canada and on the North American continent, or indeed, in any country in the world that I know of.

The continuing facilities: I also pointed out during my estimates that a new unit is opening in CPRI this year, the Toronto mental health clinic which has been greatly supported by government financing; it is starting to build—

Mr. S. Lewis: Not for children this age.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is for children.

Mr. S. Lewis: It has 12 inpatient beds for 16- and 17-year-olds.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Inpatient is not always necessary, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member spoke about continuing facilities. In our thinking, continuing facilities do not simply or only connote beds. Indeed, much of the support provided for these children is provided through outpatient and day-care programmes.

And should a 10-year-old be certified? I say my own opinion is no, very definitely. But this child was in a peculiar situation, I believe he had been made a ward of the children's aid society by a court—

Mr. S. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, this is the information I have—if the hon. member knows more than I do—why does he ask the question?

Mr. S. Lewis: He was not a ward—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member take his seat? The Minister is trying to answer the member's several supplementary questions and I think perhaps he should remain quiet while the Minister tries to answer.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I preface my statement, sir, by saying rather that the information I have is that the youngster was made a ward of the children's aid society. This is the best information I have. And because there seemed to be some problems inherent in this—but the nub of the matter lies in the fact that the doctors who examined this child believed in their professional wisdom and judgment he should be committed. Now, as I have said on many occasions, I would hope by the time the next session rolls around, to have a complete, new mental health Act to present to this House. I would hope that this matter will be dealt with because I know it has been the subject of very close study and very great consideration by those who have been involved in the matter of considering and planning the rewriting of the Act.

I believe there is another question, but I missed it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Does the hon. Minister, in view of the numbers which he himself said are small—I suppose if we included 15- and 16-year-olds, it would also be small—does the government not think it would be wise to erect an alternative facility akin to Thistletown for such children?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think the very fact that the numbers are small makes this rather difficult, Mr. Speaker. We believe in the treatment of the emotionally disturbed child who has to be hospitalized when it becomes pathological, we believe that a very important part of the treatment is that the child be as near as possible to his home. Now, there are very small numbers; you cannot have a bed or two scattered here and there all over the province. This is impossible, it is not feasible. We could not possibly staff them, and I do not believe that this is the answer. Again, I would repeat, that the whole problem of the emotionally disturbed —the report of the committee is presently in the hands of five Ministers who have their departments at work trying to determine what should be the government's policy in this matter and trying, out of that, to develop a programme that will be satisfactory at least in some measure to meet the very great problem which these children pose.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a problem for the hon. Minister of Transport. Would the hon. Minister inform the House upon what grounds he refuses to allow the city of Sarnia to pass a bylaw to regulate truck transport in the downtown area of the city

of Sarnia, in the light of the steps taken by The Department of Highways in the spending of $4.5 million to provide a truck bypass through the city?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the bylaw passed by the city of Sarnia and submitted to The Department of Transport for approval has not been approved for the following reasons:

The proposed bylaw prohibits heavy traffic, meaning a vehicle having a gross weight in excess of five tons, from using the highways named in the bylaw. The effect of the bylaw would be to prohibit heavy traffic through the city, and require heavy traffic approaching the city from the south on Highway 40 to circumvent the city by using the bypass, in order to reach the village of Point Edward and Blue Water bridge at Port Huron. The city of Sarnia and The Department of Highways have entered into a connecting-link agreement for the payment of additional subsidy in order to provide a reasonably direct route for heavy traffic bound to and from Point Edward and the Blue Water bridge on Highway 40, directly through the city, and it appears that the proposed bylaw as drawn, would prohibit use of this route by heavy traffic.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. Would the Minister inform the House how many informations were laid under section 9, subsection 1, of The Air Pollution Control Act of Ontario, 1965? I have a second part to this. How many of these were proceeded with and how many convictions were there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the hon. leader of the Opposition's question is that no informations were laid in 1965; and to the second part, one charge is being proceeded with at the present time. This deals with failure to obtain approval prior to constructing an industrial source.

Mr. Thompson: I have a question of the Minister of Reform Institutions. Is the Minister aware that a total of 50 young people under the age of 16 have been locked up with adult offenders in the county jail or the police lockup in Peterborough over the past two years? If so, would he inform the House how many children during 1965 have been detained in jail facilities which are also used by adults?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, as the information required to answer this question cannot be obtained on such short notice, I will have to take the question as notice. However, I should like to make it clear that the provision of facilities for the detention of juveniles prior to their being committed by the juvenile courts to training school is the responsibility of the local municipality. Only after being committed to our care by a juvenile court judge does the detention of the juvenile become the responsibility of The Department of Reform Institutions. Once the juvenile has been officially ordered into a training school by a judge, that juvenile is immediately transferred directly from the court to the training school.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister with his regional jails to have a separate section for juveniles' detention?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, one of the areas involved in the regional detention centres, plans of which are being proceeded with rather rapidly, has asked us to provide such a facility. Our department does not agree with this and will not go along with the idea. We do not think a juvenile detention centre should be associated with a county jail at all where it is possible to make some other provision. It may not be possible to make such other provision in some areas of this province.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a two-part question for the hon. Minister of Labour. First, does the hon. Minister propose to bring in legislation during this session concerning the right of nurses in Ontario to carry on collective bargaining? And second, how long does the hon. Minister intend to carry on the experiment of nurses bargaining under The Labour Relations Act?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the nurses have recently begun to operate under, and to take advantage of, the provisions of The Labour Relations Act of Ontario; it is too early to comment on their success so far. The government was recently presented with a brief—called the steering committee on negotiated rights for professional staff—in support of special legislation entitled The Professional Negotiations Act 1966, which proposal, I understand, is not acceptable to the nurses. After due consideration of this brief, and the success of The Labour Relations Act as applied to nurses, the government will be in a position to make a firm commitment vis-à-vis legislation in this area. Until such time as all the facts are

known, naturally neither I nor the government can commit ourselves.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I just have one supplementary question. I believe all the members of the House received a letter from the nurses. They say that they are not happy with the present arrangements under The Labour Relations Act. In fact, I think they contradicted what you had to say. That was signed by Miss Laura Barr, one of their leading lights. I wonder if the hon. Minister can explain the contradiction in that letter of May 26?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: In the first place, I do not think I could explain, in the short time available, all of the circumstances that lie behind this matter. It is only recently—in the past several months—that the nurses as a group have availed themselves of the existing provisions of The Labour Relations Act. They made several applications. I do not want to comment one way or the other as to how they made these presentations, but in any event, it has been my observation, because I have kept in close touch with this, that the provisions of the Act have met with success, as far as the nurses are concerned, and that bargaining rights have been secured.

Following the withdrawal of section 89 of The Labour Relations Act, there has been some difficulty with respect to municipally operated hospitals this past spring. I think that this matter should, in the name of reasonableness, be permitted to operate. I understood that the applications for certification which were made in the proper form had met with success. I am also aware of the fact that I am directing my answer to the hon. member for Parkdale—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Is the hon. Minister finished?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I was just waiting until the hon. member for Parkdale was free to hear the balance of the answer to his question.

Mr. Speaker, this group has representatives who act for them; facilities have been made available to them to acquaint them with the procedures before the labour relations board, and whatever documentation is necessary, and the rules that apply to presenting an application for certification and it has been my own observation that when they had understood the procedures they were meeting with a high degree of success.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the hon. Attorney General.

Does the hon. Attorney General agree with the chairman of the workmen's compensation board, Ontario, that the verdict of the coroner's jury inquiring into the cause of death of Bernard Frederick Gore, is not supported by the evidence?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, before I received the question this morning, I had read the newspaper statement of the chairman of the workmen's compensation board. I had obtained from the board certain material relating to their side of this matter and I had talked with the hon. Minister of Labour under whose jurisdiction the workmen's compensation board comes.

I have ordered a transcript of the evidence which was taken before the jury, but I have had no opportunity either to get that or to peruse it, or to read the material which I have just received from the compensation board. I do not feel that I am in a position to give judgment, which is what I am asked to do here, to state whether I am in agreement with one side or the other, until certainly I have had an opportunity to get at least the transcript of the evidence.

Now, that is being obtained and I shall try, if the hon. member insists on my judging in the matter, to give it.

I would say, however, that a request of this kind, I think, is very difficult for a layman, which I am insofar as the medical profession is concerned, and as the members of the jury were, insofar as the evidence of doctors is concerned, to make up their minds whether a doctor or a group of doctors are right or wrong; and the doctors themselves may disagree.

However, I want an opportunity to study the material and I shall then answer the question as fully as I am able to do so.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Attorney General advise the House of the terms of reference to the law reform commission of the question of compensation for property expropriated?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think the House is aware that the select committee on land expropriation reported to the House in February 1962, and that in 1963 an amending Act to The Expropriation Procedures Act was passed, in which the great majority of those recommendations were implemented into legislation.

There was, however, a recommendation in the report on the basis of compensation, and I should like to read to the House the brief recommendation on that, perhaps the

most important feature of expropriation, under the heading of: "Basis for compensation." There was a recommendation which is as follows:

> —a uniform statute to provide a common basis for compensation for all agencies that are authorized by the provincial government to expropriate land and that the requirement be that the authority make due compensation to the owner of land for any damage necessarily resulting from the expropriation.

Now, in bringing in our legislation in the Act of 1962-63—and then last year, the committee, or board of negotiation—we have not attempted to, or have not been able to deal with the matter of the basis of compensation. As the hon. members of the House are aware, there are a great many expropriating authorities, bodies of one kind and another, which expropriate land, and have the right to expropriate in this province.

I therefore wrote to the chairman of the law reform commission on March 8, this year, almost three months ago, and I should like to read this letter into the record. It was addressed to the Hon. J. C. McRuer, chairman of the Ontario law reform commission. I wrote as follows:

> Dear Mr. Chairman:
>
> Pursuant to the provisions of The Ontario Law Reform Commission Act I am asking the commission to undertake a study of the basis for compensation for expropriation as provided for in The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963. When the commission has concluded its study of this subject I would be pleased to receive the constructive comment and recommendations of the commission as to what might be done to improve the laws of the province in respect to this particular subject.
>
> As you are probably already aware, The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963 was enacted by the Legislature following its receipt of the report of the select committee on expropriations. I am enclosing a copy of the report of the select committee and you will note that the select committee did not, at the time of the making of its report, feel that it was in a position to revise the laws of the province in respect of the basis for compensation although its recommendations did lead to the uniform compensation provisions as now found in section six of the 1962-63 statute. If there is any material that may be available in this department which would be of assistance to you I would be most pleased to supply it at your request.
>
> There are many organizations which have views upon the basis for compensation in expropriation cases and I would expect that submissions from these organizations would be a very great help to your commission in the consideration of this problem. Perhaps the solicitation of briefs and submissions would commend itself to the commission as it has in the past.

On March 11 my letter was applied to, stating that the commission would undertake the study.

It is therefore mainly directed to the basis of compensation which varies so, and under which there is no real uniformity.

I have mentioned the fact that last year we established a committee of negotiation which would be an informal type of body, to work in these matters and attempt to reach a basis of compensation without expense to the owner or person whose property is being expropriated, and this has worked, I may say, very well. I hope to report on this later, perhaps in my estimates. I think I may say to the House that it is my intention to bring in one further piece of legislation very shortly and without waiting for this report. This would be in the area of the trial of necessity, or the need for the property itself.

But the above, to answer the question, is the field of study which has been directed to the commission, and I think it will be a useful service which the commission will perform in this field.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would ask one supplementary question, if I may. Would the hon. Attorney General give serious consideration to making the benefits of any legislation that may result from the work of the law reform commission in this field, available to all persons whose property has been expropriated since January 1, 1966?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, on which I would certainly not be able to speak with either a negative or an affirmative answer at the moment. In a sense it is a matter of policy which perhaps should not be asked in a question, but certainly I will be glad to take the matter under consideration.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a short statement. I think, in view of the fact that many hon. members visited the village of Winisk on the MLA tour last year, the problem faced there yesterday will be of interest

to them, some of whom will recall the rather heavy rains we encountered when we landed there on July 1, last and the northerly bank of the river on which the village and Indian settlement is located.

Last night at five o'clock we had a distress signal from the construction company at Winisk airport on Hudson bay, regarding a flood crest in the Winisk river flooding out the village of Winisk. As it was getting toward dark we could not wait for further possible messages but despatched immediately an all-weather airplane to fly into the area and find out what the problem was. The facts are as follows:

At 10.30 a.m. yesterday morning—Tuesday—the river reached its peak—and it is a great, broad river, as many of you who saw it know, particularly at the mouth—and flooded the village. Floating ice came over its banks with it. The flood crest was carried at six feet of water through the village which would cause considerable damage to the furnishings. The local Indians, who, we all recognize as a very capable people and experienced in such matters—and led, I have no doubt, by the redoubtable Chief Michel, than whom there is no better boatsman in Canada—led the families into their boats and proceeded inland and tied them up to trees until the floods started to subside.

They returned to their village about midnight last night and it is assumed that the flood has abated. Fortunately, there were no injuries to people but there was considerable damage to the village. The Hudson Bay warehouse was moved downstream about half a mile. This building is 30 feet by 60 feet and two storeys. The store was moved about one quarter of a mile and there was some damage to the Lands and Forests building, but it is still fit for occupancy. We have placed that building at the disposal of the local people who may need it for shelter.

I am happy, therefore, to say that the potential emergency did not develop, but that in taking this action, the province shows its interest in reaching out to the most remote areas when its people are in distress.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, three questions for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare were submitted by me yesterday which I believe he was going to try to answer today.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in respect of this, I had not made any commitment for today because I did not know for sure if I would have a written report on this matter. But after hearing the answer given to the hon. member by the hon. Minister of Health, the only thing I feel I could add is that the Welland county children's aid society was given the care of this child, or the court committed the child to the care of the society, in March for one year under The Juvenile Delinquents Act. As far as I have been able to learn, because of the behaviour and the actions of the child, the society thought in their judgment to have him examined by the doctor at the mental health clinic, together with another doctor, which was done, and they found that the child was mentally ill. From that point on, the children's aid society did not have any more to say about it. I feel, sir, that I am not in a position to render judgment on the actions of the doctors; they are professional people who know what they are doing. I agree with the hon. Minister of Health—I could not discuss their judgment in a professional way.

The child, while he was in the care of the children's aid society, was kept in the receiving home they have for that purpose.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question—if that is regarded as an answer.

Mr. Speaker: I would think that the member has surely exhausted the questions on this particular subject. I feel he has been taking up an undue proportion of the time of the House in the question period this afternoon, so I would deny him a further question on the subject at this time.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is an unprecedented ruling, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please take his seat?

Mr. S. Lewis: I am up on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order; I have asked the member to take his seat.

I would draw to the attention of the House that the member for Lincoln has given me notice that I omitted to mention a school in the east gallery, namely, Camden public school in the township of Clinton. We wish to welcome this school to the Legislature this afternoon.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there was a question put to me yesterday by the hon. member for York South and I undertook to obtain an answer to it.

The question was based on a copy of a letter to me, dated May 26, 1966, written by Mr. and Mrs. S. R. Van Camp of Holt road, RR 2, Bowmanville, Ontario. The original letter was received in my office on May 30, the day before yesterday, but had not reached my desk by the time the House opened yesterday afternoon.

I might point out that a copy of the original of the letter was sent to the hon. member, among other people. Attached to that copy was another message in which reference was made to a petition alleged to have contained some 2,300 signatures. I had never seen the petition referred to in the member's question because the petition itself, I am given to understand, was filed at the hearings before the Ontario municipal board when objections were submitted and discussions took place.

I would like to point out that the Ontario municipal board has been established by statute to deal with many matters which arise from time to time and require decisions in the municipal field. It is a quasi-judicial body and is, of course, independent in the exercise of its functions. Any ruling that it makes, therefore, is in pursuance of the statute under which it operates without reference to the government or any of the government agencies.

This matter arose from an amendment to the official plan of the township of Darlington which was submitted by the township to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval. Requests to refer the proposed amendment to the Ontario municipal board were received by the Minister. On September 16, 1965, the entire matter was referred to the Ontario municipal board so that a public hearing could be held, at which time all interested persons could be given an opportunity to state their views.

The application for an amendment to the official plan and the land use bylaw 2307 of the township of Darlington, which purported to implement the official plan amendment, were scheduled for hearing on March 21, 1966. Evidence and argument were heard by the Ontario municipal board members during that week.

The decision of the Ontario municipal board was issued on April 28, 1966, the effect of which was to approve the official plan amendment and the land use bylaw 2307.

I would point out that the petition of 2,300 names was submitted to the board during the course of that hearing.

Under section 94 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act, "any party or person interested may, within 28 days, petition the Lieutenant-Governor in council who may confirm, vary or rescind the whole or any part of such order or decision, or require the board to hold a new public hearing." We have no record of receipt of such a petition or appeal.

In the judgment of the Ontario municipal board, there is listed 12 specific objections which were raised by counsel at the hearing. It must be assumed that counsel at the hearing were aware of the right of petition against the decision of the Ontario municipal board and would have advised their clients of this right.

Upon reading the decision, it is apparent that the Ontario municipal board gave due and serious consideration to all the objections and, in fact, gave reasons for the decision which it reached.

In order that the information in this matter may be completed for members of the House who may be interested, I propose to table a copy of the decision of the municipal board, in which is a very full decision running to some ten pages, which lists the various objections that were raised during the course of the hearing and the manner in which the board disposed of those objections.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves second reading of Bill 52, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE REPRESENTATION ACT, 1966

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves second reading of Bill 92, The Representation Act, 1966.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I have one or two comments that I would like to make in relation to this bill.

Before I do so, I wonder if it would be permissible for me to seek information from the hon. Prime Minister on two points. First of all, I would like to know if it is the government's intention that this bill will go to any standing committee. Secondly, I would like to ask if the schedule to the bill is identical with the final report of the redistribution commission except for, perhaps, verbal changes, which make no difference in the—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will probably have further comments on the bill before second reading is completed. It is not the government's intention that this bill go to a committee of the House. I feel that if you review the history of the functions of the commission on redistribution – the various stages they went through, their report last year was brought in here. It was referred to the committee on privileges and elections. There were certain recommendations made by that committee, which were brought back to this House and they were carried out in instructions by the Legislature to the commission.

Therefore, at this stage it seems to the government that there is little more than can be done in an examination. It has been re-examined, it has been examined publicly. There is no doubt in my mind—I think perhaps in anyone's mind—that it is impossible to effect redistribution without affecting some people adversely perhaps in their own view. No doubt there are such reactions to the provisions of this bill which embody the recommendations in the report.

On the other hand, there must be finality in the question of redistribution and this matter has really been examined very, very carefully and for this reason it is not the intent of the government that this be referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections. It can be dealt with here, of course, in the committee of the whole House.

Mr. Bryden: The Prime Minister may have forgotten the second question I asked. Is this bill identical–

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I believe there are some changes in the actual descriptions which come about as a result, for instance, of the Metropolitan Toronto bill, which changed the designation of certain boundaries. But there are no variations in effect; in other words, there are no alterations that have taken territory from one riding and put it in another.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, when I asked the Prime Minister if it was the government's intention to refer the bill to a standing committee, I wish to make it clear that I was not implying through that question that it should be referred to such a committee. I accept the Prime Minister's explanation entirely. If there was a suggestion that it was going to go to a committee, I would have opposed the suggestion. In view of the hon. Prime Minister's answer, I am saved the need to do that. I agree with him entirely and I can speak for this group. We believe that when an independent commission is set up to carry out a redistribution, then we in this House should accept its findings and its final conclusions whether we like them or not.

I have no doubt that many members, including myself, have criticisms of the work of the commission. My criticisms will not be expressed; I do not think there is any point expressing them. I am certain that if you had ten independent redistribution commissions you would get ten different redistributions because there are no absolute principles. In the last analysis, judgment has to be exercised. We in this group are satisfied that the commission that has worked on this problem for some substantial time has exercised its judgment in good faith and we accept the bill precisely as it is, as I have no doubt the government does and all other members of the House do.

It would appear to me, however, Mr. Speaker, that there might be some value at this juncture to consider the procedure that we have followed in relation to the present redistribution, having in mind the fact that redistributions will also become necessary in the future. We have, I suppose, attempted what for Ontario, at any rate, is an experiment. It may be useful to make one or two comments on the experiment in the hope that might be helpful in considering policy in the future. I would like to make two suggestions for the consideration of the House as to how this problem should be handled in the future.

First of all, I would suggest that we should as soon as possible adopt in this House a statute which would govern redistribution. The procedure we followed in the current redistribution was that two or three years ago, I have just forgotten precisely when, a resolution was adopted by the House setting up a commission, an ad hoc commission, of three eminent gentlemen who were given the task of carrying out a redistribution.

I think a procedure of this type should be made a permanent feature of the political process in the province. To make it a permanent feature we should pass a statute. The statute would provide in effect for a permanent redistribution commission. In my opinion, such a commission should automatically proceed with the work of redistribution after the results of each census become available. We live in an age when population changes very rapidly. People are moving all the time. We cannot expect that the distribution of constituencies will be valid for a very long period of time. That may have been true in the past, but certainly is not true now.

I think our political process in Ontario has

to a certain extent been bedevilled by the fact that for a long time we have worked with out-of-date constituencies. Now, that we have accepted — and I think all of us have accepted — the principle of an independent redistribution, I think we should embody that principle in the statute law and make it permanently operative and almost automatic, as I believe it now is in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, redistribution occurs whenever the independent commission decides on the basis of population figures that changes are necessary. If we set up such a commission in Ontario and gave it a permanent status, we could leave to it the task of (a) deciding when redistribution was necessary and, (b) how it should be undertaken.

The second proposal I would like to make to the House, Mr. Speaker, is that if, either in the permanent law or by a repetition of ad hoc resolutions, we continue to provide for redistribution by an independent commission, we should in the future lay down more specific guidelines for the commission than we did in this instance. The resolution under which the present commission was set up did purport to lay down certain guidelines. The guidelines as set forth in the resolution, however, were extremely general in nature; they were subject to the widest possible range of interpretation. In fact they really were not guidelines at all. They were certain dictates of commonsense which I am sure the commission would have followed even if they had not been expressed in the resolution.

It was proposed, for example, that as far as possible the commission should have regard to traditional boundaries, that as far as possible it should try to arrive at constituencies that provided for a reasonable balance of representation in the House, and so on. All of the so-called guidelines in that resolution came into the same category as being in favour of motherhood. They really said nothing, they gave really no guidance to the commission at all. Now, I think that we in this House have to assume the responsibility for providing guidance and quite definite guidance on one basic matter, and that is the population basis of representation. I think we cannot refer to the commission the basic policy decision as to whether or not we believe in representation by population. My leader raised this matter when the resolution was before the House a few years ago. Unfortunately the Prime Minister was not prepared to consider my leader's proposal on its merits. He adopted a device which is all too common with our friends on the Treasury benches: Instead of dealing with the issue on its merits, he attacked the man who made the proposal. This is an old device, attack the man, do not deal with the issue—and that was unfortunate in my opinion. My leader said that this House should be prepared to lay down certain basic principles on the issue of representation by population. The hon. Prime Minister said that my leader was trying to drag the issue back into politics, that he was preparing in advance to repudiate the report of the commission. This was the level on which the argument took place. It was unfortunate, because in my opinion the hon. member for York South raised an important matter that was worthy of discussion on its merits as an issue. I think that experience has shown that the hon. Prime Minister was quite wrong in the position he took, and that the point my leader was trying to get at was a valid point.

Sir, I do not know of any other jurisdiction where provision is made for independent redistribution where the Legislature has not laid down the basic guidelines for the commission as far as population is concerned.

I think we should do it here, but we left that for the commission itself to determine. It was asked to make a policy determination —a determination that, in my opinion, ought to have been made in this Legislature in the light of public discussion. We were appalled when we read the first interim report of the redistribution commission, and learned that it considered a fair basis of distribution of constituencies of this province was along the following lines. The commission proposed that it would put constituencies into three different categories, rural, mixed and urban, and that the possible range in size between the smallest rural and the largest urban would be from 25,000 to 75,000. In other words you could have an urban constituency with three times the population of a rural constituency. The vote of a voter in the rural constituency would have the weight of three votes in the urban constituency. We were appalled when we saw that principle enunciated by the redistribution commission. We did not say anything about it at the time, Mr. Speaker, because we were of the opinion that once the matter was in the hands of a redistribution commission the politicians should remain silent. They could not effectively carry on their work if politicians were trying to breathe down their necks. Until this moment, we have said nothing publicly about that principle enunciated in the first interim report of the redistribution commission. I want to make it clear, however, that

our silence did not by any means indicate assent; it indicated that we did not consider it proper for us to comment in any way while the commission was in the midst of carrying out its responsibilities.

I may say that in actual fact the commission did not go to the extreme tolerances which it had permitted itself. We have no constituencies under the new setup, as far as I know, in which the population is as small as 25,000. We have no constituency in which the population, on the basis of the latest available population figures, is as large as 75,000. I suspect there may be one or two where the population is getting very close to that point, but not on the basis of any official population figures available. We still have, however, great discrepancies in representation in this province. I can appreciate that in some of the very sparsely settled areas of northern Ontario it is necessary to make an exception to any general rule that might otherwise be laid down, so I leave aside constituencies in northern Ontario.

Taking just those in southern Ontario, where this type of problem does not exist in this modern age of rapid communication and rapid travel, I discover that there are 20 constituencies with a population of less than 40,000. The smallest is the constituency of Muskoka. Incidentally, I am now going on the basis of the second interim report of the commission; in its final report it did not provide any population figures so I am going on the population as shown in the second interim report. Admittedly there have been some minor adjustments to constituency boundaries since that time, but this is close enough to the final result to illustrate the point I am trying to make. The constituency of Muskoka was shown as having a population of 32,875, Renfrew South 32,978, Ontario 33,098, Huron 33,133. In other words, several constituencies under this new setup will have populations of about 33,000. On the other hand, there are a large number of constituencies whose population, even as shown in this interim report, are up around 65,000. In fact, it would appear that the commission determined that all urban constituencies would be as close as possible to the 65,000 level in population. Some of them, I may say, have already grown beyond that point, but on the basis of the second interim report, I think it is fair to say that all purely urban constituencies were assigned populations as close as possible to 65,000. So you have a discrepancy of two to one; constituencies twice as big as others. In urban areas, it takes two votes to equal one vote in rural areas. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear again that I am not suggesting that one comma be changed in the final distribution proposed by the commission. I am now looking to the future only; I suggest we should not, as a matter of public policy, accept the principle that one man's vote is worth only half as much as another man's vote, or one woman's vote is worth only half as much as another woman's vote, or vice versa, whatever combination you want to make.

I do not think that we should accept that principle. This was a matter of substantial debate and controversy in the federal House of Commons, when their redistribution bill was before the House. The Liberal government proposed that in each province—they have to do their redistribution by provinces, of course—an average in terms of population should be struck. Then the redistribution commission for the province would have authority to vary 20 per cent either way from the average. That was the original proposal. I think it was a sound proposal; I think that that is the principle we should adopt here.

Apart from certain special cases which could be dealt with specially, I believe that we should lay it down in the law that a redistribution commission, in carrying out its duties, would not permit greater than a 20 per cent variation in either direction from the average size of constituency.

In Ottawa, the Conservative Opposition opposed this provision bitterly, bearing in mind some of the small rural constituencies on which, apparently, they are becoming increasingly dependent to continue as an important political force in Canada. They put forward the proposition that the commission should be permitted a 33 per cent variation from the average. The thing was finally sawed off at 25 per cent. If that is the sort of political bargaining one has to do, then I would be willing to saw off at 25 per cent. I think it is more reasonable that the variation should be restricted to 20 per cent, but certainly it should not be greater than 25 per cent.

Let us bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that if you permit a 25 per cent variation from the average in either direction, the effect of that would be that a constituency that had the maximum possible population would be 67 per cent larger than one with the minimum population, so the 25 per cent variation in either direction actually still allows quite significant discrepancies in the populations of constituencies. A 20 per cent variation in either direction, would permit

the largest to be 50 per cent larger than the smallest. That, as I say, is in my opinion more reasonable, but certainly we should not accept as fair and reasonable the proposition that some constituencies should be twice as large as others in terms of population.

The other point I think we should note, Mr. Speaker, is that the constituencies which under the final report and under this bill are the largest, are also in the growth areas of the province. These small constituencies that I have mentioned—the ones of around 33,000—are in the areas which in the past 15 years have been areas of low population growth. Therefore, we can anticipate that they will continue to have a population of around 33,000 with perhaps a small increase, but very slight. On the other hand, the constituencies that are up around 65,000, are in the areas which in the past 15 years have been rapid-growth areas. We can expect a continued rapid growth in those constituencies. In fact I venture to predict that by the election after the next, if their boundaries remained unchanged, some of them will have upwards of 100,000 population and we will be just about back in the same old mess as we have had before.

Yorkview, I think, is one of them. It is rapidly moving in that direction already, but not only Yorkview is involved. Some of the constituencies in the centre of the city of Toronto will be moving rapidly in that direction. It is true that over the past ten or 15 years, the population of Toronto has been stationary—I am now talking about the city proper—or even has declined slightly, but one only has to look around him to see that that is not going to be the situation in the next decade.

In the city of Toronto we are now witnessing a rapid increase in density of population, with apartment buildings ranging from anywhere from ten to 25 and 35 stories occupying the space that had previously been occupied by perhaps a dozen houses. In my own constituency there is a development coming in a brick yard, an area previously unpopulated, which is going to have a population of about 4,000. Just this one development in this one small section in what geographically is a very small constituency. I said "in my own constituency." After the redistribution it will be in the constituency of my hon. friend from Riverdale, but it is in what is now my own constituency. So we face almost immediately the problem of increasing disparities in the populations of constituencies. We have some very small constituencies—what I would call unduly small constituencies—whose population will continue at around 35,000. We have a large number of other rapidly growing constituencies whose populations will very soon be ranging up to 90,000 and 100,000 and even beyond that.

We should look at the present redistribution as essentially a temporary measure. That, however, I do not think should concern us too much, Mr. Speaker. As I said at the outset, we must essentially look at all distributions as pretty temporary in this day and age of rapid population change. We are going to have to have fairly frequent redistributions if we are to maintain any sort of balance as among constituencies, and if we are going to give any sort of recognition at all to the principle of representation by population.

We can look forward, I think, to another redistribution a few years hence. That is why I am suggesting we should deal with the matter by statute. Let us set up this commission, or whatever other group of distinguished citizens may be considered appropriate, as a permanent commission which will make such adjustments in constituency boundaries as appear to them to be reasonable, as new population figures become available from each successive census.

If we do that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that we should not make the mistake we made this time. We should settle the issue of representation by population, and we should write into the statute the principle that we think is fair, the principle that the commission would be expected to follow. This is the way that redistribution is handled in those jurisdictions that have had substantial experience with the process of independent redistribution and this, I submit, is the way that we should handle it here.

I would hope that, assuming that there is one more session of this Legislature, the government would come in with a bill to put redistribution on a permanent basis with a permanent commission responsible for it and with certain basic guidelines laid down which the commission would be expected to follow out in carrying out its responsibilities.

One other phase of the work—this is the last matter I wish to refer to, Mr. Speaker—there is one other phase of our experiment which I thought turned out to be a very good idea. Last year we had the second interim report of the commission before us. We really had not worked out any procedures for dealing with a report of this kind. We were sort of feeling our way and we arrived

at the procedure of instructing the commission to provide a period of time during which it would receive representations with regard to its second interim report. The commission adopted that procedure; it heard representation and it then went off by itself and considered them all. I do not know whether it actually had hearings and I do not think it is essential that it should have, but it received representations in writing and possibly in some cases orally, and went off by itself and considered them. It then came back with a final report.

I think that turned out to be quite a useful procedure. I think it is much better than the procedure that is now in effect in Ottawa where the politicians can stand up and scream for a couple of weeks about each report for each province. I do not think that the elected members of Parliament or of the Legislature have any greater interest in redistribution than any other citizen. I think a candidate who has been nominated to try to knock one of them out has just as much interest in the redistribution as the sitting member. I do not think any special preferred position should be given to elected members.

It is, however, important that citizens and groups of citizens should be able to point out to the commission any errors that it may have made and call to its attention factors that it could have overlooked. I think some sort of procedure for a review is desirable. I think that the procedure adopted in our case was a good one. Provision should be made for a similar procedure in any statute adopted to provide for a permanent and continuing process of redistribution.

One footnote I would like to add, Mr. Speaker. Although I think the procedure was a good one, I do not think the redistribution commission should come out with a final report which shows no population figures. I think that they should have a specific guideline with regard to population and then I think that they should, in everything they do, keep population uppermost in their minds. They should not publish descriptions of constituency boundaries without showing beside that description the closest estimate they can make of the population of the constituency.

Those are the lessons that I think we can draw from the experience we have had in this experiment in independent redistribution. As I said at the beginning, we in this group accept the bill precisely as it is. I do not believe we will have any comments at all to make at the committee stage because we are prepared to accept what the commission has recommended without change. We would, however, like to see the procedure now made permanent and improved upon in the ways I have suggested.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for our part that I suppose it was only natural, when we heard that there was going to be redistribution, that there was a certain natural suspicion and apprehension which we on this side would have toward the government. We would consider that perhaps they might have an inclination toward gerrymandering and a number of other aspects. It has been done in the past and, they say, for more than one party, but we feel that the commission which was set up has indicated—from the high calibre of its members—that they were going to follow a certain procedure. We believe that it was an independent commission that went after its job with a serious and sincere approach.

Certainly, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, from all sides there are representatives who feel that some hardship has been done to them, and I think, as we look at the report of the commission, we find that the hardship has been distributed fairly evenly around the three parties in the House.

I believe that the hon. member for Woodbine has got an excellent point in the fact that this is a changing society, a quickly changing society in Ontario. He has pointed to Metropolitan Toronto and showed the mushrooming that is taking place. We also see that there are certain rural areas where the representative has had difficulty getting around to the population in the past. But again, with the automobile and the airplane and with roads and so on, this is changing and there may not be the same hardships for a representative to cover an area in a very few years that there is at the present, and that there has been in the past.

From these factors, both the changes that take place geographically and physically, and also from the fact that the population itself will increase in certain constituencies, perhaps even within two years we will see new industry coming in with a flow of immigration and so on.

It seems to me that the suggestion of the hon. member for Woodbine—that there should by statute be a permanent commission made up of men of high calibre with complete independence—would be well justified and I, for one, would like to suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that his suggestion and the suggestion of the hon. member for Woodbine, should be given every consideration.

May I say that when we get into the committee stage there may be some of my members who would like to raise certain points and I assume that that opportunity will be given to them at that time.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, just by way of underlining some of the points that my colleague has put on the record, and in the hope that we will establish a permanent structure before the next census comes down—whether it is done in the next year or in the next three or four years before the next census takes place, as my colleague has suggested—I would like to raise a number of points. I raise them again, Mr. Speaker, not in criticism of the work that this commission has done. If I have criticisms they flow not from their work but from what I think were the inadequacies in our efforts in the Legislature here in establising this framework.

One of the problems that arises, if one accepts the proposition of a permanent redistribution commission, is the personnel involved. If you appoint people five years from now, they may or may not be available and I just draw to the attention of the House the solution that was found, or was established, for that problem in the province of Manitoba where they appointed the incumbents in three different positions. I think I am correct in that they are the chief justice of the province, the president of the university and the chief electoral officer. These people know that if they hold that position they are the members of a redistribution commission.

Second, they know what the guidelines are and they have been established so that from this point forward there is no doubt on anybody's part. Those guidelines—whether one agrees with them or not in terms of population—were a seven-to-four ratio, as between the rural and the urban constituencies. In other words, they came up with roughly the kind of situation that has emerged in Ottawa where you can have a constituency 66⅔ larger, if it happens to be urban as compared with the rural. Also there are certain tolerances that are established so that the redistribution commission knows that when another redistribution is due following a census, if the variation has been beyond a certain per cent, redistribution has to take place in that area, either up or down.

The final point, Mr. Chairman, that I want to draw to the attention of the House, by way of illustrating, is the different results that we have had in redistribution at Ottawa and here —and I think it is rather interesting because, as we are all aware, the commissioners in each instance were the same people. In Ottawa they started by establishing a quota and their quota was 70,000. As my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine has indicated, they argued first on the basis of a 20 per cent tolerance either way and finally accepted 25 per cent, so that you could have a constituency that would go as low as roughly 52,000 and could go as high as roughly 88,000 people. Now, if that same kind of approach had been followed in the province of Ontario, on the assumption that we were operating with an objective of 117 seats, we would have had a quota for each constituency in the province of Ontario, of approximately 54,000 people. A 25 per cent tolerance would mean that you could go down as low as 40,000 people and you could go up as high as 68,000 people, for a considerable spread and, I submit, an adequate spread in view of the problems in more thinly populated rural areas.

Now, if you accept a minimum of 40,000 by that application of the federal approach to our provincial situation, you will discover that there are 27 seats which have fewer population following the redistribution. Let me emphasize one point here, Mr. Speaker: Seven of those 27 are in northern Ontario where you have vast geographical areas. I personally would be willing to entertain a degree of flexibility when you get into the kind of riding that sometimes was produced in the federal redistribution, like, I think it is called Thunder Bay, that starts from White river and circles up to Hudson bay and ends up, I believe, at the Manitoba border. How anybody can cover that constituency, I do not know, and I think they became the victim of complete inflexibility. Conceivably, in areas that went beyond a certain size in terms of geography, you could give a little bit more tolerance. I think that problem could be met.

However, the point in my drawing a contrast between what happened provincially and federally is that even if one forgets for a moment the seven seats in northern Ontario where you have these vast geographical spaces, you would still have 20 seats in southern Ontario where I submit, sir, there is absolutely no justification at all for the degree of discrepancy that is being permitted to arise. For example, you have old seats, like Huron—the hon. Minister of Highways' seat —which has not been changed. It was 33,000 before and it is going to be 33,000 again. What justification can one have for a seat like that where, with modern transportation

conditions, it is just as easy to get around? I find if I go out into rural areas people will come to meetings more frequently if they have to drive the distance, in a seat like that, than they will in some of the urban constituencies. This is the thing that often puzzles me. Indeed, in northern Ontario, I go to meetings where people will drive 100 or 150 miles to a political meeting, but they will not go five miles from one end of my constituency to the other.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): It is to see the hon. member, not to hear him.

An hon. member: They know the hon. member too well.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was asked about three questions. I would be delighted to try to reply to these questions if they are presented to me individually.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): We will put them before the orders of the day.

Mr. MacDonald: I come back to the basic point that I was making, that there are 20 of the constituencies below 40,000. Some of them are existing constituencies that were not touched and some of them are new constituencies—such as the new constituency east of Chatham with 32,000-33,000. I submit to the hon. Prime Minister that in keeping with the united and unanimous plea that has emerged, in the next two or three years—if he still has the privilege of making a decision on this—that he should take the lead prior to the census in establishing a permanent structure. I would conclude by saying that I suppose redistribution is like many things in life; we are incapable of having it without some pain and anguish. I was almost going to say it was like birth, but I do not know.

An hon. member: The member is not supposed to.

Mr. MacDonald: On balance, I think the pain and anguish has come from all quarters. Perhaps this is testimony to the independence of the commission. Having made a good start in the right direction, I am hoping that we will continue in that direction, even if there might be pressures from either the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests or the hon. member for St. George to scrap the whole thing as a very sad experience.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): May I say a word? I think one matter that should be given prime consideration in any discussion of future action in respect to redistribution is the suggestion that it should be automatic, that there should be a redistribution of provincial seats after every census. I think it is 30 years or more since there has been a general redistribution of seats in this province —in 1932 or 1934. When we are talking about how we are going to proceed in the future in these matters, I think it is of primary importance that we should have it insisted upon that there should be a redistribution after every ten years census. The idea expressed by my friend the hon. member for Woodbine, meets with approval so far as I am concerned.

I think a commission should be set up that could deal with matters that arise within the ten-year period. In this day of rapidly-changing population, it is conceivable that in a period of five years you would want to make a piecemeal redistribution of seats in certain areas. But after every ten years, there should be a general province-wide redistribution of seats. I think we should make a solemn pledge on our part that that should be done. Whether it is by statute or otherwise in quite immaterial.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the vote is put, I think I expressed, in answer to the query of the hon. member for Woodbine, most of what I had to say. I feel that we have really broken with tradition. The reason there has not been a general redistribution for so many years is that only in the past few years the population increase in the province has been great enough to bring this to public attention. There have been two redistributions since I have been here, at least partial. One was in 1954, in which I might say I lost part of my riding.

Mr. MacDonald: Was it a good or bad area?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I got it back in this one, so I am right back where I was in the election of 1951.

Mr. Bryden: Was that by popular demand?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am inclined to doubt it. In any event, we have broken with the usual method of conducting redistributions in the province. I think that while there are objections that have been raised here as to the method by which it was done and the terms of reference, those terms were drawn very carefully. I would personally utter a word of warning against this high degree of rigidity that I can see creeping into this if we establish a permanent commission and set down certain population figures and so on.

One of the outstanding characteristics of this province is its great variety; none know that better than those of us who sit in this House. We have a variety of people, a variety of ideas, a variety of geographic or topographic characteristics. We have an enormous variety, and it is impossible to find common standards in almost any field of endeavour that will fit all areas of this province. This is true in questions of education and economic development. It is true, in fact, about the whole province, and it does not lend itself, to my view, to the rigidity of statutory requirements that must be applied with a mathematical exactness. If we get into that type of thing we will tie our hands to deal in equity rather than by statute.

However, I would tell the House that having come this far with a change and having accepted the principle of an independent commission all these matters which flow from these reports will be studied in order to come to a conclusion as to how they might be dealt with next time up.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill 82, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill 113, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, we in this party agree with the principle of this bill. Many members—I am sure, all the members of the House — have requested from time to time of the hon. Minister some help in the way of alleviating, at least in part, some of the severe crop losses that were suffered last year owing to the backward weather that we experienced in harvesting conditions. This was certainly an act of God, it was beyond the control of the farmers, indeed it was beyond the control of anyone to do anything about it. I would certainly have two criticisms of this bill.

I think that the type of assistance that is offered is not enough when one views the great deal of damage and the great losses that were suffered. After all, assistance in the way of a guaranteed loan amounting to $1,000 with the interest paid by the government, is of very little help to a man who has lost perhaps $20,000 or $25,000. The other criticism that I would have in this regard, is the fact that the bill was introduced—I believe it received first reading on Wednesday, May 18, and this meant that many farmers had already made their plans; many of them were already on the land, they either had made arrangements for the proper credit, if they could get it. If they could not get it, of course, they had made other arrangements either by taking another job or doing something else.

So those are the two criticisms, Mr. Speaker, that I would have of the bill. It goes without saying that something is better than nothing. We appreciate the small assistance that is being offered in this bill. However, we do wish it were greater.

Mr. MacDonald: I would agree with the criticism that the hon. member has just advanced. So often it is very easy from this side of the House to sum up one's criticism of government legislation by saying it is "too little and too late," but never is that phrase more accurate than it is in reference to this particular bill. Even if one gets away from what might be a relatively large farmer with a $25,000 loss, down to the great majority of smaller farmers, marginal farmers if you will, for whom losses will not be anything like that, but for which $1,000 is not going to be a very great lift. Secondly, certainly the reaction I got from many farmers and farm leaders, immediately this bill was introduced, when they were trying to find out the details with regard to its operation, was that it was simply too late. April 18, I think, was the date — May 18 for the bill. Well, even if one goes back to the announcement, which I suppose is a fairer indication of when the government indicated they were going to do it — and I believe then it was approximately April 18, shortly after the Easter recess. I picked the date out of my mind because I recall that representations were made to me by one farm leader, shortly after we got back from the Easter recess. His reaction at that point was, "Well, this is all very fine but most of

my neighbours have got their crops in, and what is going to be the position as far as they are concerned?" Or as far as my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce has said, those who surveyed the rather chaotic scene that the weatherman created for them last year and decided that there was just no point in attempting farming this year so they made alternative plans.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if I may make just one comment with regard to this bill, and I suppose the principle of it would be the appropriate place, I think this is a political fence-mending bill. It is significant that this bill came in after the farmers union march on Queen's Park, and I think this is one of a number of actions that were taken by the government in a rather belated but desperate move to cope with what other people will realize—if the hon. Minister of Agriculture had not realized up until that point—was a pretty serious state of ferment throughout the rural part of the province. By means of a palliative, a salve for all of the pains that the agricultural community was suffering, and in face of a pretty adamant stand and insensitive stand in terms of the needs of farmers—because these needs had been made very clear to this government for many months before and they had resisted them—the government came in with this piece of legislation. Too little and too late, a bit of Tory fence-mending; but sometimes one has to take only the crumbs that are given and I trust it will help some farmers.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the charges that have been made, I suppose no matter what was brought in it would never be enough to suit my friends from the Opposition. The fact that the statement was made early, or I should say in mid-April, I think, was in ample time to take care of most farmers. And the policy was made retroactive to January 1, 1966, to take care of any farmer who may have ordered his seed or fertilizer and taken delivery of it and had made any other financing arrangements. He could after the statement was made, immediately go to the bank, get the money, pay off his bill or his indebtedness or his loan that he may have made to acquire the seed or fertilizer. This would then have been taken care of, and it will be taken care of right through until next year insofar as interest and guarantee are concerned. I would feel that this was about as far as one could possibly go in making it retroactive and applicable to everybody.

My hon. friend from York South referred to the fact that this was a palliative as a concession under pressure. I would refer my hon. friend to the fact that it is difficult to know just when one satisfies the demands of those who make demands.

Mr. MacDonald: There was no doubt after the farmers marched.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There was no question about the fact at all when the $4.00 milk was announced—I refer to an instance at a farm meeting, where one of the farmers stood up and said, "Well, we have $4.00 milk now, there is really no point in marching on Queen's Park; we have got $4.00, it has been announced." But, immediately, there was an organizer there from one of the political parties, who is also an organizer for a particular farm group that was holding the meeting, who said, "Oh, this idea of $4.00 milk, even though we have got it, it really is not what we want, we want to march on Queen's Park; $4.00 milk is completely beside the issue entirely."

Now then, as far as crop assistance for these farmers is concerned it was under active consideration before the farmers ever thought of marching on Queen's Park. This was what was being considered. In my view it was a very good thing to do; I appreciate the kind words that have been said by both of our friends from the Opposition parties, in that it is a measure of assistance. I think that it has been a measure of assistance. Many farmers have called me personally; many have written to me; the farm organizations have expressed appreciation for it and I would hope the members of the House would support it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE EDIBLE OIL PRODUCTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 114, An Act to amend The Edible Oil Products Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ABANDONED ORCHARDS

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 115, An Act respecting abandoned orchards.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, there are two things that interest me about this bill. There is no doubt that many farmers have been neglecting their orchards. What goes to make up an orchard is a little bit in doubt,

because I really do not know what the term "orchard" broken down really means, whether it means 20 trees, or whether it means 50 trees. In any case, I realize that there are orchards across this province that are being neglected for one reason or another.

In some cases, the owner has simply lost interest. It is not an economical unit. The cost of maintaining it, of spraying and so on, has become prohibitive, according to the volume of fruit that can be produced and so it has just simply been neglected. In other cases, the farm containing the orchard has been sold and the new owner just has not taken any interest in it. He has let it go and it is run down, and insects get into it. Disease gets into it and it spreads to the good orchards that may be adjoining the property.

So I realize the motive behind the bill. I think it is a good one. There are two things that interest me, one I have already alluded to, and that is the fact that we do not really know in the terms of the bill what makes up an orchard, what an orchard really means, as far as the purposes of the bill are concerned.

The second thing that interests me, Mr. Speaker, is that we have reference somewhere in here to the fact that it pertains only to orchards that are within 300 yards of those that are under intensive care. I think that is the phrase that is used. Now I would point out that there are many insects and a few fungi that would not be contained within those limits of 300 yards, and I just wonder if this is not an arbitrary figure that has been picked out of the air, and perhaps does not bear any realistic relationship to what can happen in terms of spreading of disease and so on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to suggest to my hon. friend that he really has not read the bill. If he had read the bill he would have found the definition of an orchard, which I shall read into the record of the House: "An orchard means an area of land of at least one-half acre in which there are at least 13 fruit trees, and on which the number of fruit trees bears a proportion to the area of at least 26 fruit trees per acre." That is the definition of an orchard for purposes of this Act.

Mr. Gaunt: Sorry, I missed it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The second point is with regard to the 300 yards. My understanding of the drafting of the bill is that it met the approval of the provincial entomologist, so that it was felt that an orchard within 300 yards of an orchard under active care and treatment could provide a hazard if it were not looked after. This was the reason why it was established as 300 yards.

If that is not sufficient, we can always expand that. As I understand it, this was what met the approval of the people concerned.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) moves second reading of Bill 117, An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION OF CATTLE ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 118, An Act to amend The Artificial Insemination of Cattle Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 119, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE WEED CONTROL ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 120, An Act to amend The Weed Control Act.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, under this bill: From time to time different departments of government own property, such as The Department of Highways and The Department of Lands and Forests. There are occasions when they have difficulty in having the weeds controlled on this property. Will this bill be effective on the property of different departments of government?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to bear in mind the fact that there are some areas on which you virtually cannot control weeds. With regard to areas on which weeds can be controlled, I see no reason why these amendments would have anything to do with lessening the effect of The Weed Control Act as it is presently constituted.

Indeed, this Act clears up a situation in many areas where there was some doubt left as to who was really responsible for the control of the weeds growing on a given piece of property, where there was some doubt as to whether it was the owner or the one who was in possession of the property, the tenant, or just who was there. This takes care of that particular problem.

It also, which is much more important to me, takes care of the problem some weed inspectors found developing in some municipalities. Certain people refused to cut the weeds according to the Act until they had matured, or until they were ready to go to seed.

We must recognize that there are countless thousands of people in this province who suffer from hay fever. The weed allowed to go to seed has caused all of the damage to the hay fever sufferers. Not only to their discomfort, but it has arrived at the place where it will propagate itself another year. This amendment permits the inspector to move into that area and tell the person who is in possession of the land, not necessarily the owner, that he must destroy these weeds while they are in the stage where they do contribute to the discomfort of people.

Mr. Spence: This will take care of property held by the government?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As I said earlier, it should take care of it in areas where it is possible to destroy weeds. But I think my hon. friend, being a rural man, and one associated and knowing the physiological conditions of areas, will agree that there are some that are virtually impossible to do very much about.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, regarding this property that had the weeds on; that it was hard to get the weeds taken care of last year: the municipality brought it to the attention of the government many times but did not get any action. I wonder if this bill would take care of property owned by a department of this government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that this is a technical detail. If my hon. friend would do me the favour of referring to the specific piece of property, we will see what can be done about it. It is not the intention of this government to cause distress to anyone, anywhere.

Mr. Oliver: Would my hon. friend say if the municipal weed inspectors have any control or jurisdiction over such land as my hon. friend is referring to? Land of the Departments of Highways, Lands and Forests, and so on? Would he have any jurisdiction at all, even if they sought to exercise it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not got the Act before me, Mr. Speaker, but there is no reason why anyone should be exempt from The Weed Control Act. This would be my commonsense approach to the thing. For the life of me, I do not know whether public lands are under The Weed Control Act or not. As I say, I have not got it before me. But I would see no reason why they should not be in areas where weeds are controllable.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves second reading of Bill 121, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that this group is in general agreement with the principle of this bill? I want to make a comment on sections 5 and 9 of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Should this not be done at the committee stage if the hon. member wants to comment on specific sections?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member could make them, if he is going to deal with sections rather than the general principle of the bill, when the sections are called during committee of the whole House?

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure. I could mention this as part of the matter I want to deal with. It is embodied in the principle of the bill, I think. I will say that the hon. member for Riverdale is going to deal with another angle on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: As long as the member does not get into specifics; that is all I am wondering about.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, the general thesis of the sections of the bill which I had in mind is that the bill is giving the Lieutenant-Governor in council certain powers. I agree with those powers, but the Minister has indicated that he does not expect to see those powers used immediately. This was the part of it that I was a bit concerned about. He has stated, I think, that he wants to use this as a tool in bargaining with the motorcar

industry, and that he does not expect to use the specific power given him right away. This was the point that I wanted to make. I feel that the Minister should go forward once the bill is in operation to write the necessary regulations to do the job that he sees the bill performing in this field.

Unless the Minister does this, I think he is fooling himself in thinking that he can co-operate to make the bill effective in the field of automobile safety and tire safety, because he only has to look at some of the things that are happening today—the Ben Hur hubcaps on some of the cars, the experience with the well-known danger of the steering column up to this point—to know that the industry is aware of dangers but still puts style ahead of the kind of thing that the Minister wants to accomplish. So, I would say to him that the New York Legislature and other jurisdictions have given up the idea that they could write legislation and yet not put it into effect. They have gone ahead to make effective legislation that they have on the books and that is why we have seat belts today and better brake fluid and better brake linings and this sort of thing.

I call to the hon. Minister's attention just a couple of small things. Not long ago, I was talking to my family physician and he told me of his father who had been driving a car at 15 miles an hour when another car shot out and he had a crash at just that speed. He was pushed forward in the car, his kneecap hit the ignition key and the patella was smashed into a hundred pieces or so, a very painful process. And yet that has happened time after time. Industry has known about it, year after year, and yet that ignition key in most cars or many cars—certainly it is in my car, and many others—is right there in front of the kneecap. Sometimes when we are driving very slowly we do not bother with seat belts; many people do not in any case; but it would not be very difficult, I think, and the industry knows this, to change the position of that ignition key or have some other device, which is not sharp and dangerous in that way.

I remember the thing, Mr. Speaker, which interested me first in car safety was driving with my arm over my forehead to break the reflection from the windshield wiper arm, the chrome that was there, and that still exists in almost all cars. When I took it in and complained about it, the garageman again told me, as he told me in the case of the accelerator, that this was the first time he had ever heard of it. But I do know, and I think the industry knows, that millions of people complain of this; a very simple matter would be to change the reflective surface of that windshield wiper arm, but it is not done.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to deny the member his right to talk about these things for ever, but he simply is out of order, because I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with the principle of the bill, to go into the detail of how a manufacturer builds a car and how somebody breaks his leg. I do not wish to limit his opportunity to talk about this, but I just think he is doing it at the wrong time.

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Speaker, I—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I make the submission to the Speaker who is the final arbiter on this.

Mr. Young: I was keeping my eye on the Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I realized the situation. I thought perhaps if we had the speech now, we would not have it during committee of the whole, so I was allowing the member to proceed. If the member has completed his remarks, we will proceed to other bills.

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Speaker, the only point I wish to make is very simple and I wanted to use a couple of these illustrations to point out the fact that unless we are in deadly earnest about these sections of the bill, unless we are going to back them up with regulations and back them up right away, that the principle of the bill, at least as far as it applies to these things, will be ineffective and I think the House should recognize this as it passes these sections of the bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 124, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL FRANCHISES ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill 125, An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION ACT, 1965

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill 122, An Act to amend The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill 123, An Act to amend The Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill 126, An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill 127, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONFEDERATION CENTENNIAL ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill 128, An Act to amend The Confederation Centennial Act, 1962-1963.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, just one brief remark about this. The matter was raised a year ago. At that time the Minister felt that it was not necessary to make special provision to assist the Indian bands to celebrate the centennial. I would be very interested in knowing what persuaded him to change his heart in the matter.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Nothing persuaded me to change my mind at all. These Indians are still entitled to their centennial grants as we originally had thought our legislation would cover. It was found that there were certain Indian bands that were not really such within the meaning of section 68 of The Indian Act of Canada. All we are doing is broadening the Act, because of some deficiency in the legislation, so as to make very certain that centennial grants will be available to all of these people. As a matter of fact, we have already approved centennial projects on the basis that the Act would be amended, as it is being amended today.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, with that further information, I would just like to say that with now considerably less than a year before the centennial itself is to be celebrated, it is to be hoped that even with this rather belated legislation the Indians will be able to take part in the centennial in an orderly and efficient way and perhaps be able to have their centennial projects completed for the centennial year, even though we in this Legislature have not been able to order the business of the province so that our own projects were completed.

Last year, of course, we did bring this to the attention of the government, that some of the Indian bands were interested in this and that the legislation did not permit it; and I must say that, as we say so often in these bills, it is not too little because there is plenty of money there available for the furtherance of these celebrations and for certain projects, but it is obviously very late indeed and I know that the government is going to make every effort to see that the Indians are made aware of their rights and privileges in this connection, and that they will have every opportunity to take part in the celebration.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, may I in answer to the hon. member's question say this: The purpose of this legislation is to provide us with still greater and broader powers to pay centennial grants to Indian bands that are not under section 68 of The Indian Act of Canada. It was always our intention and it is still our intention and will continue to be our intention, to pay these grants to all Indian bands, including those that do not operate under section 68 of The Indian Act, so that we have not changed anything.

Our Act has been in effect since the session of 1962-1963.

Mr. Nixon: Does the hon. Minister recall his sentiments last year on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I recall the statements last year to the effect that Indian bands, wherever located, were still entitled to and would receive centennial grants, and we

have approved any number of these that have come into our committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill 129, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Attorney General, I would like to move the second readings of bills under orders 26, 27, 28 and 29. These are going to the legal bills committee and if there is any debate on the principle, we can hold them over until the Attorney General is in the House. Otherwise, I would move them and they would go to the committee on legal bills.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the principle of Bill 131 and the companion Bills 132, 133 and 134.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Then I will leave them all.

THE PARKS ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves second reading of Bill 135, An Act to amend The Parks Assistance Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The second order: committee of the whole House.

NURSING HOMES

House in committee on Bill 45, An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of nursing homes.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 9:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on section 9 I would like to ask the hon. Minister whom he expects to have on his nursing homes advisory committee? For example, are there going to be three people from the nursing homes association, or who?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): There will be three people from the nursing home industry itself, so that those who have an appeal to make will be judged by their peers. The problem will be judged on its merits by people who have some knowledge of the industry.

Sections 9 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 12:

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, at the committee meeting, I did undertake to advise the hon. members of the ideas we had in respect of regulations. We have them in draft form and they are not finalized yet, but the meat of the regulations here, the particular regulations make a fairly hefty document and if there are particular sections about which the hon. members are concerned I would appreciate them telling me and I will give those specifics. Some of them are very routine and normal administrative matters.

Mr. Trotter: There is one thing I would like to say on this and that is: When this was before the committee, my main objection to it was that the real heart of the Act is going to be in the regulations, in section 12, and I hope that the hon. Minister will supply us with a copy of them as soon as he has them. I do not expect him to read them in the House because it would take too much time, but I do object, under 12 1 (b), and that is that the regulations have the power to exempt nursing homes from the application of the Act. Could the hon. Minister give me some idea what they intend to exempt there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is really a matter directed to certain religious groups: Submissions were made to me on behalf of one particular group who pointed out to me that they did not believe in medical care or nursing care within the narrow definition that we have placed upon it, although we have considered the definition of nursing care fairly broad. This group does not agree with us in any way whatsoever and they asked and indeed petitioned us quite vigorously to write into the Act, as was done one time with the British Act, provision to exempt them. I do not like to do that, as I said in committee, and we did agree with them that we would control this by regulation and I can tell you what that exemption sounds like now:

> The regulations cover all facilities in the province which are to be licensed as nursing homes and do not cover hospitals

and other institutions which are licensed for active treatment or boarding home care.

That is the first blanket exemption and then the particulate exemption:

The provisions of this Act and regulation for any standards or rules pursuant thereto for medical and nursing services shall not apply to any institution operated by and for the exclusive use of the members of a religious order or denomination whose tenets exclude the services of licensed practitioners of medicine and nursing, but all other provisions of the Act and regulations and such standards and rules not concerning the religious exclusions noted in subsection 2 above shall apply. The medical officer of health and his officers shall act as inspectors.

Just because they are excluded from that part of the regulations having to do with nursing and medical care the quality of the home, the safety, the comfort of the patients, the number of staff, instead of using "nurses" within the framework of our definition, we will have to name "attendants" or some other word that covers the categories of personnel used by them, but all other sections of the Act will apply to them; the only exclusion will be in respect of nursing and medical care.

Sections 12 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 45 reported.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

House in committee on Bill 53, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Sections 1 to 28, inclusive, agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that this bill be amended by adding thereto the following section, by renumbering the succeeding sections accordingly:

29. A local board may provide, maintain or hire an ambulance for the conveyance of persons requiring medical attention and may pay the expense of conveying therein any person requiring medical attention to a hospital or other place.

This is to bring The Public Health Act into keeping with The Ambulances Act which I introduced into this House yesterday.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Section 30—formerly 29—agreed to.

Section 31—formerly 30—agreed to.

Bill 53 reported.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

House in committee on Bill 79, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 79 reported.

THE PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

House in committee on Bill 84, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Before proceeding to that, would I have the hon. Minister's permission to go back to Bill 45?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have no authority to give anyone permission to change the rule.

Mr. Chairman: I have no authority as the Chairman to revert to a bill that has been passed by the House.

Mr. Ben: I think there is a very important omission in this particular Act. I brought this to the attention of the hon. Minister and I anticipated he would bring forth an amendment, and I tried to get down to the House just as fast as possible.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I recall the hon. member talking to me about forgetting to have changed a word in a section of a certain Act, but I cannot remember to what he referred.

Mr. Ben: Well, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the House should know that section three in that particular Act provides that no person shall establish or maintain and operate a nursing home unless it is licensed under this Act, but there is no provision to penalize anybody.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Surely the member is out of order.

Mr. Ben: Well, all right. If you are more interested in the procedure of the House than you are in a proper bill, go ahead—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if the hon. member wanted it, he should be here.

Mr. Ben: Fine, if that is the attitude of the—

Mr. MacDonald: It is not the attitude, it is the rules of the House, you should—

Mr. Ben: I asked for permission to bring something—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Riverdale has stood in his place on a point of order.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my point of order simply is that the bill has been passed and it is not now open to the member for Bracondale to—

Mr. Chairman: The point of order is well taken. I am sorry, I have no jurisdiction over this bill at this time. Bill 84 is before us.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 84 reported.

THE MEDICAL ACT

House in committee on Bill 85, An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 85 reported.

THE TERRITORIAL DIVISION ACT

House in committee on Bill 105, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill 105 reported.

THE PRIVATE SANITARIA ACT

House in committee on Bill 111, An Act to amend The Private Sanitaria Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 111 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, (a) the Lieutenant-Governor in council may authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to pay to the crop insurance commission of Ontario out of the consolidated revenue fund a sum equivalent to such percentage of the premiums payable under any plan or plans of crop insurance, as the Lieutenant-Governor in council determines;

(b) if at any time the amount standing to the credit of the Ontario crop insurance fund is insufficient for the purpose of making payments for claims under plans of crop insurance, the Lieutenant-Governor in council may authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to advance to the crop insurance commission of Ontario out of the consolidated revenue fund such sums as are necessary to meet the deficit on such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in council directs; and

(c) the moneys required for the purposes of administering The Crop Insurance Act (Ontario), 1966 shall, until the March 31, 1967, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 112, An Act to provide for crop insurance.

Resolution concurred in.

CROP INSURANCE

House in committee on Bill 112, An Act to provide for crop insurance.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has brought to my attention that this bill was to go through the committee on agriculture. I do not think it has been there and it has got into this part of the order paper. We will not deal with it now but send it to the committee on agriculture. It will come back here in the normal course of events.

I think the carrying of the resolution can stand. We will deal with the balance of it later.

Clerk of the House: Bill 112. The order has been discharged for the House in committee, and the bill referred to the committee on agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report one bill, with amendment, and certain bills without amendment, and one resolution, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: The committee of the whole House begs to report one resolution, one bill with amendment and certain bills without amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The first order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, the presentation annually to the Legislature of a report on Ontario Hydro has been traditional for a very long period. Usually, as today, this has been given during the Budget debate, although in some recent years such statements have been made to the committee of supply. May I say how greatly I appreciated the support already given by the House to the vote in the estimates related to the pioneering work of Ontario Hydro in the field of nuclear power development. Today, therefore, I would employ the present opportunity to speak of the events and accomplishments of Ontario Hydro in the past year, with also reference to some coming events.

This year the province's unique Ontario Hydro organization celebrates its 60th anniversary. It was on June 7, 1906, that an order-in-council was passed to appoint the first commissioners, under authority of an Act passed during the session of the Legislature earlier that year.

One of the commissioners, and Ontario Hydro's first chairman, was the Hon. Adam Beck, who was to continue in that office until his death on August 15, 1925.

In this 60th year, I should like to pay tribute to the ninth chairman of Ontario Hydro, Mr. W. Ross Strike, QC, who retired at the end of March after completing nearly five years as chairman and a total of 22 years on the Ontario Hydro commission.

Mr. Strike has served longer on the commission than any previous chairman and he deserves the congratulations and heartiest good wishes of this House for his untiring, outstanding and devoted public service.

I should also like to speak of the new chairman, Mr. George E. Gathercole, MA, LL.D. The new chairman is well known to the members, since Dr. Gathercole has had a long, interesting and conspicuous career in the provincial government service before being appointed first vice-chairman in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today it was my privilege to be present at the first independent degree-conferring convocation of York University when one of those to receive a degree, doctor of laws, honoris causa, was the new chairman of Ontario Hydro—a well-deserved tribute to his long service to the province.

I also wish to acknowledge the appointment of Mr. D. P. Cliff as first vice-chairman, and the appointment earlier this year of Mr. Ian F. McRae as commissioner. The other serving commissioner is Lt. Col. A. A. Kennedy.

Now, to progress in 1965. Power demands in Ontario reached an all-time high of 7,818,000 kilowatts in December, 1965, which was an increase of 8.4 per cent over the peak established in 1964. This figure is significantly above the long-term annual growth rate of 6.5 per cent and reflects the general buoyancy of Ontario's economy. It is expected that the high level of activity will continue through 1966, and we are forecasting a further advance in power demands of at least seven per cent by this December. It is difficult to predict beyond 1966, but there are some indications that we may return to a period of normal growth, although this is not certain.

Primary energy for the first four months of 1966 totalled 16.24 billion kilowatt-hours, up 10.1 per cent over the same period last year.

Adjusted for seasonal influence, primary energy demand in April was 3.88 billion kilowatt-hours, .6 per cent less than the previous month. This seasonally adjusted total for April is about three times greater than it was 20 years ago.

To meet these rapidly rising power demands, Ontario Hydro is currently embarked on an expansion programme which will bring more than 5 million kilowatts of new generating capacity into service by 1971, representing an increase of three times the entire present power needs of Metropolitan Toronto.

For the five-year period between 1966 and 1970, Ontario Hydro's requirements for new generating stations, transmission and distribution facilities and other equipment, will involve in the neighbourhood of $1 billion.

For 1966, the capital expansion programme calls for a gross expenditure of about $192 million. At present, four thermal-electric plants, coal-fired and nuclear, are under construction. In addition, four hydro-electric sites in northern and eastern Ontario are being developed or expanded.

The new $220 million Lambton generating station is now under construction 14 miles south of Sarnia. When completed in 1971, this plant will have a capacity of 2 million kilowatts—equivalent to the present peak power requirements of Metropolitan Toronto and Ottawa.

Orders have been placed for the station's turbo-generators, boilers and other major pieces of equipment with Canadian manufacturers. The 500,000-kilowatt generating units will be the largest built and installed in this country. Construction of the workshop

facilities, site grading and excavation was begun early last summer. The project work force will average 850 men, reaching a maximum of 1,600 in the peak period of construction.

Work is progressing on installation of a fifth 300,000-kilowatt unit at the Lakeview coal-fired station on the western outskirts of Metropolitan Toronto. This unit is expected to produce power later this year. Two more such units are scheduled for 1967 and a final one in 1968. With all eight units in service, Lakeview will have an installed capacity of 2,400,000 kilowatts.

A site verification ceremony was held in Pickering Township last September for the largest nuclear-electric generating station under construction in North America. The $266 million nuclear plant is being built on the shore of Lake Ontario, about 20 miles east of Toronto.

Hon. members were given details about this project in the 1965 session. It will be recalled that the Ontario government is participating with the government of Canada and Ontario Hydro in financing the $266 million undertaking. The Ontario government will provide as its share a total of $66.5 million. Under this financing agreement, Ontario Hydro will pay $120 million, with the national government providing the balance of $79.5 million. We are confident that the moneys spent on this development will be fully recovered and we should realize a return on our investment as well.

This project has bolstered the economy by more than $50 million since the construction of the plant was announced about 18 months ago. Hundreds of workers in many companies benefit from the use of Canadian know-how. Many of the contracts awarded include options for more work if the station is expanded beyond the two 540,000-kilowatt units now committed.

First power from Pickering is scheduled for 1970. Meanwhile, Canada's first full-scale nuclear power plant, the 200,000-kilowatt Douglas Point station on Lake Huron, between Port Elgin and Kincardine, is reaching final construction stages. We expect first power from this installation by the end of the year.

There were also several significant developments in the hydro-electric field this past year. Work crews began placing concrete for a power station on the Madawaska river in the spring of 1965—the 139,500-kilowatt Mountain Chute plant, 22 miles southwest of Renfrew. The cost of this project, scheduled for completion by December, 1967, is $30 million.

Plans for a $14 million extension to Barrett Chute station on the Madawaska river were announced last spring. Two 60,000-kilowatt generators will be installed in the station, located 18 miles south of Renfrew. On completion in 1968, the plant will have a total capacity of 160,000 kilowatts—four times its present size. Construction at Barrett Chute will begin this summer. One major aspect of redevelopment will be deepening of a 2,150-foot power canal to increase flow to the station. Addition to the powerhouse and headworks, and construction of two penstocks will also be necessary.

A third project on the Madawaska, announced in September, is an $11.5-million extension to the Stewartville station, eight miles southwest of Arnprior. Two 50,000-kilowatt generators will be installed; on completion in 1969, the plant will have a total capacity of 161,000 kilowatts.

Other hydro-electric developments are concentrated in the James Bay watershed, where a $200-million programme was begun in 1958. By this summer the four projects in that area will have a total capacity of 551,000 kilowatts. The programme started with construction of the Otter Rapids station on the Abitibi river, completed in 1963. Meanwhile, other construction crews were busy on the Mattagami river, completing Little Long station in the same year. Using Little Long as a base camp, construction workers completed the Harmon station, 13 miles downstream, last year and will finish the Kipling station, a further two miles downstream, later this year. All four plants on the Mattagami and Abitibi are designed for operation by remote control from Pinard transformer station, 60 miles north of Cochrane.

Also completed was an extensive diversion which alters part of the Opasatika river flow through a mile-long excavated channel and several natural tributaries into the Mattagami. By changing the flow of the Opasatika, the annual output of the three Mattagami river power stations will be increased by some 59 million kilowatt-hours—equal to the total 1965 electric energy demands of Kirkland Lake and Hearst.

These hydro-electric stations in the far north are being made economically possible by extra high voltage transmission. Power now is collected at Pinard, near Abitibi Canyon, and fed into the new EHV system. The line is in service at 230,000 volts to Essa, near Barrie. Later this year the entire

stretch of 435 miles, linking the James Bay watershed with the outskirts of Metropolitan Toronto, will be in service at 500,000 volts.

Over the years, Ontario Hydro has built a complex network of transmission and distribution systems which form a large power grid. For costing purposes, the entire province is treated as one entity rather than a series of separate systems. It does not much matter where the power is generated, and no single generating station is of particular benefit to one community. Power is pooled from all sources and distributed through this grid. The EHV system, for example, is a two-way street; it can bring power from the north to be used in southern Ontario, or vice versa. This strengthens the security of service in northeastern Ontario.

Other major additions to the transmission network completed in 1965 were a second 230,000-volt circuit on the 34-mile line from Little Long and Harmon generating stations, to Pinard transformer station; and a 53-mile, single-circuit 115,000-volt line from Hollingsworth Falls station of the Great Lakes Power Corporation to Ontario Hydro's new distribution station at Chapleau.

As has often been mentioned, we no longer have a large number of hydro-electric sites remaining in the province which may be economically developed. We estimate that only some 1.5 million kilowatts of power remain to be harnessed economically from flowing and falling waters; most of these locations are in remote northern sections of the province.

In a continuing investigation of two possible hydro-electric sites north of Thessalon on the Mississagi river, extensive diamond-drilling programmes will begin this year at Aubrey Falls and Gros Cap. Plans for extending Ontario Hydro's George W. Rayner generating station, farther downstream, are also under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress that Ontario Hydro will take every possible step to ensure that the scenic splendour of the Aubrey Falls and Gros Cap areas is preserved. In keeping with its long tradition of protecting local interests, Ontario Hydro will co-operate fully with other government departments in working out plans that will prove satisfactory for all concerned.

These developments on the Mississagi would increase system capacity by about 300,000 kilowatts and involve an expenditure of over $60 million.

A two-site hydro-electric development is also under investigation on the Montreal river, a few miles southeast of Cobalt.

Rehabilitation and enlargement of the Chippawa power canal at Niagara Falls, begun early in 1964, was completed in late October last. This has increased the water-carrying capacity of the canal by 11 per cent.

Northwestern Ontario, because of its endless chain of lakes and rivers, is often thought of as a great potential source of hydro-electric power. In fact, the northwest, like southern Ontario, has reached the point where most of its future power needs must come from thermal sources. True, there are five small sites which are under study and may prove economical on the English, White and Little Jackfish rivers. It is not yet known which sites will be developed for power purposes, but total capacity would be only about 190,000 kilowatts. Thus, to meet the expected growth in power requirements in northwestern Ontario, we are proceeding with the first stage of an interconnection which will eventually lead to the physical integration of the province's two major electrical systems into a single provincial grid.

This interconnection will link Ontario Hydro's east system, which serves southern and northeastern Ontario, and the west system, which serves northwestern Ontario.

Interconnections such as this introduce economies through the exchange of power between regions, and they strengthen security of our vital service to customers. This has been Ontario Hydro's experience over many years as various small systems were linked together to form our east and west systems.

By bridging the gap between Ontario's northeast and northwest, construction of these new transmission lines will also mean that electrical utility systems from Saskatchewan to Quebec will be physically interconnected.

The first stage will be carried out in co-operation with the Great Lakes Power Corporation which serves the Sault Ste. Marie area.

An agreement between Ontario Hydro and the Great Lakes Power Corporation sets out the programme of work and the division of responsibility between the two utilities in providing for the first stage of the interconnection.

For 1968, we propose to provide transmission facilities which will permit power to flow from the Great Lakes Power Corporation system into northwestern Ontario and which we will replace by delivery of a like amount of power from our east system to Sault Ste. Marie.

This will involve construction of 100 miles

of double-circuit 230,000-volt line from the Michipicoten area of the Great Lakes Power Corporation system to Marathon. The line will initially be operated at 115,000 volts.

The project will also require a 230,000-volt circuit from the Sudbury area to Sault Ste. Marie. Sections of these facilities already exist. A second 230,000-volt circuit is to be provided in this section at the latest by May, 1969.

The transmission system proposed for the early stage will have only a limited capability for the transfer of surplus power between the east and west systems. The amount that can be delivered will be relatively small because of the heavy loads that would result on the transmission lines through the Great Lakes Power Corporation system from the Michipicoten area to Sault Ste. Marie.

In effect, these new facilities will allow an exchange of power between Great Lakes Power Corporation and the northwest and between Ontario Hydro's east system and Sault Ste. Marie. At a later stage Ontario Hydro plans a direct physical link between the two systems.

This will be accomplished by building a 230,000-volt line from the Michipicoten area to our Rayner generating station near Thessalon, which will complete the interconnection from the Sudbury area. At that time, when the east and west systems are integrated into the high-tension transmission network, it will be possible to transfer larger amounts of power between northeastern and northwestern Ontario.

For 1969 and later years, it is also planned to extend 230,000-volt transmission facilities in stages from Marathon to the Lakehead.

Based on preliminary estimates for the first stage, the cost of these facilities to be constructed by Ontario Hydro and Great Lakes Power Corporation will be approximately $20 million, the larger part being contributed by Ontario Hydro. Cost estimates of the entire construction programme are not yet available.

Mr. Speaker, for some years, requests have been received for the construction of a line from Timmins along Highway 101 which would make service available not only to Foleyet, but to the small number of residences, commercial establishments and cottages along the way. Unfortunately, the probable deficits from such an extension made the proposal impractical until a recent decision of Canadian Johns-Manville Co. Ltd. to go ahead with an asbestos mining development, 43 miles southwest of Timmins.

A 50-mile, 115,000-volt line will be built from Timmins to serve the mine site and a further 15 miles of 25,000-volt line will be constructed to Foleyet to connect this community to the Hydro system. Both lines should be finished in about a year.

Between 125 and 150 customers in Foleyet will receive electrical service. Cottages and other customers along the line between the mine site and Foleyet will be able to obtain power also. I know that this is a development which will give much gratification to the people of that particular area.

At the end of last year, approximately 49,400 miles of rural distribution line were in service in Ontario Hydro's systems to supply more than 515,000 rural customers, including 134,000 farm customers.

The total number of customers served in the province by Ontario Hydro and the associated municipal utilities is now well over 2,100,000.

To improve reserves and provide standby capacity, Ontario Hydro has purchased from Canadian companies 25 oil-fired turbine generators representing 291,000 kilowatts. The value of the new units is approximately $28 million. These will be strategically located in heavy load centres.

Increasing numbers of North American utilities are installing this comparatively new type of unit, which is particularly valuable in providing operational flexibility and standby service in case of a breakdown in system equipment. In emergencies, these units can be started up rapidly, while coal-burning units require several hours to be brought into service.

I would like now to speak of water levels. Water conditions in the east system have improved in the past year. At the start of 1965, apart from the Great Lakes, water storage was 20 per cent below normal. This situation changed during the latter part of the year, when heavy precipitation resulted in water storage that was 11 per cent above the normal conditions.

Great Lakes levels in 1965 increased hydro-electric generation, saving us the equivalent of 400,000 tons of coal worth $3.5 million over the experience in 1964. Nevertheless, power output at the Niagara and St. Lawrence plants during 1965 was still 3.7 billion kilowatt-hours below average, which is equal to almost 1.4 million tons of coal worth more than $12 million.

In the west system—northwestern Ontario—water conditions have remained good during 1965 and storages are now slightly above normal.

Meanwhile, the provincial government and the international joint commission are con-

tinuing their studies begun last year on water conditions in general.

As to coal purchases: this fuel is a major purchase item for Ontario Hydro. In 1965 some $36 million was spent to buy 4.1 million tons, most of it from United States suppliers. By 1970 the total expenditure could exceed $60 million to buy some seven million tons annually, give or take a million tons, depending on water conditions and power demands in the province. Since the expenditure is, of necessity, a large one, Ontario Hydro is constantly seeking ways to lower costs—about 50 per cent of them involving transportation.

Hydro's purchasing group tackled the coal-handling and buying problem and was successful in evolving a method which co-ordinates supply from the United States coal producers, and shipping via rail and vessel to our coal-fired plants. In essence, the concept is storage. Last summer, huge storage facilities were completed at Conneaut, Ohio, on Lake Erie. Ontario Hydro's coal purchases are being shipped to this point by rail on a year-round basis and held until ships can haul the coal to our plants during the navigation season.

I have simplified the Conneaut concept; in actual fact, it took a lengthy period of negotiating and bargaining to work out all the details and arrange the separate contracts with all parties involved. Through careful buying and better transportation arrangements, it is estimated that Ontario Hydro has saved about $1.50 per ton on the cost of coal in the past few years.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): The vice-chairman of Hydro was talking about buying a couple of boats, or getting them built and buying coal from the east in our own eastern province. Does that drop out of the picture completely?

Mr. Boyer: No. I intend to refer to our purchases of coal from Nova Scotia. Purchases are delivered by two large ships which were built by Upper Lake Shipping Company, who have a contract for transportation of the coal from Sydney in Cape Breton Island.

Coal still is an expensive fuel, in spite of the economies I have mentioned. In large part, this is due to the transportation costs.

There is, however, a simple improvement which can be made—removal of the 50 cents per ton tariff on U.S. coal imposed by the federal government. The 50 cents is not a tariff or duty in the sense of protecting the competitive position of the home product. It is nothing more nor less than a straight tax—and a discriminatory tax at that.

The 50-cent-per-ton tax is costing Ontario power consumers almost $2 million annually. Since Ontario Hydro is the largest importer of coal in Canada, this federal tax is an especially severe burden for Ontario power consumers.

I said this was a discriminatory tax. I would like to explain why. Coal which is imported from the United States for the manufacture in Canada of coke and synthetic rubber is not assessed with this special charge. In other words, it comes in tariff-free. But Ontario people are paying almost $2 million for coal that is used to produce electricity.

For a number of years we have been urging the Dominion coal board and the various responsible Ministers at Ottawa to remove this duty. We are continuing to press the authorities for that action to be taken. However, the complexities of international tariff adjustments are such that progress appears to be slow.

Another item that will affect coal costs, should it be approved, is the proposal by the St. Lawrence seaway authority to charge lockage fees on the Welland canal. Based on estimated coal purchases for 1967 and 1970, the additional cost in these years to Ontario Hydro would be approximately $100,000 and $250,000 respectively.

Numerous organizations, including Ontario Hydro, have submitted briefs to the St. Lawrence seaway authority opposing the imposition of tolls. The hon. Prime Minister spoke in this House a week ago on the attitude of the province towards this matter.

With reference to the question of the hon. member for Niagara Falls, I will refer to purchase of coal in Canada.

We have a five-year contract with Nova Scotia suppliers for 2.85 million tons of coal. This contract will come to an end next year. We expect a total shipment of 750,000 tons in 1966—which is the amount provided for in our contract.

The only economic alternative to coal is uranium. As large nuclear-electric power plants, such as the Pickering station, are completed, the growth of our coal imports and expenditures of U.S. dollars will level out.

On the subject of air and water pollution, I should like to outline Ontario Hydro's programme at its coal-fired plants to maintain high standards of air quality. This control programme began about 15 years ago

with the construction of our first large coal-burning station. By the time our new Lambton station, near Sarnia, is completed in 1971, air quality control expenditures for this and the four other plants in Toronto, Windsor and Fort William will total more than $15 million.

An important measure to keep the air clean is the installation of electrical precipitators to collect dust particles. During the past year we announced plans to instal 99.5 per cent efficient precipitators—the best equipment available—for new units at the Lakeview and Lambton stations, and to instal additional equipment providing similar efficiency for three large units at the R. L. Hearn station on the Toronto waterfront.

Stockpiling separate supplies of low-sulphur coal for use when meterological advice warns of atmospheric conditions unfavourable to good dispersion of flue gases is an important step in maintaining high quality air standards.

In addition, we are keeping the situation under continuous review. I might say that extensive air-quality surveys are conducted in co-operation with other organizations in the Sarnia area. Our surveys will be intensified in the next few months, despite the fact that the plant will not produce first power for more than a year.

In Ontario Hydro's view, costs of recovering sulphur dioxide in the form of sulphuric acid from flue gases at its Lambton station would be prohibitive, and the product would be priced far above the market.

Estimates suggest that sulphur recovery would commit Ontario Hydro to a capital outlay of $25 to $30 million, with only a slim chance of reaching a break-even point through sales of acid.

Ontario Hydro has not, as it was mentioned earlier in the session, refused to consider this matter; rather, after considering it and consulting with industry that was interested, it found that this was not a practical matter.

The general opinion of technical men in the power industry is that the problem of sulphur oxides is still better handled by dispersion of hot gases from tall chimneys.

In connection with water quality, a large thermal-electric plant requires vast quantities of water for its cooling system. For example, when Lakeview's eight units are operating in 1968, the station's cooling system will borrow 1 million gallons of water a minute from Lake Ontario—several times the average rate of consumption of Metropolitan Toronto.

This water does not come into contact with any contaminants. It is chlorinated to prevent formation of algae under certain water and temperature conditions in the condensers. Then the water is returned to the lake in better condition than when it was taken out. Pollution already existing in Lake Ontario causes problems, however. On certain occasions, Lakeview units have been shut down because large concentrations of algae blocked the intake screens. To minimize this problem, high-powered water jets are used to wash weeds from the screens and various types of mesh are on trial.

Last summer, a matter which caused much comment had to do with cloud-seeding. I will try to place this in proper perspective.

Cloud-seeding generators have been improperly styled "rainmakers." They are incapable of creating rain that would not naturally occur, of changing a sunny day or even a cloudy day into a rainy day. With winds and clouds moving in a specific direction, the function of the machines is to endeavour to increase the amount of rainfall over a target area—in this case, Lake Abitibi —when rain is already falling there. Cloud-seeding does not make it rain above the cloud-seeding generator, but is intended to increase rain many miles away.

The cloud-seeding operation is carried out by projecting silver iodide crystals into existing naturally formed rain-producing clouds. Silver iodide impregnated cord is burned in propane fuel generators and vaporized silver iodide is emitted into the atmosphere. The prevailing wind and updraft conditions of the air are used as the mechanism to carry the vapour into the cloud. The burners must be located sufficiently far up-wind from the target area to permit the vapour to rise into the cloud at the time the cloud has arrived over the target. A selective programme of operation of burners is prepared for each particular storm condition in order to achieve this objective.

The silver iodide particles emitted by the burners ascend over a period of hours to a level in the cloud at which temperatures are below 25 degrees Fahrenheit—usually around 10,000 feet—where they augment the numbers of natural nuclei in forming tiny ice crystals. Crystals attract water vapour from the cloud and increase in size to form snow flakes, which become heavy enough to fall from the cloud over the target area. When ground temperatures are above freezing, this precipitation falls as rain. The short period of effective life of silver iodide, which is less than one day, precludes the argument of long-term effects caused by cloud-seeding.

With the unusually heavy rainfall of August and September it was not necessary or desirable to continue cloud-seeding. The levels on Lake Abitibi, a water storage area, rose much higher than was expected on the basis of the earlier weather outlook.

To see Ontario Hydro's problems in perspective, please recall the weather conditions prevailing all spring, one year ago, with very little rain in northeastern and southeastern Ontario, following, indeed, upon four years of below normal rainfall. In the Lake Abitibi area and the James Bay watershed generally, rainfall in June, 1965, was 50 per cent below normal.

Ontario Hydro has important generating stations on the Abitibi watershed and it is essential to maintain a high level of production for the benefit of Ontario Hydro's entire east system. Otherwise, our coal-fired plants in the Toronto area must be brought into greater use at much higher cost.

Ontario Hydro's difficulties—caused by low-stream flows and below-normal storage conditions during the past four years, and particularly due to the drought last spring—explains why the commission, on July 26, placed a contract for cloud-seeding. The objective was to improve water storage for the Abitibi watershed plants. If dry weather conditions had continued, as was expected, cloud-seeding might produce a small percentage of increased rainfall over Lake Abitibi when cloud conditions and wind direction were suitable.

Although increases in natural rainfall which are expected to occur through cloud-seeding are small, the value of this extra water could be up to 30 times the cost of the seeding programme in terms of additional output from hydro-electric stations.

This was Ontario Hydro's first contract of this nature in the province. It took effect on August 1, 1965. By that time, 18 generator machines were placed. Rain was fairly general on August 1 and the operation began, continuing for several hours on occasional days, as conditions permitted, until August 8. In all, six machines had been used when operations ceased on August 8. By that time there had been a remarkable general change in the weather over the greater part of Ontario; the frequent and heavy rainfall experienced then continued throughout many parts of the province.

The coincidence of wet weather and the start of the cloud-seeding contract led to misunderstanding and criticism. When the operation of the machines was suspended on August 8, it appeared likely that cloud-seeding could be resumed after the harvest. But the continuance of rainfall, which you will recall, Mr. Speaker, was general over much of the province, made this unnecessary.

Last fall, the contractor removed 16 of the 18 cloud-seeding machines from northeastern Ontario. One of the remaining two was stolen; the other is in the care of a man who has moved from his former residence and has not been located.

If the cloud-seeding generators were capable of producing as much rainfall as we experienced in Ontario during August and September, then such equipment would be demanded to relieve drought conditions prevailing in several regions on this continent. But you will agree this is a fantastic notion.

While we certainly sympathize with all whose business or farming operations were affected at the time by the heavy precipitation, there is no doubt that their problems were caused by natural weather conditions and certainly not by artificial weather conditions.

I am almost at the conclusion of this, but I would like to refer to municipal electric rates; I would like to mention a new power-costing method effective January 1, 1966, which affects the interim rates of municipal electrical utilities.

The new system was approved at nine regular and special district meetings of the Ontario municipal electric association last year. It resulted from a two-year study undertaken by Ontario Hydro, both as part of its continuing review of cost of power principles and at the request of the OMEA.

At the end of last year, Ontario Hydro was serving 360 municipal utilities. Two of these have since amalgamated with Windsor.

These municipal utilities, which buy power at cost from Ontario Hydro, are billed monthly on the basis of interim rates, which vary for each utility. Monthly billings are adjusted to actual cost of supplying power at the end of each year.

Under the new system, 281 utilities experienced decreases, 71 had increases and eight municipalities were relatively unchanged. Where increases occurred, it is expected that most utilities will be able to absorb higher wholesale costs without raising rates to customers.

While the cost of power change is not likely to be reflected immediately at the retail customer level, it will provide greater uniformity in the bulk power rates paid by municipalities and will have the effect in

the long run of creating more uniform retail rates.

The changes have been introduced in the interests of rate stability, fair allocation of costs and benefits in the light of changed conditions, short and long-range financial obligations and marketing objectives.

Even including the 1966 revisions, the wholesale cost of electricity in Ontario has been remarkably stable over the past decade.

Based on 1966 estimates of cost, the average wholesale rate per kilowatt to municipal utilities will have increased only 11 per cent since 1956. More important is that the greater use of electric energy by consumers has acted as a brake on the rise of kilowatt-hour costs at the wholesale level while decreasing them at the retail level. Because municipal utilities have improved their load factor, that is, kilowatt-hour consumption of utilities has risen faster than the peak kilowatt demand, the utilities' wholesale costs per kilowatt-hour have risen on the average only 4.5 per cent in the same ten years.

Residential customers of municipal utilities paid an average of 1.17 cents a kilowatt-hour in 1956, compared with an estimated 1.12 cents in 1965, which was a decrease over that period. Average charges to commercial and industrial customers of municipal utilities have followed a similar trend.

A revision of the rural rates was announced January 12. These revisions will adjust the rate structure to changed conditions, realign rates with the cost of providing service to various classes of customers and simplify dealings with consumers.

It should be noted that despite marked increases in cost, no major change in rates for regular rural electric service has occurred during the past 12 years.

A change has been made in the method of payment of taxes which will benefit 640 municipalities. Ontario Hydro, under The Power Commission Act, pays grants in lieu of taxes to municipalities where the commission owns property. It is estimated that in 1966 these payments will total $5,665,000. It will be of greater assistance to the municipalities concerned if such payments are made in instalments. Accordingly, commencing this year, an advance payment of 50 per cent of the amount paid the previous year will be made to the municipalities about the end of June. This will conform more closely to the tax position of other property owners.

I have endeavoured to sum up Ontario Hydro's activities in the province during 1965. There is one matter which I have not yet mentioned, and I wish to do so now. As hon. members will recall, a large section of the northeastern United States and a portion of Ontario experienced major power interruptions on November 9. That event has pointed out that even with the fullest available knowledge, man's judgment is fallible and that greater emphasis and efforts must be made to avoid similar occurrences in the future. Several important and practical steps have been taken in recent months to prevent such a recurrence. These were outlined in a statement to the House on March 30 by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management and also were discussed very fully in the standing committee on government commissions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks, may I be permitted to repeat my felicitations of former years, for your fairness in presiding over the debates of this Legislature.

I would also like to congratulate the Chairman of the committee of the whole House, the hon. member for Eglinton, who has tackled this very difficult job with energy and vigour and has been eminently fair to all hon. members, and if I might say so, particularly to the members of the Opposition.

If I may be a bit personal, and I am sorry he is not in the House, I sometimes feel that his philosophy is much more that of a Liberal than that of a Tory.

May I, at the risk of annoying the hon. members on the other side of the House, read into the records some of the reactions to the Budget introduced by the hon. Provincial Treasurer last February 9? First, let me quote from two of the many hundreds of letters appearing in the newspapers throughout the province. On February 17, a letter signed, R. S. Oster, appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star*, and I quote:

> We have experienced in the latest provincial Budget the workings of one of the most unfair, unimaginative groups of legislators in the history of our province. In justifying the tax increases, government supporters have pointed out how our Ontario tax structure is really not so very different from those of her sister provinces. Well, does that make such changes correct or just, or does it on the other hand point out the me-too aspect of an antiquated Family Compact oligarchy? If it is true that the only fair form of taxation is one which taxes those with the ability to pay,

then the Ontario sales tax has to be the most unjust of all. By making goods cost more the government is taxing the poor and the rich equally. The ramifications hit directly at the wage-price spiral which everyone has been watching with subdued horror since the end of World War II. Such taxation takes away much of the relief that any Medicare programme would have given to low-income and pensioned people. It has to be an unsocial tax which shows once again conservatism in its most irresponsible form.

And I am still quoting, Mr. Speaker:

The kind of government we need across the land is one which not only shows initiative but innovation in its policymaking and taxation. What we have at Queen's Park is a group of unimaginative, self-satisfied, staid, annoying bureaucrats for whom the words "new" and "imaginative" and "social consciousness" do not exist.

And I conclude the letter by this paragraph:

Why don't we as voters remember from one election to next this government's unfairness and at least put in an effective Opposition which will force a complete revamping of our tax structure. Let us not forget this next year.

And another letter appearing in the same newspaper ends this way:

I only wish an election were imminent so that I for one could vote against the present government in response to its wretched tax boosts.

I could go on quoting many letters appearing in all newspapers in this province. The main criticism in these letters is the continuation of sales tax at the increased rate on drugs and many household goods which effect the low-income people of this province who have to make a much larger contribution than their income permits.

The editorials appearing in the newspapers were not too flattering either. Let me quote an editorial from a paper which is usually quite favourable to the present government, the *Globe and Mail,* in its edition of February 10, entitled, "The best things in life are not free" and I quote:

You pay for what you get. In case chatter of free-this and free-that had caused the Ontario people to doubt the truth of this aphorism, yesterday's budget should correct their thinking.

The majority of the electorate has been demanding increased services from the government. The government has responded to some of these demands, and yesterday it presented the first bill. Treasurer James Allan was unusually candid about its being only the first.

The same editorial, comments more or less favourably to the Budget, trying at least to justify some of the increases in both expenditures and revenue. However, I would like to quote some other parts of the same editorial and I quote:

But there is a meanness in the government's doubling of the land transfer tax, a tax which discourages what another government encourages, home ownership. Where is the sense in Ottawa's paying $500 per house to increase the homes built in winter, while Ontario taxes people who buy them? It is a tax, moreover, which produces a pittance for the government—only $6.5 million in this fiscal year against total tax revenues of $1.1 billion —but it is no pittance to the homeowner who must pay it just when his home purchase makes him least able to pay.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Racine: Well, I do not think, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Edwards: Well, I am just asking if the hon. member would permit a question?

Mr. Racine: I will answer any question at the end of my speech, if the hon. member wants to ask it then.

Mr. Edwards: I just wondered if the hon. member knew that the former leader of his party was the author of the sales tax.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

An hon. member: What about that!

Another hon. member: Yes, what about that!

Mr. Racine: Continuing the quote:

—not balancing this meanness, but acceptable is the reduction—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): He loses his place.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): At least he makes his speech, which is more than you do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Racine: I enjoy the interruptions of the hon. members for Perth and Simcoe East, but I do not believe that they add much to the debate.

Mr. Edwards: Neither do you.

Mr. Racine: Continuing, I was saying:

> —not balancing this meanness, but acceptable is the reduction which will not prevent the present foolishness of forcing many family businesses to be sold to pay death taxes, but which will give relief to some individuals.
>
> The strangest part of the Budget speech, however, was Mr. Allan's bland threat to the federal government that in 1967 it would either make a further four per cent abatement of income tax available to Ontario, or Ontario would tax its citizens four per cent and blame it on Ottawa.
>
> Ontario has not usually gone into federal-provincial bargaining sessions carrying big sticks, and it is curious that it should do so now when the federal-provincial taxation committee and the Carter Royal commission on taxation have yet to report. The action flowing from these reports could change the whole taxation picture in Canada. Is this Mr. Robarts' way of indicating that whatever the change, it must mean a bigger pie for the provinces?
>
> We really must have that Carter report before blackmail and intimidation have become the principal tools of government.

I could go on quoting from some of the editorials appearing in the newspapers throughout this province, strongly criticizing the Budget. I believe, however, that the government members from the four corners of the province are well aware of the fact that this was a very unpopular Budget.

I believe it would have been wise on the part of the hon. Provincial Treasurer to await the release of the Carter report before making wholesale changes in the tax structures of the province. It may take some time before proper adjustments are made after implementation of the report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to make a few comments on the hospital situation in Ottawa. During the study of the estimates of The Department of Health, I found it advisable to make some remarks and offer some constructive criticism of the hon. Minister. Since that time, the Minister and the commission have announced that permission has been given for the construction of a children's hospital to service the Ottawa area and an addition of some 116 beds for the Grace hospital. These announcements have been well received by the public and will fill a need that has existed for many years.

There are, however, many important problems regarding the entire hospital situation in Ottawa. First and foremost is the problem of the unmanageable debts on three Ottawa hospitals. I understand that the commission has met or will soon meet with the authorities of the General, St. Vincent and St. Louis de Montfort hospitals in order to arrive at a reasonable solution.

The new chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission will be receiving his baptism of fire when he submits his recommendations to the hon. Minister of Health. I certainly hope for the sake of the population of Ottawa that this solution is one that will permit the normal development of all hospital facilities in Ottawa.

Nothing much has been said lately about the Ottawa Civic hospital. The Ottawa area members, including yourself, Mr. Speaker, are well aware that real problems exist in this institution. I would like to quote some of the editorials appearing in the Ottawa newspapers regarding the Civic hospital problems.

From the Ottawa *Citizen* of March 28, entitled

> CRITICAL BED SHORTAGE
>
> The statement by Dr. H. G. Smith, a medical member of the Civic hospital board of trustees that the shortage of hospital beds here represents almost a crisis, sounds very familiar. The same sort of opinion has been heard repeatedly over the past several years in Ottawa, but little has been done to reduce the lengthy hospital waiting lists to reasonable proportions. It is becoming increasingly obvious that hospital projects in Ottawa, planned and completed, fall well short of what is required to meet the demand caused by rapid population growth and the widening area that must be served. The Civic hospital alone has a waiting list of 3,500 at the present time; the situation can be expected to get worse when the Ontario Medicare plan becomes effective on July 1.
>
> Dr. Smith pointed out that the opening of the 300-bed Riverside hospital late this year is likely to provide temporary relief at best. Even when this hospital was in the planning stage, strong arguments were advanced in favour of making it a 500-bed institution. Mayor Reid has since announced that 200 beds will be added there next

year. The aim should be now to provide the extra hospital space at the earliest possible date.

Study should also be given to proposals that a convalescent hospital be erected to accommodate patients who do not require full hospital care. Such a move could free beds in Ottawa's active treatment hospitals for the more serious cases.

The latest statement of the city's shortage offers still another argument to support the proposal for a children's hospital. Such a project would not only provide sick children with the specialized services that they need, but would also make more space available for adults at the general hospitals.

On May 6, in an editorial entitled,

CONCERN OF CIVIC'S DOCTORS

It would be regrettable if the misgivings expressed by Ottawa Civic hospital doctors over the proposed children's hospital should interfere in any way with plans for the project. Mayor Reid has rightly stressed that general practitioners would be on the staff of the new hospital and will have admitting privileges. It would not make sense to erect a children's hospital to serve the entire Ottawa area and bar general practioners from admitting patients.

The fact that the Civic hospital has considered replacing the hospital's 200-bed children's unit is obviously a factor in the debate. It is understandable that the Civic would want to improve its services, but as noted by Mayor Reid, emphasis should now be placed on the plans for erecting a hospital that would provide specialized facilities for treatment of sick children in the community as a whole.

If the Civic hospital were permitted to expand, the same would apply to all local hospitals. Both the academy of medicine and the Ontario hospital services commission have approved the proposed children's hospital. The aim of all parties concerned should now be to make the project a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Health is better informed now about the hospital situation in Ottawa. I am sure he will see to it that the decisions taken by the commission will be with a view to assuring for the population of Ottawa and of eastern Ontario the best hospital facilities. There is at the present time a group representing all hospitals in the city, meeting regularly in order to discuss mutual problems. I hope this group, together with the Ottawa academy of medicine, and the officials of the city, will be given official recognition by the government and that in the future discussions regarding hospitals in the Ottawa area will be made by that group in co-operation with the commission.

During the study of the estimates, the hon. Minister of Health mentioned the fact that the commission would not now authorize any organization to start a hospital or an addition to present facilities unless it had sufficient capital to do so. This was, I believe, an unnecessary criticism of past administrations. As I said before, and I would like to repeat, the hospitals built and operated by religious orders in Ottawa and throughout the province would have been able to continue their operations without too much difficulty had it not been for the advent of the Ontario hospital services commission. Public capital was simply not available but the religious orders had no misgivings in mortgaging all their assets to provide the necessary services and certainly did not deserve that kind of criticism.

The Minister of Health will, I am sure, find an intelligent solution to this very grave problem. And, as I mentioned before, an area of weakness in Ottawa and perhaps throughout the province, is the lack of facilities for convalescents. In a report of the summary of recommendations by the Ontario hospital services commission regarding hospital needs in Ottawa, dated December 16, 1964, it is stated that by 1969 the projected total bed need of the chronic care type would be 410 beds. On a statistical basis, a surplus of 317 chronic care beds will exist at that time if all the beds of this type presently available continue in use.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite ready to dispute those figures. There is a very long waiting list at the three chronic care hospitals in Ottawa and a number of patients are now occupying beds in general hospitals who could be transferred to a chronic care institution. The commission will have to find suitable accommodation somewhere else in order to correct this very serious situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding the Lower Town redevelopment project in Ottawa. This project, representing an expenditure of some $15 million, of which $5 million will come from the provincial Treasury, is one that has been received with a great deal of enthusiasm by the civic authorities and by many people living in this area—but with great misgivings on the part of others. I am personally very enthusiastic about it and I hope

it will become a reality during my own lifetime.

I would like to bring to the attention of this Legislature the fact that in my constituency in the past few years hundreds of homes have been demolished, displacing thousands of people. One of these areas, LeBreton flats, was completely wiped out. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that not enough consideration has been given to the people living in that area. Many of them, low-wage earners, had to move from that area and were not given the opportunity to obtain suitable accommodation at a rent they could afford. A low-rental project should have been built before demolition took place in or close to that area, and the people who owned their own homes were scattered all over the city and many even left the province in order to purchase a home at a price they could afford to pay.

Let us not make the same mistake this time, let us make sure that the people living in Lower Town at the present time and who wish to remain there, near their churches, their schools, their place of employment, be given the opportunity to do so. The city of Ottawa, together with the federal and provincial authorities, has recently unveiled that plan. On the surface, it seems to be a pretty good one. This is one of the oldest areas of Ottawa, many of the homes being between 50 and 80 years old and some possibly more. A very complete study has been made of all aspects of the problem. The renewal project would take into consideration the needs of the community and would conserve its present aspect. As little disruption as possible should be made of the present population.

Mr. Speaker, I am very enthusiastic about this urban renewal project. There are, however, some aspects of the project that worry me. First, I have been told that there has been a considerable amount of speculation by a number of individuals who have purchased property from other persons. The argument by the purchaser was that when expropriated they would get very much less for their property than they would be getting if they sold to these private developers. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that anyone should be permitted to make substantial profits on property being expropriated for an urban renewal project. I hope the Ontario housing corporation and other interested parties investigate this situation. I also hope that when the redevelopment takes place, this area will have really improved.

In connection with that, I would like to quote an article appearing in the Ottawa *Citizen* on May 14 of this year. This article deals with Ottawa's first redevelopment project, the Preston area project and the heading of this article is "Is city creating new slums out of old?" They show a picture of a series of houses being built on Preston street and saying that the project faces mounting criticism. And I read this article:

> Ottawa's first venture in urban renewal may be a multi-million dollar lemon. Criticism of the project has been vociferous ever since its inception two and a half years ago. Architects, planners, area residents, have all deplored the scheme. Its supporters urged them to hold their fire until the project was completed. "Wait for the finished product," they said, "And you will cool down." But the critics haven't. The first of the 104 two-storey red brick row-housing units, known as the Preston street new development, is slated for July 1 occupancy. And the critics get more vocal by the day. The houses squat unimpressively on a five-and-a-half-acre site bounded by Booth street, the Queensway, Preston street and Dowson street. They are the first evidence of the city's determination to redevelop areas congested by substandard housing with low-rental public accommodation.
>
> Occupying part of a 16-acre site expropriated by the city in the face of strong local opposition in 1964, the houses will accommodate some 550 people and cost more than $1.6 million. The city is slated to pick up more than $1 million of the tab and a percentage of the operating loss. The brunt of the cost will be borne by the federal and provincial governments. When completed the majority of the houses will have three bedrooms, although there are a handful of bachelor and one-, four- and five-bedroom suites. Each is furnished with oil-fired heating, a kitchen, a living room, a utility room and a small backyard. The area enclosed by the housing will be landscaped and trees will be planted.
>
> Urban renewal as defined by the central housing and mortgage corporation is a rebuilding of a municipality to improve living and working conditions. The Preston street project is unlikely to improve either, according to this critic. Much of this criticism is centred on the decision to build row housing as favoured by most of the municipalities in Ontario in recent years, rather than the more costly duplex and semi-detached type of development.
>
> "It does not seem to exhibit the kind of imaginative approach we should have

in this day and age," comments centennial commission architect, Robert Clack. Mr. Clack is in charge of the community improvement and beautification for the commission. He has seen many renewal projects in this continent and others, and regards row housing as an excellent form of replacement accommodation if skilfully handled; but leave out just one of the factors and it falls down very badly and very quickly. I doubt very much whether the Ottawa project could be as should be.

Mr. Clack's criticism is mild compared to that of Waldo Levac, who lives opposite the new development on Booth street.

The city invited Mr. Levac to move his family of five into one of the new units. He declined.

"They pull down some lovely homes," he says, "and the new ones are no improvement." Besides, Mr. Levac believes the project will be of little use to those it is designed to serve. They are not low-rental at all. Get a raise and they will take it away from you. Rents vary between 20 and 25 per cent of the tenant's income, but effectively exclude anyone earning more than $5,000 per year.

Father Jerome Ferraro, pastor of St. Anthony's church on Booth street, has mixed feelings about the new development in his parish. He concedes that uncompleted rows resemble army huts but feels the finished products will not actually look that bad. The fact that more than 50 per cent of those affected by expropriation owned their own property has left the fears that new tenants may not look after the homes as well as the old, the pastor said. But the influx of new residents should help speed the special integration of the predominantly Italian parish. The sole defender of the project is John Dace, the city administrative officer in charge of urban redevelopment.

While admitting that the Preston street project is not too attractive, Mr. Dace considers it a good compromise.

Now, duplexes are ruled out in this project. Economic conservation and restricted space ruled out duplex or semi-detached development, he said. Nor were high-rise buildings suited to large families. In defence of row housing he pointed out that the private developers often favoured this type. Theirs are fancier, they call them garden homes. Take away the frills and you have still got row housing.

Pragmatically, Mr. Binks accepts public criticism of the city's renewal project as inevitable. Everyone likes public housing so long as it is not in their own area, but it is a function of the city to ensure decent housing for its people and future development along Preston street lines can be expected. Ottawa, Mr. Binks says, is now dealing with third-generation welfare people and will always require some form of low-rental public housing. But the city is just embarking on its renewal programme, he added, and the demand for public housing is still far greater than the supply. We have a lot of catching up to do. To this end the city hopes to go ahead soon with similar renewal projects in east and lower town. Mr. Binks anticipates that some six or seven hundred public housing units in the area including both high-rise and row-housing development, all of which is small comfort to those who fear the city may live to regret the characterless rows of Preston street.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this project, I would like to put an editorial or part of an editorial appearing in the Toronto *Daily Star* of February 16, 1965. This editorial was entitled "Displaced families east side scandal" and this was referring to the $50 million St. James Town project. This is not a public housing project, this is a private project where houses were built but at the time the developers wanted to start demolishing, there were some 200 low-income families living in those areas. Part of this editorial says this:

> But, as Michael Best reported in the *Star* Saturday, the east side story also has its scandalous aspects. It looms as a disaster for some 200 low-income families who must get out before the bulldozers arrive.

I do not know what happened in this development. Those families have been moved. But at the end of the article, it says this:

> In a public housing scheme such as Alexander Park, every displaced family must be offered decent, safe and sanitary accommodation at a fair and reasonable price, having regard to their ability to pay, or else the federal government should withhold its loans and grants. There are no such requirements in a private project. A decent social quality which the mayor and council majority so glibly ignored yesterday, will require either a surplus stock of public housing to which displaced families can move, or some change in the rules covering private redevelopment. Why cannot provision be made for publicly subsidized low rent housing within these

private projects, Alderman Brown had suggested.

Mr. Speaker, I have about another 15 minutes. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would announce that we will continue tomorrow with the estimates of Treasury and, following the group for which the Treasurer is responsible, the estimates of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 127

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Seventh report, standing committee on legal bills and labour, Mr. Bales 4169

First report, standing committee on municipal affairs, Mr. Kerr 4169

Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 4169

Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 4169

Question of Mr. Simonett re railway overpass in East Zorra township, Mr. MacDonald 4169

Questions of Mr. Simonett re Timagami boat lines, Mr. Smith 4170

Statement re financial assistance to farmers purchasing pesticides and herbicides, Mr. Stewart 4171

Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan, continued 4172

On notice of motion No. 28, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Apps, Mr. Ben, Mr. Young, Mr. Harris 4200

Third readings 4208

Recess, 6 o'clock 4208

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the east gallery, students from Glen Echo public school, Hamilton.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills), from the standing committee on legal bills and labour, presented the committee's seventh report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 106, An Act to provide for the registration of and disclosure by public finance companies that hold shares in private loan companies.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton), from the standing committee on municipal affairs, presented the committee's first report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill 124, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act;

Bill 125, An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act;

Bill 126, An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act;

Bill 127, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act;

Bill 128, An Act to amend The Confederation Centennial Act, 1962-1963;

Bill 129, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE EXPROPRIATION PROCEDURES ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I might inform the House that this is a bill to provide procedure for trial of the necessity for the expropriation of property.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bil.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the handling of quotas by commodity marketing boards and brings up to date The Farm Products Marketing Act, with the same terminology and powers as are now included in The Milk Act.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if I could ask, I notice that the hon. Prime Minister has been good enough to suggest that we could get a copy of the bills when they are presented. Perhaps there has been some delay, but we have not received a copy of these bills.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I was not aware that our usual procedure had in any way been altered. We will arrange to get copies.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question asked by the hon. member for York South, re a railroad

overpass on the 13th line in East Zorra township, constructed as part of the Gordon Pittock dam development.

The overpass is being constructed concurrently with the Gordon Pittock dam but is not part of the project. Originally the latter included a level crossing, but as the traffic was nearing the count at which The Department of Highways and board of transport consider an overpass is required, it was decided to proceed with the overpass at this time.

The funds provided by the Upper Thames River conservation authority for a level crossing, less than $1,000, were contributed towards the detour. The authority, apart from contributing a small parcel of land to The Department of Highways for realignment of the north approach, is not involved in the cost shared.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister, who then is involved in it? That was the question.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, then I will give the hon. member the following information.

The cost sharing is complicated by the fact that the work lies astride the boundary of the city of Woodstock and passes over both the railway and the south branch of the Thames river.

There are four agencies sharing in the various parts of the work.

The contract price totals $569,635, including $309,504 for the structure, and $179,131 for the approaches. The cost sharing arrangements are:

(a) One half span over river within city—Department of Highways, 75 per cent; city of Woodstock 25 per cent.

(b) One half span over river outside city—Department of Highways, 100 per cent.

(c) Span over the railway—board of transport 80 per cent; Canadian Pacific Railway five per cent; Department of Highways, 11.25 per cent; city of Woodstock 3.75 per cent.

(d) The approaches within the city—board of transport 80 per cent; Canadian Pacific Railway five per cent; Department of Highways 11.25 per cent; city of Woodstock 3.75 per cent.

(e) Outside the city—board of transport 80 per cent; Canadian Pacific Railway five per cent; Department of Highways, 15 per cent.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a series of questions of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

First, on May 27 last, at page 3929 in *Hansard*, the hon. Minister answered a question in regard to the sale of the Ontario Northland Boat Lines at Timagami, and on February 1 last, at page 129 of *Hansard*, the hon. Minister had answered the same question. Would the hon. Minister inform the House which of the two answers is correct?

Second, when and if the sale of the Ontario Northland Boat Lines is completed, will it be a condition of sale that service by Shell Canada Limited be maintained at its present level for a period of at least five years?

Third, is a sufficient amount of the shoreline of Lake Timagami that is included in the proposed sale, being retained by the government or the ONR to provide proper access to the lake for the public and for the launching of private boats?

Fourth, will the government provide proper parking facilities at the lake, as has been provided in the past, but which is now being sold to Shell Canada Limited for the proposed building of a privately operated automobile service centre?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, I have checked *Hansard* and I cannot see where my answers vary but very little. I said someone would supply service.

The second part of the question, the answer is no.

The third part asks, is a sufficient amount of the shoreline of Lake Timagami that is included in the proposed sale, being retained by the government or the Ontario Northland Railway to provide proper access to the lake by the public and for launching of private boats? I might say the commission has kept land available for this purpose. Since then the commission has reverted this land back to the Crown, which incidentally provides a larger area than the commission provided in the past. Therefore this land is available through The Department of Lands and Forests.

The answer to the fourth part of the question is that the Ontario northland conservation commission never provided free parking facilities but charged a fee for this service, and the commission presumes that Shell Canada Limited has every intention of providing the same service, which is normal for all operations of this type.

I repeat that the commission is meeting with the chamber of commerce at Timagami on Friday of this week to discuss matters relating to the changeover of Timagami Boat

Lines from the Ontario northland transportation commission to Shell Canada Limited.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister stated that the answers are not different. May I quote the two parts of *Hansard*?

Mr. Speaker: No. I think what the member should do is to ask a supplementary question —if the Minister cares to answer it, but the questions themselves and the answers are not debatable.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of supplementary questions then. On question three, I believe that the amount of shoreline being retained is 70 feet and that this shoreline is not accessible for boat launching. Would the hon. Minister clarify what portion of the property is being maintained for this purpose and being turned over to The Department of Lands and Forests?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot give the hon. member that information. I do not have a map with me, but I was assured when this deal was talked about that there would be enough property left for boat launching and for the use of the public. I do not have a map with me and do not know the terrain that well that I would want to answer that question at this time.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister obtain the information for me as well as the assurance that the service will be continued, as he said, on February 1?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I said twice that we were going to supply this service. I am sure that if the member will go into the office at North Bay they will show him the maps and tell him the plans they have, and there will be boat-launching facilities; I have said this three or four times now.

Mr. Smith: The second part of my question referred to the boat line service down the lake, which is not a part of the contract which the Minister said was on February 1.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not get his question.

Mr. Smith: The second part of my question referred to the service of the boat line down the lake, and I would like to be assured that this will be part of the agreement. On February 1 the hon. Minister said that it was a part of the agreement and last week he did not indicate that it was. I would like to be assured that this will be a part of the agreement.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: On February 1 I do not recall saying that it was a part of the agreement and I will read out a passage:

> I am informed that one of the conditions of the sale of the Ontario Northland Boat Line at Timagami was that service be continued. I would think that the new owner would expand it to take care of increased business if necessary.

Mr. Smith: The sale was certainly part of the agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister of Agriculture have a statement?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Before the orders of the day, I would advise the House that The Ontario Department of Agriculture and the government of Ontario intend to add to the assistance programme for the purchase of seed and fertilizer, the purchase of pesticides or herbicides, used used in the planting of a crop and lime, wherever it is indicated by a soil test analysis.

This is in addition to the programme introduced early in April for assistance in purchase of seed and fertilizer.

There are a number of farmers who use pesticides or herbicides, sometimes both at the planting season and immediately following planting, and I feel this is an addition that is quite justified and we are pleased to do this.

I regret, however, to advise the House that the federal Department of Agriculture have seen fit not to accept our request that they join with us in providing this assistance programme to the farmers of the province of Ontario. We asked them to go along with this earlier, at the time prior to the introduction of the programme, and we were given to understand that favourable consideration would be given to it. However, when the written request went into Ottawa, we regret to say that they saw fit not to accept our request.

However, the programme is going ahead and the province of Ontario is carrying the responsibility and we will fulfil it to the letter of the statement.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): When the hon. Minister talks about the programme to which Ottawa will not contribute, to what is he referring—the whole programme?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Oliver: The whole assistance programme to the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Having to do with the statement I made early in April providing guarantees for the purchase of seed and fertilizer and now pesticides and lime, too.

Mr. Oliver: Of course, that is in addition to the other; that is not the basic programme and my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? Am I to assume that the limit has not been moved up, that it is still $1,000?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: That is an awful lot of political tub-thumping for that kind of thing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not political tub-thumping at all.

Mr. MacDonald: The last part was nothing but tub-thumping.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I resent very much what the hon. member for York South has said. There is no tub-thumping at all. I advised the House that Ottawa was asked to take part in it and am now advising the federal Department of Agriculture has not seen fit to go along with Ontario.

An interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Could I have a little bit of order, please?

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Yak, yak, yak, yak.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Glengarry have a question?

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, since I see that we are going to give lime assistance. For a number of years the federal government has given a total of $1,205,000 in grants for lime usage on farms in the province of Quebec, and I would like to ask him why the ceiling is $42,000 for the province of Ontario, if the Minister can give me that answer, please?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to know the answer to that one, too!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-third order: House in committee of supply. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT
(*continued*)

On vote 2201:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey South.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I want to talk for just a moment or so on what has become an annual debate in respect to item number 10 in vote 2201, having to do with the grants to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society.

I have stated a number of times in this House that I felt there was a need for help in improving the breed of horses insofar as grants from agency was concerned. But I have been very specific in saying that I feel the time has arrived when these grants should not come out of public Treasury. The people of this province should not be asked to contribute further to making grants for the improvement of this breed of horses.

There have been grants in the past over a long number of years, and without question the fact that we make these grants has made for a considerable improvement. I think the day of helping this organization is long since past. They ought to be able to either stand on their own feet at the present time or else the organization or the industry itself should move in to supply whatever is needed by way of encouragement and inducement to improve the thoroughbred breed.

Therefore, I move, without further debate:

> That item 10 of vote 2201 be struck out and that the industry be urged to itself maintain grants to deserving thoroughbred horsebreeders in the province.

Mr. Chairman: The only amendment I think that would be properly before us would be to strike out the item; we cannot say anything about the industry. This House has no right to instruct an industry.

Mr. Oliver: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that if you will look at last year's debates, you will find the amendment was much more specific than that one is, and that last year the one who sat in your place as Chairman of the House agreed the amendment was in order and we voted on it.

I felt that the Chairman last year was perhaps more lenient in his interpretation

of the rules than he might have been. So in framing the amendment this year I did not say, as you will note by the reading of it, that any instructions be issued; I simply said that the industry be urged. I would say that in itself is not a direction, rather it is an intimation of a desire on our part to see that the grants are maintained but not out of the public Treasury.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): May I just say a word? The first part of the hon. member's motion is a motion I have been moving with fair regularity in this House over the years —namely, to strike out item 10 from vote 2201, that is, the provision of funds for the Canadian thoroughbred horse society.

Last year, the hon. member for Grey South moved an amendment which in my opinion was clearly out of order. The Chairman at the time was very lenient and accepted it.

Mr. Oliver: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is surely a reflection on a decision that was made by the Chairman of the House last year, a decision that was endorsed by the House because it was not contested, even by my hon. friend. When he gets up today and says that that was clearly out of order, I suggest that he is clearly out of order in saying that amendment was out of order, because it was not out of order, and it was so decided by the House.

Mr Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would take the trouble to check back on what happened, he would notice that I protested most vigorously and suggested to the chair of that time that the proposed amendment, which was analogous to the second part of my friend's motion, should be ruled out of order. The hon. Minister of Labour, who was acting as House leader, proposed that too. The Chairman—I have forgotten which member it was, it was not the regular Chairman, but it was one of the members of the House—treated the matter quite indulgently and with a smile he said, "Well, I am going to allow a vote on it anyway."

Mr. Oliver: It does not matter whether he did it with a smile or not.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that no precedent was established, that we are not now committed to what, if generalized, would make a shambles of procedure in this House, namely, that under the guise of motions to reduce or strike out votes we attach riders and even propose legislative action. If we want to pass laws to govern the conduct of other people, we should bring them in as statutes. I have always moved this motion, and I am quite happy to let it go forward in the name of my hon. friend, but I would suggest that as it now stands it should be ruled out of order. If he does not wish to re-submit it, I will put it in as a motion simply to strike out.

Mr. Oliver: My hon. friend has said we cannot pass motions that would legislate or seek to legislate. We are not even going any distance in that direction. All we are saying in this motion is that the item be struck out and that we urge the commission; now that is not instructing the commission, that is simply suggesting that from our point of view the grants are valuable but they should not be paid by us and we urge others to pay them. Now, surely, that is not even in the category at all of the motion that was accepted for debate and voted on last year. This one is clearly within the rules. Last year there may have been some doubt about it, but I would be the last one to reflect on the decision of the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member for Grey South that under the circumstances there is nothing to prevent him from saying this, but I think as far as making it in the form of an amendment, that the House at this particular time would not be able to accept the form of amendment. He can say anything he wants in connection with it. I think all we can do in a committee of supply would be to reduce the amount or to strike out the amount and there would be nothing wrong with the first part of his amendment, that Mr. Oliver moves: "That item No. 10 of vote 2201 be struck out." If he would so amend it, I would be glad to put it to the House.

Mr. Oliver: No, I would not amend it in that form and I would have to appeal against your ruling. Then we would have to vote on that appeal.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the Chairman's ruling will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the appeal is lost.

Mr. Oliver: Oh, you cannot get away with stuff like that.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members, please.

I have a motion before me by the member for Grey South moving:

> That item No. 10 of vote 2201 be struck out and that the industry be urged

to itself maintain grants to deserving thoroughbred horse breeders.

Now, the ruling of the chair is that the first part of this motion is in order, that item No. 10 of vote 2201 be struck out and that the committee of supply has no jurisdiction over the second part of the motion to instruct thoroughbred horse breeders or The Treasury Department. I am prepared to accept the first part of the amendment. I have suggested under the circumstances that the second part of this is out of order.

All those in favour of the Chairman's ruling, will please stand.

All those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 53, the "nays" 14.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman's ruling is upheld and I shall now put the motion that is in order. The hon. member for Grey South moves:

That item 10 of vote 2201 be struck out.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I had understood that the hon. member for Grey South did not want to move that portion of the amendment. However, that is up to him. Oh, he is now accepting it, that is fine. Under the circumstances, I wish to discuss it. As I say, if he had not moved it himself, I would have moved it as I have been doing for a number of years.

Before we have a vote on it, before we consider it any further, I would like to get some further information.

Mr. Chairman, I would call to your attention the fact that I have had on the order paper since February 2 of this year, that is precisely four months ago, the following question:

In the current fiscal year, how many breeders received grants from the government's annual grant made to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society?

What breeders received in excess of $1,000 in individual grants, and how much did each of them receive?

I am sure that question could be answered in 15 minutes but it has taken the hon. Provincial Treasurer four months and he still has not produced an answer.

I would like to call attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that I had a somewhat similar experience last year. I put the question on the order paper very early in the session. By the time we got to this particular vote, it still had not been answered, although that was a long time later. I did get, from the hon. Provincial Treasurer at the time, a partial answer, but the complete answer to my question, which he promised, was given approximately half an hour before the prorogation of the session. We got it just before the Lieutenant-Governor came in to close proceedings for that session, a simple question that had been placed on the order paper quite early in the session.

I do not know if this is the plan of the government again this year, to give me the answer to this question, which has been on the order paper since February 2, half an hour before the prorogation of the House. It may be, I do not know. I think that it could have been answered in writing long ago, so that I would not now be faced with the problem of trying to scramble around getting the information down, or such part of it as the hon. Provincial Treasurer sees fit to disclose at the present time.

It is typical of the general attitude of the government towards written questions, Mr. Chairman. They treat written questions with contempt. They answer them whenever they feel like it, not when it is feasible to answer them, and apparently the same thing is going to happen again with my question.

However, I am going to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer to give me the answer to that question now. I want the total number of breeders who received grants in the past year—my question said in the current fiscal year—but that was back in February, so it referred to the 1965-66 fiscal year. I would also like, if he has it and he should have it, the total amount of money paid out in grants under this item. Also I want a list of the breeders who received individual grants in excess of $1,000, and I want the amount that each of them received.

I think it is fair to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer to provide all that information, especially in view of the fact that he has had four months' notice of my desire to get it.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): I do not have that information at this time. I would point out to the hon. member that this government does not make grants to breeders. The government makes a grant to the breeders society and the society distributes the grant that is made to them. I do not have that information at this time.

Mr. Bryden: Surely, we are not going to be presented with that argument. I am well aware that the government does not make

the grants to individual breeders. In fact, my question was framed in this form:

How many breeders received grants from the goverment's annual grant made to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society?

You make a lump sum grant to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society, but the amount of that grant is determined by the amount they pay out under a certain formula to individual breeders. Therefore, the hon. Provincial Treasurer necessarily must know the amount paid out to individual breeders, because he would otherwise have no way of knowing whether he was making the proper payment to the society. He has provided such information in the past, even if belatedly, but surely he is not going to tell us now that he does not know which breeders got grants and how much.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The statement I made was absolutely truthful and correct. I do not know. I can assure the hon. member that he will get the answer to the question he has asked.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, last year we received this from the hon. Provincial Treasurer, pointing out all the different breeders that received it and how much. Is it to this that the hon. member is referring?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Sure, half an hour before we prorogued.

Mr. Worton: In fact, we got them right from you direct, sir. I asked the—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the information having been provided, not only last year, but the year before. If I just have a moment to get my papers sorted out—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I provided the answer last year, but the point really is that this is not government information. We have to go to the association, because we do not make the grants. We give them a lump sum and they distribute it. To get the answer to your question, as it is not within the government service that the answer lies, we have to go to the association itself.

Mr. Bryden: That is not entirely an accurate statement of the situation either. It is true that the government makes a lump sum grant to the society, but the amount of that grant is determined by adding up the various grants the society has made. If the government is checking on the expenditure of its own funds, I am sure that it would want the information. It would require that information from the thoroughbred horse society before it could arrive at the amount of the grant it is going to make.

It does not make a lump sum grant which the thoroughbred society in its discretion then divides up. Not at all. The thoroughbred society under a certain formula arrives at certain grants, and the grant the government makes is the sum of those grants.

The only way you can satisfy yourself that you are making the proper grant is by adding up the individual grants. If you give the society money without checking that in the first instance, then you are not carrying out your responsibilities, because that is the basis on which the money should be paid out. You should not pay the money until you know what the individual grants have been.

So it is information that is strictly within the knowledge of the government, and it has been provided in past years. I may say it was like pulling teeth to get it, and I said that last year it was provided about half an hour before the House prorogued. The answer actually was recorded in *Hansard* on page 4551 of last year, and the final page of that session was 4556, so it was five pages before the last page recording what happened in this House in the last session.

I am going to read that answer out, but before I do so perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer will at least give me this much information. With regard to the fiscal year 1964-65, unfortunately I do not have the public accounts in front of me, but what was the total amount paid out for this grant in the 1964-65 fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Are you asking for the total amount that was paid out?

Mr. Bryden: Just the total amount of the grants. The amount you turned over, both for 1964-65 and then 1965-66.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The amount was $154,300.

Mr. Bryden: Surely not under this item to the thoroughbred horse society? That was the total amount for the two, the standardbred and the thoroughbred. I just want the thoroughbred horse society grant.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The thoroughbred was $73,519.

Mr. Bryden: That was in 1964-65. What about 1965-66?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think I have those figures here. I can get them for you.

Mr. Bryden: Surely they are easily obtained.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, they are—

Mr. Bryden: The Minister acts as if this was the first time he has ever heard of this matter. Apart from the fact that I and others have been raising it every year, I have had a question on the order paper for months asking for the information, and the government simply does not want the information made available. That, I suppose, is the sum of it. They would like to table it as quietly as possible at the end of the session when nobody will look at it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You cannot table anything quietly. You table it, and it is tabled.

Mr. Bryden: They will table it at a time when people will be preoccupied with other things.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What nonsense!

Mr. Bryden: They will not notice what the answer is. There can be no excuse. The hon. Prime Minister can take his high and mighty attitude all he likes but there is no conceivable excuse for delaying the answer to a question for four months, a question on which the government could get the information in ten minutes. The only conceivable motive can be to conceal as far as possible the information that is disclosed to him.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There is nothing to conceal.

Mr. Bryden: As I say, this government has treated questions on the order paper through the years with total contempt. I will say this for the present Prime Minister, he usually answers them all. The previous one, half the time, did not even deign to answer the questions placed on the order paper. This one answers them all, but some of the questions with sharp curves in them are answered right at the last possible moment.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member just contradicted himself. He said we treat them with total contempt.

Mr. Bryden: That is what you do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member just qualified it himself.

Mr. Bryden: I said the ones that have sharp curves in them you leave till the very end, and none of them do you answer with any reasonable despatch. I have rarely seen a question answered, even the simplest, in less than a month. In most jurisdictions, including Westminster and Ottawa, questions by members are treated as priority items.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member will stay with the vote.

Mr. Bryden: I think, Mr. Chairman, we have a right to protest this cavalier treatment of the questions on the order paper. But I would agree with you; I think I have made my protest by now.

Since no one, or very few, ever saw the answer to the question last year, I will advise members of it. In the 1964-65 fiscal year, that would apply to the racing season of 1964 I would imagine, 156 breeders shared in this grant, which totalled in that year $73,519. The following breeders, who total 18 out of the 156, received grants of $1,000 or more. I am going to read out the list:

> Armstrong Brothers Co. Ltd., $2,225.25; W. R. Beasley, $1,224.12; Bell, G. M. and Gardner, G., $1,016.75; J. A. Boylen, $1,039.50; Mrs. M. J. Boylen, $1,279.50; Conklin Farm Ltd., $2,623.25; G. R. Gardiner, $1,143.37; W. A. Graul, $1,254.25; Viscount Hardinge, $1,758.75; Mrs. C. C. Mann, $1,405.75; D. G. McClelland, $2,151.75; E. C. Pasquale, $1,154.25; P. A. Sherwood, $1,832.75; J. W. Smallwood, $1,037.50; Conn Smythe, $1,204.12; Stafford Farms, $2,055.00; E. P. Taylor, $15,096.25—

This is better than 20 per cent of the amount paid out to all breeders, Mr. Chairman:

> —J. Tomlinson, $1,339.75.

I have not added up that total but obviously the bulk of the $73,000 paid out of the public Treasury last year went to a handful of breeders, all of whom are rich men and do not need the money at all. As a matter of fact, the main beneficiary of this policy that the government has carried on during the years has been E. P. Taylor.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer refuses to disclose how much E. P. Taylor or some of the other rich boys down at the jockey club have received during the past year. I have no idea what they received, but I know that they received most of the money in previous years. Specifically, E. P. Taylor, the largest beneficiary, received $15,096.25 in 1964, he received $20,996.25 in 1963, and in 1962 he

received $18,385.50. In a three-year period, 1962-63-64, he got approximately $55,000 out of the public Treasury of this province. I really do not know why E. P. Taylor needs $55,000 from us. I have no idea what he got last year, I suspect it must have been a pretty good sum and that is why we are not getting any information now. But we will wait and see when we do get it, if we ever do. What earthly use he has for this sum of money I do not know.

The same would apply to Boylen and Smythe and all the others. They do not get as large sums as E. P. Taylor, but they have no earthly need for the money at all. I have protested year after year against this policy of handouts to a few rich men, of outdoor relief to the barefoot boys from Bay street, out of the public Treasury of the province.

There have been some sports writers or newsmen, not a great many but some, who have blasted me from stem to gudgeon. They have suggested that I want to apply a means test to our policy of providing incentive grants to horse breeders. Gordon Sinclair regularly rakes me over the coals on this matter and every time I listen to his arguments I realize how sound my position is. One year Jim Coleman—he used to be on the payroll of the jockey club as a public relations man, that of course put him in a strictly impartial position—blasted me from stem to gudgeon in the Winnipeg *Tribune,* no less.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Which is your stem and which is your gudgeon?

Mr. Bryden: I know that that sort of shoddy argument can be used. But I am putting forward the case once again that if the government in its wisdom decides that it is desirable to use public funds to encourage the breeding of racehorses in this province—I am inclined to go along with my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury, who unfortunately is not here today, who does not think that that is a desirable public policy—but if the government thinks it is a desirable policy, then I would suggest that it should work out a system that would achieve its policy.

Its, objective, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has told us year after year, is to encourage the breeding of a better breed of racehorse. You are not encouraging E. P. Taylor to breed racehorses by giving him a handout from the public Treasury of $55,000 over a three-year period. He will breed racehorses whether you give him 10 cents. One just cannot say that the policy is accomplishing its purpose. The same would be true of Boylen or Conn Smythe or any of these people who are listed here. The breeding of racehorses is by and large a rich man's hobby, and these rich men will do it whether or not they have their fingers in the public till. The government has opened the till for them to stick their hand in but they will do it anyway.

If it wants to encourage the smaller breeders, then I would suggest that it devise a different system, which will make sure that the money goes to the small breeders and will serve as some sort of an incentive to them. I realize that the small breeders have been suckered into this deal, they keep hoping. I suppose the breeder of a racehorse is something like a man who goes exploring for gold—he keeps hoping that someday he is going to strike it rich. He keeps breeding horses which are regularly beaten by E. P. Taylor's horses but he hopes that some day he may get a few bucks out of the grants.

Every now and then a few of them do get a couple of hundred dollars. But most of them never get anything and for those who do get something, it is so small it is not even worth mentioning. Now, 16 or 17 breeders get well over half of the total, the remaining 140 share the rest. This is about the way it works out, year after year. A few get nearly all.

If the Provincial Treasurer really believes in the policy which he has enunciated, then I would suggest that he should sit down with the thoroughbred horse society—and if they are interested in this objective, they would be prepared to sit down with him—and work out a system whereby the small breeders will get the grants. Undoubtedly these grants would be an encouragement and a stimulus to small breeders. Then you would be accomplishing the policy you have in mind. But you are not accomplishing it as it stands now.

In my opinion, the only answer, since it now has become just a form of outdoor relief for rich men, is to strike it out. If it were struck out, then perhaps the thoroughbred horse society would take another look at the whole situation and do something about it, but until they are prepared to do that I do not think that we should be prepared to give them any money at all.

I should emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this motion of my hon. friend does not apply to the grants to the Canadian standardbred horse society. I agree with him in that, although the hon. member for Sudbury suggested that that item should be struck out of

the estimates, too. I have never myself proposed that it should be struck out. I mention the point because in the past, whenever I have attacked the grants to the thoroughbred society, I have always heard eloquent answers from the other side with regard to the grants to the standardbred society.

They defend the grants to the standardbred society eloquently and I think they can be. But I am not attacking them; I never attack them. The last time I got information about them it seemed to me that there was a wide distribution of fairly small grants and that a lot of breeders got some assistance. As long as the policy is in that form, I have no particular objection to it.

My major aim, Mr. Chairman, is to try to work out a system that will produce a similar result with regard to the grants to the thoroughbred horse society. However, I doubt if the government is prepared to do that, and therefore under the circumstances I have no option but to vote in support of the motion to strike out the grant altogether, especially in view of the fact that I have, myself, put this motion in the House for so many years that I cannot remember when I first moved it.

I am glad now to have the support of the senior member of the House, the hon. member for Grey South. The first time I moved this motion, almost every Liberal on the Liberal benches got up and spoke in favour of it. It happened that the hon. member for Grey South, who was then acting leader for the group, was not in the House at the time. But he got wind of this and came rushing back into the House. Thereupon the whole lot of them switched over the other way and voted against this precise motion. This was a few years ago and it can be found in *Hansard*. They all spoke for it, but when the boss came in and laid the law down, they all voted against it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Nonsense; that is not true!

Mr. Bryden: It is precisely true!

Mr. Nixon: It is ridiculous.

Mr. Bryden: Let me say this, those who spoke on it all spoke for it. There were some who said nothing. I am glad that we have now converted the hon. member for Grey South who, on that occasion, induced them all to vote against this precise motion. I hope he has the same influence with them now as he had then and that they will all vote for the elimination of this item as the members of the NDP certainly will.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is so close to being 100 per cent correct that I would just like to make it absolutely correct. The last time it took the hon. member for Grey South at least a year to be converted. But he was converted in about two minutes on the issue that we are at now, because he told the chairman that he was not going to introduce this resolution if you struck out that portion that was out of order and later—about three minutes later—he did so. So conversions are coming more and more quickly in the Liberal Party.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, my hon. friend from York South is imputing motives—

Mr. MacDonald: No, I am stating facts.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would just simply like to add that we are never going to go as far as the party to the left of us for they voted on second reading one way and on third reading, another.

Mr. Chairman: There is a motion before the committee.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the discussion today has not been unusual; we have heard most of it before. However, when we speak about being "converted"—I am beginning to think that all of our hon. friends opposite are being converted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They just do not know to what!

Hon. Mr. Allan: When I make the proposal that I intend to make today, I am sure that they will agree with what I say and I am delighted to hear them say today—all of them, practically—that the horse breeding industry in this province is an important industry. It is a very important industry and although I respect anyone's opinion, whether it agrees with my own or not—and I do respect the statements that have been made today by the hon. members opposite—I think that basically we are not so far apart. It may be unfortunate that a few men who are wealthy are in the thoroughbred horse breeding business. From our point of view, we have put horse breeding first; that is, we look upon the breeding of horses—and this is largely racehorses—in this province as an important industry. When you think of the development during the last few years and when you think of the number of persons who are engaged to find employment in this industry and when you think of the investment that exists as a result of this industry, there are

many thousands of persons in the province of Ontario who are engaged in the business of breeding horses. Think of the revenue that this province receives as a result of this activity that during the past year netted almost $12 million in the tax on betting.

I have no figures to indicate the revenue that we receive through hospitals tax on the admission to the various ractracks, nor on the sales tax as a result of the receipts of restaurants, and so on, in connection with these operations, but at least we are all agreed that this is a good industry and that we want to support it. And I may say that this is agreed to by many other jurisdictions and I am just going to give you a few of them in the United States. In fact, almost all the states where the breeding of horses is important in the United States, do contribute in some way to breeders' awards. It is surprising how anxious these different states are to develop the horsebreeding industry in their particular state.

In California, instead of five per cent of the purse of the winner, there is an award of ten per cent; in Florida, they have a different plan; awards of from $100 up to $500 for one race. Now, I am told that the government of the state of Florida is very anxious to develop the horsebreeding industry in that state. Illinois is ten per cent; Maryland has a schedule of awards very much like Florida; New Jersey goes even further and makes awards even to the winner of the fourth place—first, second, third and fourth places and, in addition, pays a bonus in the purchase of studs; Oregon is ten per cent; New York is ten per cent and the only states that do not have breeders' awards are Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico and Ohio, where racing is not carried on to any extent.

So we as a government feel that the horsebreeding industry is an important industry in this province. We have endeavoured to support it; we have been guided in the type of support that has been given by the breeders' associations and by the persons who make up the membership of those associations.

Now there can be a difference of opinion as to whether or not the awards are made in the best possible way. I can inform the hon. member for Woodbine that the awards that were won last year by a person who owned only one horse was between $3,000 and $4,000, so that although in the thoroughbreds there are some whose awards are larger, the standardbreds—and I would be glad to get a list of the awards and the numbers of them and furnish them to all hon. members of the House, or make them available to all members of the House, so that there is no definite rule that works in horseracing. I am told that there is no procedure that works always even in betting on horseraces, and while those with the greatest number of horses may as a rule receive the largest award, this is not always true.

I am told also, that the number of persons receiving awards has increased tremendously.

Mr. Bryden: Since when? There has been no significant increase as far as the thoroughbred horse society is concerned over the last number of years. It was 156 for the last year for which you will give us information and about the same—in fact it was higher in the previous year—it was 160.

Mr. MacDonald: If this had been written by the jockey club, they would not have changed a word.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I was very patient when others were speaking, and I would like to say what I intend to say.

There has been a very great increase in the number of breeders throughout the province who have received these awards. The percentage, of course, has gone down for the ones that received large awards, because of the greater amount of money that has been paid out in awards. But as the class of horses has improved as a result of the efforts of the breeders, I would like to think that the awards have had a part in improving, and I think the hon. member for Grey South said that in his opinion had been a help in improving, the standard of our horses in this province.

So, Mr. Chairman, as one who listen always to the suggestions of others; however, before I heard this today, we had decided upon what I am going to say now, and it is this—that I wish to advise this House that I propose to request the chairman of the Ontario racing commission to examine this situation thoroughly. For this purpose, we shall make available such assistance by economists as is necessary, because this review will be examining facets of what has become a substantial industry, an industry apparently well suited to Ontario.

We have many things in our favour. We have climate, we have a type of grass, a type of forage. We have the areas, we have the population that encourages horseracing. So this industry is well suited to this province. We have the availability of labour and supplies and it would be very interesting to know the amount of agricultural products that are used by this industry.

Because of all these advantages, and because of the desire on the part of this government to do everything possible to develop this industry, I make this proposal to the House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member for Grey South should withdraw his motion.

Mr. Bryden: It is not very clear what the hon. Provincial Treasurer's announcement adds up to. He says he is going to have a study made of the subject. That could lead to some result, I suppose, but I know of a great many government studies that led to no results.

The Provincial Treasurer, in introducing his statement, made reference to conversions that have been taking place. If there have been any conversions, he is the only one who is being converted, because the position we took today is precisely the position we took last year and the year before—and you can go back through *Hansard* year after year—

Hon. Mr. Allan: It is no disgrace to be converted.

Mr. Bryden: My argument has always been that the system ought to be reviewed and changed to achieve the objective which the hon. Provincial Treasurer says he has in mind. That has always been my position. Up until now the government has contemptuously pushed it aside, but now it appears that it is weakening a little bit. It is going to look into it at least. It is now prepared to admit that the present system is somewhat short of perfection. When one considers that we are not in this House dealing with racehorses but with mules, I suppose it is progress to get even that little bit of a concession out of the government.

However, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman—I do not know what my friends on the other benches will do, I have not even had a chance to talk it over with my own colleagues—I still am in favour of the motion and think it should be carried.

The statement the hon. Provincial Treasurer has made, though it does contain an admission that the system is not right, does not really give any definite assurance that remedial action will be taken. I feel satisfied that the best way to get the thoroughbred horse society working out a new system would be to remove the grant for a year. That would get them thinking about it. I do not think they will do any thinking about it until then.

Who are the thoroughbred horse society? They are the very fellows that I listed who are getting the big pieces out of the pot. They are not going to change anything until they are forced to do it, and I think we would help the hon. Provincial Treasurer's inquiry, we would give it a real sense of urgency, if we took this item out of the estimates for this one year. If they work out a new system applicable for this year, then the hon. Provincial Treasurer can still get a warrant to pay them the grants on a new basis.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, you object to warrants.

Mr. Bryden: Well, all right, then let them go without for this year and then we will come back next year with a proper system.

There is one thing the hon. Provincial Treasurer said that he says every year, Mr. Chairman, and I think we have to get the record straight on it. He keeps saying that the number of participating breeders increases year by year and has increased to a substantial figure. Now that is true as far as the standardbred horse society is concerned, but as I tried to make clear, we are not talking about the standardbred society, and the motion does not relate to them. We never have been talking about them. We are talking about the throughbred horse society, and let us just see how much the number of participants in breeders' awards has increased over the past few years.

In the 1962 racing season, the number of those who participated was 160. In the 1963 season, the number was again 160 and in the 1964 season it was 156. How can the hon. Provincial Treasurer, in the face of those facts, say that the number is increasing? I am relying on information that he himself provided to this House, so I think my information is reliable. The number went down in the last year for which the hon. Provincial Treasurer has vouchsafed information. There were 156 recipients in the 1964 season; the 156 together received $73,519; one of the 156 received $15,096; 18 of that 156 together received $40,841, and 138 of them received $32,677, or an average of about $225 or $230 apiece.

That is how your system has worked out. The number is not increasing. Perhaps the number getting into the charmed circle of grants of over $1,000 is increasing, but the other number is declining. The other fellows are getting peanuts as it is, and are being squeezed out.

I welcome the hon. Provincial Treasurer's statement but I do not think it is a firm

enough commitment to induce us to change our position in this matter. Therefore, I will still vote in favour of the motion that is before the House.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have only one slight remark to make and it is this, that perhaps there is a great difference between the thinking of the hon. member for Woodbine and myself in that personally I am interested in the horsebreeding industry. I am not interested in persons. I am interested in the development of the horsebreeding industry.

Mr. Bryden: And your policy contributes nothing to it, because it is encouraging people who do not need any encouragement.

An hon. member: That is what you say.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I think it is obvious on the face of it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting and puzzling development. We have heard so often from the other side of the House that the Opposition is guilty of wasting time in this House. Yet the hon. Provincial Treasurer has come into the House and listened through a debate that has now gone on for an hour and 15 minutes, and only at the end of the hour and 15 minutes does he suddenly come out of his briefcase with a statement, a new statement of policy. The hon. Provincial Treasurer interjected across the floor of the House that there is no harm in being converted. Another way of putting the same thing is that there is no harm in beginning to admit that you are wrong.

Mr. Bryden: He has been wrong all along.

Mr. MacDonald: You have been wrong all along and you have been stubbornly defending it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not stubborn.

Mr. MacDonald: And now you are finally beginning to admit you are wrong.

But, you know, there are two reasons for setting up a committee. One is to get real facts and the other is to delay what you know is the inevitable solution. And I suggest this is precisely what you are doing in this instance. You are going to give these boys out of this pot another $50,000 or $60,000, or whatever it is for a period of two or three more years. That is what it adds up to.

Mr. Chairman, I can hardly believe that the hon. Provincial Treasurer came in and sat with that statement in his desk. If we had not got up and fought this issue, I submit to the House there is a very good chance we would not have got the statement.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, do not be silly.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the mildness of his protest confirms my conviction. The fact of the matter is that the government did not intend to do anything. It is now at least seeing that it is becoming politically embarrassing, and so when we put the pressure on the government members, they finally get up and read a statement that they are going to delay any correction of this situation. This is very interesting.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer gets up and says he is interested in one thing only, namely, the development of the horsebreeding industry.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to go into the detail, but my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, has documented solidly that if the hon. Provincial Treasurer's interest is really in developing the horsebreeding industry, he is spending money from the public Treasury that cannot be defended for one moment. E. P. Taylor, Conn Smythe, and the rest of them will continue breeding their horses even he does not give them a cent, or even if he gives them half a million dollars.

If you want to develop the horsebreeding industry—and this is the only way in which the procedure is a defensible one—you should distribute it among the small horsebreeders. We have suggested this for a number of years. We have had a typical display of Tory delay and tactics where the public purse is being used to line the pockets of friends of the Tory party.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): That is just plain nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no plain nonsense about it at all.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, there is.

Mr. MacDonald: It is right there in front of this House.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Which vote does that Tory policy come in?

An hon. member: It is political trash, that is what it is.

Mr. Bryden: We have read out the names.

Mr. MacDonald: We have read out the names and the overwhelming majority of them were well-known Tories.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth): Whose horses paid $12 million to government revenue?

Mr. MacDonald: Never mind whose horses paid the $12 million. That is not the point at all. We are not arguing against the money that comes into the public Treasury, we are arguing about what money out of the public Treasury you are handing to a few well-heeled individuals who do not need it in the first place and who would continue to breed horses even if you did not give it to them.

In other words, it is completely indefensible. It is idle for the hon. Provincial Treasurer—you will have a chance now that there is finally a little bit of activity in this issue, instead of sitting blandly and doing nothing about it until you were smoked out after an hour and 15 minutes debate.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, we were not smoked out by the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: You bet you were smoked out.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, we were not.

Mr. MacDonald: Certainly not by anybody else. And the Provincial Treasurer can squirm in his seat. I wish the public could see—

Hon. Mr. Allan: And I am not squirming either.

Mr. MacDonald: —exactly what is happening here, because this is a classic example of how the Tory party treats the public purse.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Oh, nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: A classic example of how it is done.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer mentioned how he was concerned about the thoroughbred horse breeders association or the thoroughbred horse breeders. In one of the first comments I ever made in the House—it was back in 1960—I brought to the attention of the government that there was more attention being paid to horses than to humans; there was a substantially smaller grant being given to assist amateur athletes. I think it was $20,000 in that day as compared to approximately $80,000 for thoroughbred horses. And let us look at the record for this past year.

The amount given to thoroughbred horse breeders was $73,519. To amateur athletes, to show your concern for the youth of today, you gave $47,177, less than 2 cents per youth. Surely it is about time you paid a little more attention to the future of the nation by contributing to the youngster rather than to the horse.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief. It seems to me that when we have announced a policy that would seem to have a great deal of merit, it upsets our friends very much on the NDP benches.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Provincial Treasurer has not announced a policy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to say that I am just a little concerned that the Provincial Treasurer may have inferred we are all against the horsebreeders association.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Well, you are!

Mr. Thompson: May I say that he is trying to twist it that way. I am sure he is such an honourable man and so sincere that he would not want to twist it in that way. There are a great many people in Ontario who take a lot of pride in this great sport. I may speak personally. I come from a background where I was taught at an early age to ride a horse and perhaps some of the pride I have in Ontario is in some of the horses that have been produced. I am thinking of the credit that came to Ontario and Canada with Northern Dancer. I think it brought a great deal of credit to us.

But I also believe that one of the unfortunate things is that when the government decides it is going to pay from the public funds to this particular sport, it happens that it pays to people of considerable wealth, who, I am glad are working in this area; they are entitled to take up any kind of sport they want. But it is quite true that they really do not need these public funds as a form of recognition for the record they are building in the sport.

To be quite honest, I think it probably causes some embarrassment to them that they are receiving this. I do not know the gentlemen listed, but I would feel that perhaps it does. Many of them, I would think, are men who have contributed to many charitable societies. I think if you get going on with this inquiry you will find that probably they themselves feel the contribution they are making in getting recognition in winning races and developing first-class horseflesh—these really are the things they are in it for, not to get this little extra bit of money or something from the public purse.

But apart from that, we think it is wrong in principle, because as the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has said, there are many other areas. If you are going to do it for one, you have many other areas for which to do it. Our concern, sir, is that the industry itself and it has had a proud record and a good history—the industry itself we believe could by itself encourage the method of giving prizes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We will look into it.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer could advise us if this report is going to be made to him as Provincial Treasurer, or to the government, or to the Legislature? That is, is it going to be public or is it going to be private? I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer could tell us if this investigation and its scope and its methods are going to be up to the full discretion of the Provincial Treasurer or of the racing commission and whether, for instance, the government is going to insist that there be such things as hearings. Before we vote on this question, I for one would like to hear a little bit more about the proposal that this matter be considered by the commission.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not looking upon this as a Royal commission or anything like that. We have a competent racing commission and it is my intention to ask them to make a study and to report thereon.

Mr. MacDonald: To the House?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I would not think so. I always report to the House.

Mr. Bryden: How about reporting what E. P. Taylor got in 1965?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will report that.

Mr. Bryden: Surely the time to report it is now when we are discussing the matter.

Mr. Chairman: The motion before the committee is:

That item No. 10 of vote 2201 be struck out.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment is defeated.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of Mr. Oliver's motion, will please rise.

All those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 20, the "nays," 48.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment defeated.

Item No. 10, under 2201 agreed to.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, under vote 2201, there is a grant to the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals and I just want to refer—

Mr. Chairman: That is back previous to the amendment. It has been agreed in the House that when the amendment is lost, it automatically carries everything up to that point.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, speaking to your ruling, I would say that the vote that was just defeated carried item 10 and the rest of it is surely open for discussion.

Mr. Chairman: It is not the wish of the Chairman to restrict debate but it has been customary in the House to consider items following the amended section, and we are now dealing with item No. 10.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if you are going to follow this procedure in the future, it would seem to me that you would not accept a motion on item 10 without finding out first of all if any members wanted to discuss preceding items.

Mr. Chairman: That was my intention. I was going to ascertain if there was any discussion preceding item No. 10.

As I say, it is not the intention of the chair to restrict your discussion on it, but I would remind members of the House that this has been the practice.

Mr. Nixon: My understanding of your ruling earlier in the session on this matter, Mr. Chairman, was that you would try to

deal with the items in each vote order, but before leaving any individual vote and carrying it in total, you would accept some additional discussion.

I did want to say something, if you would permit it, on our grant to the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. You may wish to rule me out of order on it for another reason, however, because I want to suggest that there is some legislation that is associated with the work of this society that the government should be considering. This may well come under the jurisdiction of another Minister, but this is the only place in the estimates that I know of where it can be raised.

This has to do with the procedure that has taken on a great deal of importance, both economic and in the minds of a good number of the public, and that is the collection of animals for laboratory experimentation. This has centred in certain areas across the province and the society whose vote we are discussing at the present time is experiencing some considerable difficulty in regulating the supply of laboratory animals for research in this province and, in fact, in Canada and in the United States.

Very briefly, I would like to suggest to the House, Mr. Chairman, that the government should be considering some licensing procedures—whether this would be under the Minister of Agriculture, sir, or the Attorney General, I could not say—so that the society would have the right to go into the premises of these various enterprises, if you want to call them that, which are at the present time supplying these laboratory animals for testing and experimental purposes to forward medical science, and other areas of science in Ontario.

It has even been suggested that a supply of these research animals might come from some of the other branches of the government that come to us for monetary assistance, for example, the Ontario veterinary college.

I just want to point out very briefly, sir, that this is a problem, and a growing problem, and that we in our support of the society should be aware that it is seeking some assisitance and some guidance from this government on this very important matter.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I would like to tell you something about this. This matter has been before my department for some time, placed there by the deans of the various medical schools of Ontario. A committee has been set up by them and by the humane society and I believe by some representatives of The Department of Agriculture to look into the whole matter and come up with some proposal that they believe might be satisfactory.

Vote 2201 agreed to.

On vote 2202:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there are only three items here and what I want to deal with is the staff relations branch. If you have any order in mind, I would be willing to wait until we get to it.

Mr. Chairman: It seems that there are various branches that are listed under this vote. If members wish to proceed under the various branches we could do that.

Office of the secretary.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would like some further information about this particular vote. From time to time there are references by Ministers that they are having some difficulty in getting something through Treasury board, and there is a feeling from some of those of us on this side who have never had the experience—but are looking forward to it in the near future—of dealing with Treasury board. Just how does this work?

You have certain specific items passed as we go through the estimates. Is it then necessary, before this money is spent, for the Minister who is responsible for that sum to go to a committee of Cabinet under the chairmanship of the hon. Provincial Treasurer so that the specific expenditure is then authorized? It is then pre-audited and the expenditure is then made. Is this the order of the series of events?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, it may be a little difficult for me to outline all the responsibilities of Treasury board. It is composed of the Ministers, and the Provincial Secretary is the administration officer and has a staff which assists in analyzing requests that are made. Perhaps I should separate the types of requests that are made for funds. At the time of the estimates, the Treasury board considers every estimate, but before consideration the Treasury board staff endeavours to analyze the estimates that are going to be presented for it. The staff will, more and more, consider them from a point of view of programme basis.

Treasury board finally approves of these estimates that you see in this House here,

and once these have been completed, and even during the times when certain expenditures or increases in staff are requested by departments, these are considered by Treasury board.

Treasury board has a responsibility in endeavouring to keep the expenses of government reasonable; to make sure that the administration is efficient, as far as this can be done. It considers all applications for Treasury board orders; no Treasury board orders are obtained without the approval of Treasury board; special warrants are considered and approved by Treasury board; it keeps an eye on the complement of various departments and sees that they maintain their staff within the complement that has been established—this, of course, is in an effort to control expenditures within the provision that has been made in the estimates for these various departments.

I do not know if Treasury board may be considered by some as a bit of a whipping boy when something is not gone ahead with; I do not think that that is quite right. The members of Treasury board are very co-operative; they are broadminded and progressive, and—

Mr. Nixon: Are you the chairman of that board?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am speaking of the other members. The secretary of the board is really most careful to make sure that those items which should come to Treasury board find a place in the agenda of the board, which always meets once a week, and during the estimates meets as many as five and six times each week—mornings, afternoons and evenings.

This is a very rough outline of the work of Treasury board but I can assure the hon. member that Treasury board performs an excellent function for the government.

Mr. Nixon: It has been said several times in the House, Mr. Chairman, that Treasury board, in reaching its decisions, has available to it considerably more information about the expenditure that appears finally, after it has processed it, as simply an item in this rather slim volume that we deal with for so many hours here.

I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer if it is true that there is more information available from one of his colleagues on a specific item of expenditure, or even a specific programme, as he likes to call it? Is there more information than is available in the book that is before us?

Hon. Mr. Allan: It would be right to say that there was because it would not be possible to have the information presented here in the estimates in the amount of detail in which it is presented to Treasury board. As I pointed out the other night, we have plans to begin this year with programme planning which will result in the form of the estimates being quite different. The programmes will be outlined. I had a mockup of them the other night, but I do not seem to have it today; here it is.

Mr. Nixon: Would you pass it around?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would be glad to show it to you. We borrowed it from some of our friends in Ottawa, so I want to be sure I take good care of it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer in his reply to my colleague, the hon. member for Brant, answered the question I was going to ask.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer whether, in his period of office, he has ever examined a branch of a department and decided that it had fulfilled its function and was no longer needed?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I could outline to you as definitely as you would like the procedure at the time of the estimates. These items are brought to the attention of the staff, and they in turn, I suppose, to the attention of the Ministers of the departments. Each programme is gone over by our Treasury board analysts. It is not the responsibility of Treasury board to say to another Minister that a certain programme must be discontinued. The Minister is responsible for his department, as you would understand, but we try in a co-operative way to keep the programmes up to date and certainly in instances, programmes are discontinued.

Mr. Thompson: I am thinking of the analysts who look at—for example—a small branch in a department. The analysts as I understand, go in to have a look through the department. He may look at a branch of the department, which was started a couple of years before, and in asking has this branch covered its function, the analyst may come to the decision, as I understand it, that there is no need for this branch. In the priorities which the Minister may bring before the Treasury board, the analyst may suggest that it seems to him that should be down the

scale in your priorities when he comes before Treasury board.

My interest is really if the hon. Minister had any concrete examples you could give us of where you have discontinued a branch. As I have sat in the House over the years, I can think of several things where the government has decided they are going to stop doing this.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me, sir, it was decided by the House that we should deal with this estimate in sequence by sections. If there is not anything before the programme analysis branch, please continue.

Was there anything under the office of the secretary?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am talking of the general principles of the Treasury board and its functions.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, that is the second item, programme analysis branch.

Mr. Thompson: No, the general principle of the Treasury board and its functioning.

I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, as I say, as I have sat in the House I can recall where you have decided you will cut out several things. There was a publication, I think, one time, Scope, or something. That is an example. Is there an example—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not have an example in mind at the present time.

Mr. Thompson: But there are a number?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, there are, and I would point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition that every department, I think every department that comes before Treasury board, has a programme bigger than can be managed within the funds that are available. Because of this, this immediately creates priorities and it is at this time that some of those with a lower priority are discarded for something that has a higher priority.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in relation—

Mr. Chairman: Under this same heading?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, in relation to the question asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition, we have certainly had instances brought to our attention in the public accounts committee of the sort of thing that the hon. leader of the Opposition was talking about, not necessarily on the initiative of the Treasury board or its staff but partly and perhaps primarily on the initiative of the departments.

One thing I can remember was quite a substantial reorganization that took place in The Department of Energy and Resources Management. The civil servants did not say this, but I got the impression that when that department was set up it was, shall we say, a rather flamboyant production hastily put together. Since then the civil servants have reorganized it. They have eliminated a lot of not very important functions and have combined others. They did not fire any people, but they co-ordinated and reorganized the department and as far as I could see from looking at it, made it a much more effective and economically operated department than before. Most of the departments that come before the public accounts committee indicate to us that they are in the process of reorganization. This does not necessarily mean the elimination of entire branches but it does mean often quite a lot of consolidation.

I know that the hon. leader of the Opposition is interested in building up a sort of campaign point of administrative inefficiency and resultant waste in the government. I certainly would be the last to say that there is no inefficiency in the government. In an organization of this size, it would be most remarkable if there was no inefficiency, but I really think that on that point he is barking up the wrong tree.

Whatever I may say about the government and its waste—and I think there is significant waste, much greater waste in other ways, but these are policy matters that reflect differences in philosophy. The waste is not as direct and immediate as what the leader of the Opposition is looking at. I will criticize the government on a great many things, but when it comes to the efficient organization of the services which the government, in its wisdom or lack of it, decides are appropriate in this province, I think that the civil servants of the province are doing a good job in providing those services as economically as possible. I think there is very little padding of the old-fashioned type that we used to think existed —I do not know if it ever did—in any of these estimates.

I think the money that is asked for, by and large, is money that is needed to carry out the programmes that the people have been directed to carry out. I think that both the Treasury board division and the departments themselves are quite economy- and efficiency-conscious and are working on this problem all the time.

I do not want to create the impression that

we have reached perfection. I do not think we will ever reach that, but it is obviously a continuing process that will go on forever. You will always find better ways of doing things, but having spent a few years on the public accounts committee, I have been on it ever since it started to operate, I have been very much impressed with the professional attitude of the senior civil servants of the province both in the departments and in the Treasury board division.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, just to add a few words to the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine, I, of course, quite agree with what he says. I would mention this in particular, the organization and methods section of the branch of Treasury board, and I would point out to the hon. member for Brant that it is in this way that changes are often brought about.

The department asks for some of the staff of the organization and methods section to go into the department to assist them in making changes and reorganizations. This has been wonderfully well received by the departments and I think that some of the items the hon. member for Woodbine mentions have been helped a good deal by the staff of the organization and methods branch.

Mr. Chairman: Organizational and methods services. The next heading is staff relations.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the staff relations branch. My understanding is that this is a fairly new branch; am I correct in that? May I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer how long it has been in existence and what its staff consists of at the present moment?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I wonder if the hon. member for Woodbine realizes just the responsibility of the staff relations.

Mr. Bryden: I was going to get on to that but I am quite happy if the hon. Provincial Treasurer will give whatever statement he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: At present there is a staff of four and the responsibility of the head of this branch is in the negotiating field. That is, he is the person who negotiates with the representatives of the civil service association. I will have an amendment to The Public Service Act which will institute a slightly different plan of negotiations. But this is the responsibility of Mr. Johnson, who is head of the staff relations.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Provincial Treasurer says the bill he will be bringing in, of which I think he has already given notice, will make a slight change in the law on the subject. The impression I get—

Hon. Mr. Allan: More in the procedure.

Mr. Bryden: The reason I am raising this is I would like to have the matter clarified. The impression I get is that a major change in policy is at least in the embryonic stage here. I may say that I am not raising this in a critical sense, because if the change in direction which I think is taking place is actually taking place I think it will be a very good thing. I do not know precisely what the government has in mind but this is certainly a new departure to have the civil service association negotiate money matters with Treasury. I do not think that has been the policy up until very recently. Was not the joint council used as the negotiating body?

Hon. Mr. Allan: This will be very plain to you when the bill is brought to the House, and it does make a change in the procedure.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): May I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer when the bill might be introduced?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Very soon.

Mr. Young: Before the civil service estimates?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not sure that it will be before the civil service estimates but it should be this week.

Mr. Bryden: That is fine.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think I had better take a little more time; I am reminded today is Thursday. Within a week, I guess, would be better.

Mr. Bryden: If the bill is going to clarify the matter, that will be helpful, but I always hesitate, Mr. Chairman, to drop a matter at the time I have a chance to deal with it on the basis of an assurance that everything will become clear when a bill is presented. I have found by bitter experience that when the bill is presented things are far from clear, and I have then missed my opportunity to deal with my point.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I hesitate to discuss the bill before it comes to the House, because bills have a habit sometimes of changing.

Mr. Bryden: That is what I am worried about; sometimes they have a habit of dying. There is one sitting—

Hon. Mr. Allan: This one will not die.

Mr. Bryden: There is one that has been sitting on the order paper for second reading for the longest time—a government bill. We expect that our bills will go to the morgue but a government bill is sitting there and looks like it is headed for the morgue, judging by the progress made to date.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You will like this bill.

Mr. Bryden: You think so? Well, is it your intention—is it the government policy, as it is now developing, that negotiations on money matters will take place with Treasury and that they will not get tangled up in joint council machinery?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Let me say this, and I am not trying to avoid answering your questions, but joint council will be less important after the revision of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: All right, Mr. Chairman, I will content myself at this point with making one or two observations.

I think that staff relations in government services in most of Canada have been bedevilled for over 40 years by the attempt to use the joint council technique as a substitute or as a form of collective bargaining. I get the impression—I have no inside information at all, I am just an interested observer —but I get the impression that your whole arbitration system is in a mess right now because you have not really devised an adequate bargaining procedure to sort issues out so that arbitrators can manage them.

I would hate to have been an arbitrator in the arbitration now in progress. The board got an undigested mass of issues that would have terrified most human beings, and I am waiting with interest to see what they are going to do with them. They are certainly going to have more than their share of trouble, I would think, in trying to arrive at a fair settlement of this large mass of important issues on which the parties were miles apart.

When material is submitted to arbitration in that form it indicates, I think, that proper negotiations have not preceded the arbitration. If the fact that the Treasury in now getting into this field is an indication that the government is now going to try to make collective bargaining work, I would welcome the proposal.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Could I assure the hon. member that this is exactly what we are trying to do now? We have not reached perfection and we are a long way from having reached perfection, but we are trying to improve the procedures. I think that what we are doing now will be an improvement. There are many things, many influences, that I cannot discuss here which we wish were a little different, not altogether on our side, but I think you will like it.

Mr. Bryden: On that basis, I will await the bill with interest. Perhaps when we have the precise terms of the bill before us we can discuss the matter a little more fully.

Vote 2202 agreed to.

On vote 2203:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise matters with regard to the public service superannuation fund and the Canada pension plan; those are items 6 and 7. There are also statutory items, but items 6 and 7—

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything before item 6 on vote 2203? The member for Woodbine, please.

Mr. Bryden: How many employees in the public service of the province—and I am now using the term in the sense in which I think it is defined in the statutes—how many employees in the public service of the province are not covered by the public service superannuation plan?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Did you say public service?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, I am now talking not merely about the civil service. As I understand the setup the civil service is a small part of the public service and there are a good many employees of the province who are public servants but not civil servants.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You are separating the classified and the unclassified.

Mr. Bryden: Is that the basis on which separation takes place? I do not know. I understand there are some who are not classified who have been around for quite a while. I have a question about that on the order paper, too, that has not been answered.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I wonder if it would not be more appropriate to discuss that in the civil service estimates.

Mr. Bryden: Okay, if it is in the civil service department that I can have that information—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think I have that information in my civil service estimate book.

Mr. Bryden: What about superannuation generally? This is where your obligations under superannuation are paid, but is this where you have information about how the plan operates, and so on, is that more readily obtainable from the civil service department?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The Treasury is responsible for the payment into the superannuation fund.

Mr. Bryden: And you have a pensions fund branch—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The Civil Service Act really determines the payments. The item you see here, "Payment of unfunded liability on the public service superannuation fund," is entirely apart from the superannuation payments. I think you understand what that is.

Mr. Bryden: Are the payments not actually made by a branch of your department—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, the $12,270,000 is the superannuation payment really—

Mr. Bryden: —into the fund, but then does this department, as distinct from the civil service department, not actually administer the fund?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: You make the payments—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, we administer the fund and the payments.

Mr. Bryden: So would this then be the best place to ask about such matters, for example, as the integration of the plan with the Canada pension plan?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I think the division between the department of civil service and Treasury is that the department of civil service decide who are eligible for the payments. The Treasury simply then—

Mr. Bryden: Makes the payments.

Hon. Mr. Allan: —makes the payments.

Mr. Bryden: So that the question I mentioned as to the method of integration of your plan with the Canada pension plan would be better asked under the estimates of the civil service?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: That is fine. With regard to what is, I suppose, the more mechanical process of paying the cheques, I have had quite a few complaints, Mr. Chairman, about the length of time it takes to get these cheques out. Now I am not saying that in all cases it is the fault of your branch, but I think there is a fault in the government sometimes where people do not get their payments until quite a long time after they have separated from the service. And, sometimes they need the money quite badly. Sometimes it is their own fault as they have not directed what they want done with the money, but I have known cases where they were quite clear and specific in their directions and still had to wait a long time.

I was praising the efficient administration of the government a little while ago, but when it comes to writing cheques—and this is a routine cheque—it seems to take about a month to write a cheque in this government. I do not know why this is, and I think it is time you did something about it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will tell you. Mr. Chairman, there are two sides to every coin and—

Mr. Bryden: But there is only one side to every cheque and that is the one that has the payment on it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Here is one of the first things that creates a problem. All civil servants are paid ahead of time, that is the cheque that should be due on the 31st of the month for their services up until that time, is paid on the 24th of the month. If, in the wisdom of those who set up this system many years ago, they had paid two weeks late, then these refunds could be handled so much better. Before the refund can be processed, it is necessary to make sure—and if there are certain overpayments —some have accountable warrants—perhaps I will just read this:

> Before a refund can be made it is necessary for the pension funds branch to receive clearance from the department concerned so that no moneys are owing to the Crown by the former employee.

This cannot be done until after the end of the month. This is due to salary payments in advance, accountable advance warrants not repaid, and other government property that could be in the hands of the employee.

Often, too, the employee's wishes are not made clear to the pension funds branch. He may wish to transfer the money to another pension fund as very many of them do and would not know for a bit whether he would want to transfer it to another fund, because as you know, if he takes the cash at that time there is an income tax matter to attend to. Or, he may be leaving for health reasons, which is a very important point should he desire to return to the service at a later date.

Up to date the average number of refund claims in our possession is approximately 400. We are processing approximately 100 refunds per week, which is one month's backlog in our pension funds branch and I think if we could keep them within a month, that that is about as good as we can hope to become.

Mr. Bryden: You mean make the payment a month after the—

Hon. Mr. Allan: A month after; I do not think that we can improve very much on that.

Mr. Bryden: Except that you do not maintain that pace. I certainly—

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do when everything has been done by the person.

Mr. Bryden: I stated, when I was raising the matter, that in some cases a problem arises because the individual has not instructed the pension funds branch—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right; I have found that they are sometimes three months late.

Mr. Bryden: There is sometimes a difficulty there that the individual does not understand he has to instruct the branch. If there could be some way, perhaps in the department of advising them before they leave, about what the alternatives are, and as to the action they should take. I ran into one case where a person came to me and I found it was really quite simple. If she had understood what she was supposed to have done, the whole thing could have been cleaned up before it was, but she sat around stewing for two or three months and then came to me about it.

But I had another case where there was not any doubt about it at all. The woman had been a fairly short-term employee and the income tax problem was not an acute one. She wanted the money in a lump sum. In fact, she even committed herself to buying a refrigerator in the expectation that she was going to get the money. I do not have the details in front of me, but it took a long time. What really got me was that when we finally got it to the point where everything was clear and there was no doubt that she was going to get the money, I was still told that it was going to take something like ten days or some such time, to get a cheque issued. Now why should it take that long to write a cheque?

Hon. Mr. Allan: It should not and it does not, as a rule.

Mr. Bryden: I should not pursue the thing without having the precise details in front of me.

Hon. Mr. Allan: A cheque, as you know, has to go to the auditor to be countersigned and if you happen to meet with a long weekend, take for instance, Good Friday which is a holiday and Easter Monday which is a holiday, there is almost a week gone there. I remember someone last year who suffered as a result of that, but we recognize the desirability of doing these things promptly. I think any businessman realizes that to do something promptly—

Mr. Bryden: It is good for public relations.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It is good for public relations, and we want to do our best.

Vote 2203 agreed to.

Vote 2204 agreed to.

On vote 2205:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on 2205, may I ask the hon. Minister if the plans on reporting of the sales tax collections by a collection office so that a geographical unit would be able to judge the economic progress from year to year—

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything before the retail sales tax under vote 2205?

Does the member for York South have a question in advance of that?

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question, some questions, on the gasoline sales tax.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for Windsor-Walkerville defer to the member for York South, please?

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my information is that some time ago—within a few months—a delegation of the Ontario retail gasoline association visited the hon. Prime

Minister, and conceivably the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Allan: How long ago was it?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not sure, sometime within the past year, at least before the report into the gasoline industry in B.C. came out. That is the extent to which I can nail it down.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think you probably have the wrong association.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not think so, because I am informed by a responsible officer that they had met and they were assured by the hon. Prime Minister that the government would take a look at the report when it came down from the Morrow commission in B.C., and it would then decide whether or not any study was needed in the province of Ontario.

Now, this report has been available for some couple of months or so. As a matter of fact, about the third week in March it was released to the public.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer is aware of the fact that there have been a lot of problems in the relationship of the oil companies and the retailers and many of them have direct relationship to taxes, to things that certainly should come under the jurisdiction of the provincial government. I am wondering if the government has given any consideration to this Morrow report and whether they are contemplating such an investigation of any of these difficulties here in the province of Ontario.

Perhaps I can ask that question and get the hon. Provincial Treasurer's reply, and depending on what his reply is, I might have something further to say.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know anything about any meeting with the hon. Prime Minister. The reason I suggested that I thought perhaps you had the wrong association, I had a good deal to do with the Ontario retail gasoline dealers association. In fact, I spent a good deal of time last summer in meeting with them, and in meeting with the oil companies, and I had some very kindly comments from them as a result of those efforts. I have never known the Ontario retail gasoline dealers association to be as well satisfied with conditions as they exist, as they are now.

I thought you were probably referring to the group—

Mr. MacDonald: No.

Hon. Mr. Allan: —that came down here with the hearse.

Mr. MacDonald: No.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am sure that the members of the Ontario retail gasoline dealers association have always been very friendly with me and have approached me at any time, and I have heard nothing from them so I know nothing about what you are speaking.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister should not be put off by the fact that they were friendly with him. Everybody is friendly with the hon. Minister. He is such a congenial person that everybody is friendly with him, but that does not necessarily mean that there are not some differences—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, but they come to me with their problems.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, no later than yesterday—

Mr. Bryden: It was not until they got home they realized they got nothing.

Mr. MacDonald: It was no later than yesterday I was speaking to Mr. Langdon, who I think is the executive secretary, or some comparable position, and asked him whether or not the association was interested in the kind of investigation that took place in B.C. I think I am correct in reporting his answer to the effect that they were interested.

But perhaps I can make my point by referring to a couple of documents and a recent letter, which was, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer intimates, from this other group. The other group is known as the superior auto service association. I suppose one might describe it as a ginger group that has developed among gasoline retailers. It is now operating under the presidency of Mr. Elwood Smith, Sudbury, and a few weeks ago—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know him so well.

Mr. MacDonald: —they had their march on Queen's Park. They invited representatives from all parties to meet with them up at the Park Plaza and I happened to be the only representative of any party that appeared.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Did they have a dinner?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, they did. They certainly did. I can assure you I was interested to know whether everybody else had been extended an invitation and I was assured that they were extended an invitation.

Mr. Nixon: What do you mean, everybody else?

Mr. MacDonald: Invitations were extended to the leaders of the three parties, or their delegates, and the only person who emerged was me. It was the kind of a situation that I rather relish, because they had a lot of unfulfilled complaints.

However, let me get down to the basis of the issue; that was just by way of setting the background. This organization, interestingly enough, has written very recently—on May 24 as a matter of fact—to the Minister of Mines in Ottawa with regard to a report that the national energy board had been requested by the Ontario retail gasoline dealers association to investigate the importation of 3,000 gallons of low-priced gasoline into Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not 3,000—it was three million.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, three million gallons of low-priced gasoline.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I want to keep you correct.

Mr. MacDonald: Interestingly enough, when I checked with the Ontario retail gasoline dealers association, I discovered that both of these organizations are heading for the same objective. But each of them reacted differently to the news that three million gallons of low-priced gasoline were coming into Ontario.

The Ontario retail gasoline dealers association was fearful that this would provoke still another of these periodic outbreaks of warfare between various gasoline companies. The companies themselves are big enough that they are able to sustain the losses, and in various ways they take it out on the gasoline retailers. These are the people who suffer, and they were afraid that this kind of war would be provoked by this move.

Interestingly enough, the superior auto service association came up with an opposite reaction, namely, that the price of gasoline in the province of Ontario is virtually a monopoly position, and any low-priced gasoline that might be brought into the province might conceivably challenge that monopoly, with some benefit, certainly to the consumer, and conceivably to some of the retailers.

Just let me quote one or two paragraphs from their letter:

> After giving this situation much study we are convinced that to stop the importing of gasoline would in effect enhance the position of the major oil companies in continuing to fix a gasoline tank wagon price to the gasoline dealer and lessee. Our investigations show that in most cases the major oil companies post the same tank wagon price set up by zones and all gasoline dealers must buy at a preset price.

This organization, when it met with us a couple of months ago, pointed out the strange inequities that come when you set up zones. It pointed out, for example, that the charge by oil companies to dealers in the Orangeville area is 37.4 cents—at least it was at that time. South of Orangeville, because it is another area of another zone, it was 33 cents. So there is a difference of 4.4 cents.

I shall, in a moment, draw to the attention of the hon. Minister that this was a problem that the Morrow commission in B.C. looked into, and came up with some recommendations about which I think we should give some thought.

However, let me proceed for a moment with the letter. Quoting from this letter from Mr. Elwood Smith, president of the superior auto service association, to the federal Minister of Mines, he said:

> We also believe that the major oil companies either own or control the majority of unbranded gasoline companies in Ontario. We understand that Flash Petroleums has been bought out by a division of British Petroleums. Visco Petroleum Products Limited which operated Hercules stations, are now controlled by Premium Oil. Premium in turn is controlled by Standard of New Jersey. Standard of New Jersey also owns the controlling interest in Imperial Oil Esso.

Incidentally, I have heard it said that the control there is by Standard of Indiana, but I do not think this really makes any great difference, because they are all subsidiaries of the one holding company and ultimately in this family of companies you have Esso in Canada.

> Over the past number of years many small gasoline companies have started up only to be bought out by a major company. There is no major oil company in Canada that is not foreign controlled.

Then they ask this very pertinent question.

> Are the two major oil companies who own Flash Petroleum and Hercules stations

and sell at reduced prices doing so to prove to The Department of Justice that there is no fixed price on gasoline in Ontario?

In other words, is this a minor exception to try to prove the general rule—the general rule being that we have a fixed price? The letter goes on:

Why are the major oil companies charging their dealers and lessees a tank wagon price of 37 to 39 cents per gallon when they will sell the same gasoline to unbranded distributors, and these distributors can sell to the dealers of these major oil companies for 31 to 33 cents per gallon?

Dealers and lessees must buy gasoline from the major oil companies they are tied to. Any purchases made from an unbranded distributor would violate their agreement. Even though they would be saving approximately six cents per gallon, both the dealer and the unbranded distributor would lose his gasoline supply if the major oil company were to find out that the other two partners were dealing with each other.

The major oil companies have too much control on the gasoline market now, and if this imported gasoline were stocked, it could bring about even more severe conditions for the gasoline dealers and lessees. To stock this product could force dealer and lessee to pay higher tank wagon prices for gasoline.

And, as a result of that, they request from the federal government, I quote:

We humbly request that your office work in conjunction with The Department of Justice to thoroughly investigate the gasoline distribution and sales policy of the major oil companies in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, this is an old story, and the combines branch of the federal justice department has looked into this issue on a number of occasions and made some pronouncements. But it is interesting to note that the only place where we have really got into the heart of the operations in the relationship between the oil companies and the lessees—whether they be independents or the subsidiary outlets of the oil companies—has been in the province of British Columbia, because of a very unique political situation where a maverick backbencher forced Premier Bennett, before the last election, to set up a Royal commission.

I think the whole of the country is going to benefit from this Royal commission, because finally we have had the curtain drawn aside. I am not going to go into the whole detail of this report. I just want to draw the attention of the House to the five or six basic recommendations which it made. I do so because I discovered that in a very interesting way they coincide and overlap with the proposals that were made by the superior auto service when the delegation came to Queen's Park.

The first recommendation of the B.C. report was for uniform retail markup price on gasoline throughout British Columbia. On page 57 of the report there is this comment of Commissioner Morrow.

I can see little or no reason for the higher markup price by service station operators in many locations outside the consignment area. I believe the markup throughout the province should be about the same. The present high retail markup in some areas is absolutely unfair.

Following the investigation in British Columbia that was the proposal of Commissioner Morrow. Referring back to the points that were drawn to our attention by this group in the province of Ontario, the superior auto services association, their first proposal was that we should establish retail prices on gasoline—with a floor price, also that we should establish maximum wholesale prices, maintaining a nine-cent margin for the retailer. The net effect of those two proposals is in essence the same kind of thing that the British Columbia commission has noted and, incidentally, also would avoid the kind of recurrent warfare that goes on in the province of Ontario when, for no other purpose than to drive a competitor out of a particular area, one oil company will drop their price for a time. The consumer will admittedly benefit for a short time, but meanwhile there is a great deal of dislocation and instability in the whole industry.

Second, the Morrow commission recommended that a two-cent reduction in the five-cent differential in price between premium and regular grade should take place.

Third, a five-year moratorium on construction of service stations.

This is something that has often puzzled me as I go across the province of Ontario. A number of service stations along highways have closed up and yet, a bit farther along, another one is being built. It seems to me there is an incredible amount of economic waste; lack of planning in this irrational dog-eat-dog competition.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Private enterprise!

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Private enterprise!

Mr. MacDonald: It may be private enterprise, or it may be the law of the jungle. I am just raising the question of whether we have not reached the point where it is so much the law of the jungle that ultimately the consumer is going to be paying for it. And conceivably, it may be well for the government to look into it here as has been done out in British Columbia.

The comment of the commissioner in British Columbia in regard to this is found on pages 47 and 48, as follows:

> British Columbia is serviced with considerably more gasoline outlets than actually required for the motorists at this date, and this results in an excessive quantity of resources being employed in the distribution of gasoline.

A little later on they say:

> Bearing in mind the low average gasoline sales of many of the lessee dealers, and of the independents financed by oil companies, my view is that there is an over-investment in retailing facilities.

Later, again:

> It is my view that all areas in Ontario and in British Columbia are, at this date, amply served with service stations and this situation will not change in the immediate future.

And, finally:

> I recommend that a "rest" be taken for a period of at least five years in the construction of additional service stations. The licensing authority in British Columbia would have the power at present to carry out this recommendation.

Now, I draw this to the attention of the Provincial Treasurer. Whether or not that sort of a conclusion—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am the licensing Minister—the hon. Provincial Treasurer is not—in the province of Ontario now. I wonder if it should be under this vote.

Mr. MacDonald: I hope the Minister will not just try to run interference. I am dealing with the whole problem which, admittedly, may overlap because of licensing into the Minister's energy department, but it lies for the most part within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The tax!

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The tax.

Mr. MacDonald: The tax—right. And the whole relationship within the industry. The hon. Provincial Treasurer told us that he has spent considerable time with the gasoline companies and the retailers—the retail outlet representatives—in the past year, to try to resolve some of these difficulties.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Just as the Good Samaritan.

Mr. MacDonald: Just as the Good Samaritan. We are reviewing your Good Samaritan capacities and functions at the moment, then. Let's put it down to that, if that is the way you want to describe it.

The next B.C. recommendation was that there should be an end to oil company subsidizations to service stations leased to operators; a complete divorcing of wholesaling and retailing.

I suggest that here you get into an area which is certainly one of the areas of great concern for retailers in the province of Ontario. For example, the proposals of the superior auto services association were that operators should be permitted to maintain this nine-cent margin with no gimmicks, no gold stamps, no two cents under-the-counter deals that operate in some instances.

They requested that there be some sort of a regulation to stop forcing dealers to buy at higher prices than local wholesalers for certain materials which they are compelled to market along with their gasoline. And in many instances, if they are lessees from an oil company, whether or not they want to be bothered with all of this marketing of other products is something they have no control over.

So, there you have another major area which is of concern here and has been investigated in British Columbia. I could take more time but I just wanted to lay the general situation before the hon. Provincial Treasurer and suggest to him that since Mr. Langdon informs me that the Prime Minister had given the retail gasoline association the assurance they would look at the report from British Columbia and consider whether or not the same kind of investigation was needed in Ontario, that some sort of reply should be made by the government to that association. In my view there is need for an investigation.

But before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions that I want to

raise with the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and as well to seek his reply specifically to the general proposition that I have raised. The superior auto sales association contends that there are secret agreements between the government and the oil companies. Indeed, the association supplied members of the provincial Legislature with photostatic copies of the contracts. They were told by somebody in the department that this was a secret contract and it could not be let out—the contract that is in existence between the big oil companies and the provincial government. I am interested to know what sort of a deal the government has with the oil companies. Why are these secret?

Hon. Mr. Allan: What deal?

Mr. MacDonald: This is a contract with regard to taxation arrangements, I suppose the collection of taxes—

Hon. Mr. Allan: There is nothing secret about that.

Mr. MacDonald: There is nothing secret about it? Well, I can certainly get you the information that has been given to us with regard to the suggestion that they were secret.

Let me give you another specific, Mr. Chairman. I understand that the oil companies write off bad debts on gasoline tax collected when the retailer goes bankrupt. In other words, the retailer has already sold the gasoline, he has collected the tax from the consumer, but if perchance he goes bankrupt, the oil company from which he gets his gasoline can write off the tax and it never gets through to this government at all. Why is this kind of cozy little arrangement permitted between—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I happen to be a retailer. The tax is paid when you buy the gas from the wholesaler—when it goes in your tanks. If an operator went broke, why would the government not get its tax? We pay the tax to the company at the time it puts the gas in the ground, so the operator could go broke three times a week and he would still have his money.

Mr. Bryden: Somebody has the money.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The company has the money. You do not mean to tell me the companies do not pay?

Mr. MacDonald: That is the whole point that they are making, that in the—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member said the retailer, he did not say the company.

Mr. MacDonald: What does the hon. Minister mean?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member said the retailer.

Mr. MacDonald: I said the gas company is not obligated to return to the Provincial Treasurer the tax which has already been collected, if perchance the retailer had gone bankrupt.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The retailer does not remit the tax.

Mr. MacDonald: I know it, but this is the point. I am told that this is one of the factors in these contracts that exist between the government and the gasoline companies. I am just trying to throw a little bit of light on it. Let us find out what these contracts are.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I can reply to this. I am informed that refunds are made only where they are absolutely warranted and that the refunds in the whole province of Ontario amount to $20,000 a year. This is where the tax has not been collected. The total amount as a result of these bankruptcies is only $20,000.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Provincial Treasurer says the amount of tax involved is only $20,000?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, so what! The Provincial Treasurer on the one hand is presenting himself as the man who is being very careful and cautious but he hands out $20,000 to E. P. Taylor at one point and he hands out $20,000 to the oil companies. If this tax has been paid by the consumer—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it is only in instances where it has not been paid.

Mr. MacDonald: How conceivably could it not have been paid by the consumer?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would be glad to look into the details but I am not familiar enough with the details. This is my understanding, and the statement I have made too, that it is practically nothing in the whole of the operation.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, I will let the matter rest there, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer will look into it and will let me know.

If 10 days from now he has not, I will ask him before the orders of the day—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will let the hon. mem- know before he asks.

Mr. MacDonald: And also would he give me a copy of the contracts that are entered into between this government and the oil companies with regard to the gasoline tax collections?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I think the Chairman went over these item-by-item instead and I think the next was the hospital tax branch. I have a question on retail sales tax.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Anything on hospital tax branch; legal branch; retail sales tax branch?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon I had asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer if the department considered reporting sales tax collections by locality or by collection office, because the sales tax is a good barometer of the economic development of the area. Two years from today you would know the sales tax in one area was $1 million and something, the following year it might have been $1.5 million, and it is a good thing for the community to know.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I could inform the hon. member that we realize that this could be an indicator of business in a certain area. However, we have been installing a new computer — it is the second one of its type that was sold in Canada—and we have had a few problems and we are not in a position to do it at the present time.

Mr. Newman: But you are contemplating it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We are sympathetic to the idea and will give it consideration.

Mr. Newman: Once you can programme it, you will have—

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have not said no.

Mr. Newman: Right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The revenue inspection branch; succession duty branch.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have one item under the succession duty branch that I thought was worthy of attention. That is from the brief or the policy of the Ontario chamber of commerce concerning The Ontario Succession Duties Act and this is on tax rental. The Ontario chamber believes that steps should be taken to relieve Ontario taxpayers of the extra burden of tax which results from the imposition of succession duties by the province of Ontario.

It recommends that Ontario suspend application of The Succession Duties Act and rent the field to the federal government; or as a less satisfactory alternative, Ontario replace The Succession Duties Act by a new Act streamlined to dovetail with and follow as closely as constitutional limitations will permit, the form and substance of The Canada Estate Tax Act. This should be accompanied by an attempt to work out an arrangement whereby the federal government would collect succession duties on behalf of the province.

Is the hon. Provincial Treasurer considering this?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, we have given it a great deal of consideration and we have decided not to do it for the reason that we would have lost probably at this time up to $20 million in revenue. As a matter of fact, the federal government has very little interest in the collection of what you might say a 25 per cent interest in estate taxes at the present time.

First, they abate 50 per cent of the estate tax and then they pay to us 50 per cent of tax that is collected, so that at the present time this government has as revenue the money that is received from succession duties and half of the estate tax that is collected from the residents of the province of Ontario. As the hon. member knows, the Ontario committee on taxation will be making a report before very long. I would expect that there would be quite a few changes in certain Acts at that time, and certainly there will be a great deal of consideration given to this particular Act, along with some others.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Transfer tax branch.

Vote 2205 agreed to.

On vote 2206:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on 2206, the Provincial Treasurer said in his introductory remarks that the experts in data processing in his department were collating the expansion of the computer service in all departments. Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is a pretty big statement.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Provincial Treasurer said something about overseeing the acquisition of new machinery.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have attached to the organization and methods section of the department, an expert in computer operation, who assists departments in the arranging of the development of their programmes. He is extremely busy at the present time because I think there are eight or nine departments which have requested him. But this one person, whom we feel is going to be an excellent individual in this line, does assist the other departments in the development of their programmes, not in the operation of the computers.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have not been satisfied with the comments of any of the Ministers that enough attention is being paid to economy in the acquisition of these expensive but extremely useful machines. I think it is very easy for any Minister to say that if we put in a computer we are going to save so many dollars over a number of years. But the thing that impresses me about computers is their tremendous flexibility.

It is not true to say that if it is programmed to do some work for the Minister of Education, it cannot at the same time do some work for some other Minister as well—such as the Minister of Transport. I would like to be assured that the plan is that these expensive machines are going to be operating on a 24-hour basis. Down on King street at the IBM office, they make a big thing of keeping those wheels turning night and day and they hire people to use this tremendously expensive equipment so that it simply does not rest at all. It is not necessary to buy a complete outfit for each department; its flexibility is something that perhaps has not been properly appreciated.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, perhaps you would like a rather full statement in connection with this?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I would.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Late in 1964, Treasury board directed organization and methods services to evaluate the prospective use of computers in the government service and to recommend a course of action which would promote effectiveness and economy for the government as a whole. This is the thought that the hon. member has been expressing.

In July 1965, Treasury board and the executive council approved O and M recommendations concerning the planning, development and control of automatic data processing through the service, whereby individual departments were charged with the decision as to the extent to which they would need, and their method of using computer equipment, subject to the overall responsibility and control of Treasury board. Apart from departments which could justify an installation of their own—for example, Transport, Education and OMSIP—mechanization in the short run is expected to develop around three centres: engineering and scientific at The Department of Highways; financial in Treasury; and a business and statistical centre in Economics and Development. To this end a director of automatic data processing standards was engaged last December and placed in organization and methods services. His basic responsibilities are to: Assist departments to determine the feasibility and develop applications for which mechanized processing can be used to advantage; provide co-ordination, promote the use of shared facilities and develop interdepartmental systems in areas of common interest; to develop criteria guidelines and standards for systems specifications; requests for tender; equipment evaluation and review equipment proposals submitted to the Treasury board.

To date the organization and methods services have completed the data processing feasibility studies in five departments, and recently evaluated additional equipment requirements for three installations, the three I mentioned —Highways, Transport and OMSIP. Studies in two departments are in process and O and M are serving on planning committees for three other departments. Requests for assistance have also been received from three more departments which are scheduled in the near future. I could give you a list of the departments but I think that answers your questions.

Vote 2206 agreed to.

On vote 2207:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was waiting to see if anyone else wanted to raise any matters under this vote. I think we should have the hon. Minister's statement on this. He never gives a statement until we start squawking about something, so I would like to hear what he has prepared on the Ontario racing commission.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have not any prepared statement on the Ontario racing commission. I can report to the House that it seems to be functioning exceptionally well at the present time—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We would be shocked if you said anything else!

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, there have been several changes since the first of the year. I do not know whether the members know that there was a supervisor of thoroughbred racing; we now have a very experienced person whom we have engaged who was with the federal government as supervisor of standard or harness horseracing, and we feel that at the present time with this control in management things have been going along very nicely.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, I feel particularly qualified to discuss this vote at some length inasmuch that I have never been at a racetrack and I only made one wager to a friend and it came true and I decided that I would stop while I was ahead, and so I feel particularly qualified to make some extended remarks on this vote.

The particular matter I wanted to discuss with the Minister has to do with racing charters, or the lack of those charters in this province at the present time. And to say quite frankly to the House, I think we are getting into a hopeless position in respect to the allotment of racing days to various communities in this province. I think we have to take the bull by the horns, as the saying is, and do something to clarify and to regularize this business of racing charters.

As I understand it, we gathered them all up a few years ago and we said: now, this is it, from now on no old ones are any good and unless you have got them now you are out in the cold. The jockey club had a few, I understand, gathered in their vest pocket somewhere and up until this year they have given out the odd one for a few days to this community and that one on a rental basis—I could never understand that, why the jockey club should get rental for giving out racing days—but at the present time the situation, as I understand it, is this. Even the jockey club now has not any more days to give out—the old charters have all been gathered in by these new raceways that are being built and we are in a position in this province now where communities who are great, shall I say, are unable to get an allotment of racing days and they are just out in the cold.

It is beyond my comprehension why this province cannot in the regular fashion say by legislation that there shall be charters available to those communities who have proven their worth and who have established themselves as responsible racing communities and are desirous of obtaining a charter for a certain number of racing days. I am aware of the federal connection with this matter but I am also perplexed that this province can on its own do this task of regularizing this charter business if it puts its mind to it. One of the tasks that this government should assign itself is to bring order out of the chaos which exists. There is not any sound reason in my judgment why the great raceways of this province should have all the available charters gathered in their hip pockets, and other racing-conscious areas unable to get a single place by way of racing days.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: The time has come, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, when you should do another examination, and a good one, as to the ways and means that can be employed by this government to regularize what, in my opinion, has become a regular subject of discontent in this province with respect to racing days.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I so often find myself in agreement with the hon. member for Grey South and I am very sorry, at the present time, to find that a number of small raceways are not able to obtain charters this year. The reason for this is rather simple. I think I should say, first, that I do not think that any of the larger raceways have charters in their hip pockets because from the information I have—

Mr. Oliver: They have to, to get the raceway.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, what I took from your statement was that a number of these large raceways have charters in their hip pocket that they are not using.

Mr. Oliver: If my hon. friend understood that, it is incorrect; and perhaps is a result of my failure to communicate. What I did say was that these large raceways that have been organized, as my friend quite well knows, were organized because they were able to garner in a lot of these small charters that were here, hither and thither throughout the province and those charters are no longer available for the small places—the big ones have them all and they needed them to establish their raceway.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Everything was going along very nicely until the tracks had been completed. Last year Windsor was not operating. As a result, Windsor loaned their

charters or whatever they did with them, to these various smaller tracks and everyone was able to obtain charters for as many days as they wished to race.

My understanding of this situation is that the procedure that has to be followed—and this is laid down by Ottawa—is that these associations must apply by private bill for a charter.

Mr. Singer: Oh, surely not.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am sure that—

Mr. Singer: As soon as my friend is through, I will give him our version of the law; we have had a look at this.

Hon. Mr. Allan: If you give us your version of the law, we have taken it up with Ottawa. We have done everything within our power and we are hopeful that we are going to find some charters that are active that can be used in Ontario. We are very hopeful that this is going to happen. We have explored this thing to the best of our ability and the information that I have—if the hon. member knows some other way of doing it, there will be no one more willing to co-oporate than will this government, because we are very sorry to find these racing associations without charters at this time.

These were available for so long and so easy to get that it did not occur to them to apply by private bill this year for these charters. I do not know what would have happened, but this seems to be the only way that charters can be procured unless you can buy an active charter from another province and the transfer is approved in this province, which I would think this government would be willing to do, if they can buy them.

I could tell you that the federal people—I have worked with them—one of the hon. Ministers here was in Ottawa yesterday to see the Minister of Agriculture. This particular part of the Criminal Code is under the control of the Minister of Agriculture. We are doing everything we know to assist these small tracks to get charters. If the hon. member knows anything that can be helpful, I am sincere when I say we would be delighted to know about it and do anything we could.

Mr. Oliver: My friend has put his finger right on the problem. He said in a word that there are so many charters and that there shall be no more charters unless a community goes before the committee on private bills with a private bill seeking a charter.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think the statement was made that there would be no more charters revived.

Mr. Oliver: Yes, that is right, no more charters revived. Also, as my hon. friend has just said, this year the charters are all being used, therefore it is not likely that the situation will improve.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not this year.

Mr. Oliver: Not next year, either.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh yes, it could improve next year.

Mr. Oliver: What is the hope that it could improve next year?

Hon. Mr. Allan: By private bill.

Mr. Oliver: Yes, that is the point. The situation we are getting into is that the only way 75 or 100, I do not know how many communities in this province would like to have a charter, the only way they can get it is to come down here before the private bills committee, pay the prescribed fee, pay all the costs involved—

Hon. Mr. Allan: This would not be a great amount of money.

Mr. Oliver: It would not be a great amount of money?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Mr. Oliver: What I am suggesting is that it would be costly, it would be inconvenient—

Mr. Singer: A thousand dollars.

Mr. Oliver: —and there is not any sensible reason if we determine—I want to make this point—if we determine as the hon. Provincial Treasurer has said, but I do not agree with him for one moment, although I am not a lawyer, that this province has not the power to grant charters without coming before the committee on private bills for a private bill. That would be argued at length.

If we decide that it cannot be done except by a private bill, then I suggest the time has come for us to get up on our hind legs and go to Ottawa or whatever has to be done. It is a ridiculous situation to me that these other great raceways can get their charters, they can have all kinds of race days and the only way a smaller community

—and some of them are not so small—the only way they can get a charter is to come down on bended knees before the legislative committee of this province and say, "Please give me a charter." The whole thing is atrocious and my hon. friend knows it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, no. May I very unwillingly disagree with my hon. friend? They would not need to come on bended knees.

Mr. Oliver: I do not care how they come.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That way, I think, is the cheapest possible way you could get a charter.

Mr. Singer: What about North Bay last year? Certainly they were here and they were told pretty loudly that they had better go home. Their bill never came before the House.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They were here. At that particular time there were loads of charters. It is too bad now that it has not been proceeded with.

Mr. Singer: They should have been on bended knees.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There was just one more vote—were there any questions?

Mr. Singer: We have the solution for you.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, do you? Well, then, do not talk, tell me.

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid you will have to hear the member for Kingston and the Islands after supper.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 28, by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell).

Resolved,

That this House take appropriate action by way of amendment to The Election Act of Ontario or by way of special legislation to make it possible for all persons absent from the province in the service of the province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada, who would otherwise be qualified to vote in elections for the Ontario Legislature, to vote in such elections.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Beaches, resolution No. 28 standing in my name, which has just been read.

My remarks this afternoon are going to be quite brief, and in beginning I would point to the rather limited purport of the resolution which is on the order paper in my name. It relates to a suggestion that persons absent from the province in the service of the province or of the government of Canada, who would be otherwise qualified to vote in elections be allowed to, despite their physical absence from this province on polling day.

I am dealing here with a relatively small group, who through no fault of their own, find themselves deprived of those democratic rights which their fellow citizens have. And, ironically enough, are deprived of the right to vote under circumstances solely connected with their service to fellow citizens of this province or the Dominion of Canada. They are scattered about the world in the service of Canada and scattered certainly about North America and parts of the world in the service of this province.

And I would suggest that stated another way, in question form, we might ask is it reasonable and is it fair that those who serve us in this way should have their right as citizens diminished simply because they are so serving us?

I mentioned that my remarks would be brief. The first reason for this is that I hope to deal with nothing more than the bare principle this afternoon. And the second is that since drafting the resolution and filing it in this House, the hon. Prime Minister himself has made a statement on April 21 dealing with the question of The Election Act. In it, he said:

> In recent months there has developed an extensive debate, not only in this province but in other parts of Canada, concerning the efficacy of our various election Acts and the procedures that we have followed for many years in conducting provincial and federal elections.

His announcement then goes on to deal with his proposed appointment of a committee at the end of this session.

The wording of the particular statement of the hon. Prime Minister does not quite assure me, although it may have been his intention, that this particular committee is, in fact, going to deal with the question of franchise, as well as procedures and machinery involved in the question of elections, and I would hope to record tonight the desire which I am sure not only myself, but many others in this House would have. Such a committee would, in fact, investigate the question of franchise and extensions of the franchise generally.

I mentioned that this is not a large group and I suppose some might say in a province where in a provincial election perhaps 20 per cent or 25 per cent of the enfranchised citizens do not vote, why worry about such a small group? Certainly, there are three types of voters that we as working politicians have to bump into or have knowledge of. One is the enfranchised person who does not vote, another type is the one who has to be encouraged to vote, and then there is a third class that we have all had some experience of, the person who takes an almost religious attitude toward the right of the ballot and who treats the exercise of the ballot as almost a sacrament.

Of the group who do not vote, they are like the grumpy little old lady who was describing politicians and why she did not like them and said that she never voted because it only encouraged them.

On the other extreme of the spectrum are the ones, such as ourselves as politicians and those who work for us, who take this very strong position in endeavouring to hold our franchise and maintain it.

And the group, the public servants I am speaking of, I would suggest to the House, obviosuly fall within that—a conscientious and well-informed number of voters.

From a practical point of view, the question is obviously: What means should be used to accomplish this extension of the franchise—how can it be done economically and how can it be done so that honesty is observed?

Basically, there are two ways in which the franchise can be handled—this extension could be handled. One would be to copy the present practice of the chief electoral officer with respect to votes in the armed services. Briefly, as you recall, this requires the sending of a card to the service people and the return of the card with an application or a ballot, the preparation of an envelope and the ballot in the envelope. It is sent to the returning officer and is checked against the general voters' list of service personnel. This is expensive and highly complicated.

The other way it could be done would be to imitate present proxy provisions. In The Election Act today there is a section allowing for proxy voting for mariners on ships. In this particular provision in our present Election Act, a mariner can have a member of his close family act as his proxy, verify the proxy before a judge and the proxy voter can vote in an ordinary provincial election under those circumstances. It is an extremely cheap and simple way of handling the extension of franchise to these mariners and, of course, there is nothing new in it to those who are experienced with the broad use of proxy voting in a corporate democracy.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): A corporate what?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: A corporate democracy.

Mr. Bryden: Joe Stalin's kind of democracy.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: A corporate democracy is the one I meant, and in corporate democracy, as the hon. member full well knows, the use of the proxy is a steady and common practice.

The disadvantage of the first type I mentioned is cost, and the disadvantage of the second one is that in these years, certainly in 1966, proxy voting in the hands of a close member of your family may or may not be suitable. The old days when everyone in the family voted the same way, I would suggest, are probably passing. We are not in the days when the Smiths were all Liberals and the Browns were all Conservatives and stayed in one party, and therefore proxy voting today would mean a great loss, I would think, of privacy.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I am most sympathetic for a simple third way, a compromise between the two, and that would be that of merely mailing in the ballot by the public servant from his place of work outside the country. They are a small group; they are a scattered group; they are a well-informed group; they are a literate group and generally, I would say, they have the highest quotient of honesty of any group in our society. It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that when this is being considered, we could have a simple process of writing in to the chief electoral officer, receiving a form of ballot, accompanying the ballot with a declaration as to correctness and absence of incorrect statements, and simply then mailing this in to the appropriate deputy returning officer.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, it is a small matter that I have raised in this resolution

but it does relate, I submit to the House, to a matter of simple justice. I think that it is in our interest as citizens of the province and of the country to do everything we can to see that those who serve us outside the province and outside the country are as closely identified with and as little separated from the life, the responsibilities and activities of this province, as possible.

I believe this because not only is it justice, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would make them better servants of those of us who remain here.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I would think that the hon. Prime Minister's statement that a select committee would be operating following the end of this session, looking into The Election Act, would mean that the discussion that would take place during this hour would be somewhat academic but perhaps would be examined rather closely by the members of that committee.

I would agree with the previous speaker that some amendment to permit this sort of possibility would be a good one and, in fact, we should favour it in this House. It is true that the number of people concerned would be rather small, particularly those who are in the employ of the province of Ontario. Those who are absent on trade missions and who would be on the staff of Ontario House in London, and so on, would be about the extent of the number. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that a much larger group would be those in the federal employ and particularly those who would be living in the Ottawa area when they returned from their ventures and responsibilities overseas.

A good many of these, as a matter of fact, would no doubt be personal friends of the hon. member who has just spoken and some of those may be among the select group to which he would talk on the telephone. I would not suggest for a moment that he is assured that all of these people would support him or even those of his colleagues in his party, but it is true that this would concern those who would normally live in the Ottawa area more than any other and this may be even another reason why I would support the hon. member who moved the resolution in this regard.

I would agree with him further that it is a rather narrow resolution. It refers to a small group of people who should not be disenfranchised, of course, but it would be reasonable to enlarge the idea of the resolution to contain some thoughts that would perhaps be a recommendation to the committee on election law and that would permit much larger groups to take part in elections in the province.

I refer specifically to those who are in ill health at the time of an election and are not able to go to the polls. I would submit to you, sir, that the resolution does call for an amendment to The Election Act to extend the franchise and so some brief remarks along these lines would be in order. I think it would be successful too, because here, surely, is a group of at least 75,000 people in this province who normally do take part in the day-to-day activities, electoral and otherwise, and who have been disenfranchised through the unfortunate condition that finds them either bedridden or in a hospital and therefore unable to vote.

It happens that in certain elections, special polling subdivisions are set up, particularly in homes for the elderly. But even in this case the poll is not a movable one, and if the elderly person is able to get down to the main hall to cast his ballot, then he is not disenfranchised, and the rest who are too ill to do so, must miss this opportunity to exercise their vote and that we might have the benefit of their experience.

I would add then, to the recommendation that the member has made specifically in his resolution, that the committee that is going to examine this in the near future would prescribe some machinery whereby those who are in hospitals, in nursing homes, and even home in bed ill, would have an opportunity to cast their ballots.

In the case of the hospital, it should be a simple procedure to set up a poll in the hospital, even a movable one that could go from room to room and those who are bedridden could take part. For those who are bedridden at home, the mailing procedure that the hon. member described a few minutes ago might very well fit into the need that is so obvious.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that in general I would agree with the hon. member. There is some thought that a good many people serving the province and the nation are outside of the country for years at a time, and in a sense take on the political colour of the country in which they serve. I think of our agent-general in England, who has served so well there since Ontario House was re-established, back in 1944 or 1945, and has been such a good ambassador for our province. I do not know how often he returns home. It may be that he will be back in Ontario after having been retired from his

responsibilities and will be once again able to take a more active role in politics.

But the argument that these people lose touch with political affairs, I do not think is a strong one, because they are in the service of our province and our nation, and they should have the opportunity to take part in the electoral matters that we, in this House, consider so important.

So with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would say that in general we support this, but we would like to add to the comments of the previous speaker some recommendations to the committee that will be considering this matter in a more general way, in the months that lie ahead.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Russell has now before us on the order paper one of a series of resolutions designed to cadge a few votes down Ottawa way. I have no doubt that he will go back and show this around, and say, "Well you see fellows, I was fighting for you up there in Queen's Park." He probably will not bother to add that he was of course supporting a government that refuses to act upon the suggestions that he puts on the order paper.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the idea the member puts forward is worthy of support. It has always struck me as somewhat anomalous that an 18-year-old in the armed services is eligible to vote, if he is outside the country, but a senior diplomat in the service of the country is not. I am not complaining about the vote of the person in the armed services, I am simply complaining about the lack of a vote for well-qualified people and people who are certainly qualified to vote under our electoral law, except by the one fluke of residence.

I would agree that we should do something about this. I do not see any reason in the world why we cannot amend The Election Act before the next election to enfranchise the people referred to in the resolution. I do not think there would be even any serious problem in collecting the votes. I will admit that I have not gone into it in any detail, but we already have machinery which we use in every election for collecting votes from members of the armed forces in various parts of the world, and it would seem to me that the identical machinery could be used to collect votes from these other people who are serving in various types of civilian service throughout the world.

I would, however, like to suggest that there really is a bigger problem here and that we might as well deal with the whole problem at one time. It is essentially along the lines of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Brant.

In my opinion, anyone who is away from his constituency on election day should be allowed to vote by mail. It strikes me as perfectly ridiculous that a person who may have arranged his holidays six months or a year in advance—and many people have to do that, especially if they are taking extended holidays—is disfranchised if the date for the advance poll and the date for the election fall within his holiday period.

I think it is asking a little too much of his sense of civic duty to expect that he is going to cancel a plan that he may have made a year in advance, merely to vote, so why should he not be allowed to submit his ballot by mail? This is done in other jurisdictions.

I do not see any reason why it cannot be done in Ontario. There have been no abuses that I know of in the jurisdictions where it occurs. It does mean that there is a bit of delay before the final results come in, and occasionally the fate of a constituency can hang in the balance for a couple of weeks until these absentee ballots are counted. However, this proposal would solve the problem referred to in the resolution.

It would also solve the problem of the person who is in hospital on election day. It is ridiculous that we disqualify people because they are sick. If they happen to be in a general hospital both on the day of the advance poll and on election day, they are disqualified. As my friend has also pointed out, there is the problem of the shut-in, who cannot get out. We should be trying to encourage people to exercise their franchise, and the simplest way of dealing with all of the problems is to provide a system of absentee voting by mail for people who are qualified to vote.

I would certainly support the resolution now before us but I do think we should carry the matter further and solve not only the problem referred to there, but the entire problem of the person who is away from his constituency on election day.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of being the fourth speaker on such a resolution is that the other three speakers leave you very little to comment about. However, I would be very happy to support the member for Russell in his resolution.

I think it is rather obvious that those people who are away from home, through various reasons, should certainly be given the opportunity of casting their vote in an Ontario election.

However, in agreeing with the member for Russell, I too would like to go a little bit further and I would like to point out that there are many other areas in which consideration should be given to make certain that citizens who are eligible to vote are enabled to do so. In this connection, I am particularly concerned over the great number of physically handicapped persons who, because of their physical disability, find it almost impossible to vote in either provincial or federal elections.

For example, there are many thousands of multiple sclerosis patients who are eligible to vote in our provincial elections, and a large percentage of whom are disenfranchised and are denied the right to vote because they cannot enter and reach their particular polling station. The entrance in many cases is barred by a flight of steps, which a wheelchair cannot climb and over which many crutch and cane users find it almost impossible to pass.

A wheelchair weighs approximately 50 pounds, and this along with the weight of the person makes it a difficult and often an impossible task for him or her to be carried into a polling station. The safety element is also of grave concern, when cane and crutch users attempt to climb such barriers, which they normally try to avoid, in order to exercise their right as Canadian citizens.

At the present time special regulations do govern the voting rights of another group of handicapped Canadians and legislation has been passed to assist the blind to vote and this certainly is as it should be. I feel also that special regulations should also be made for the physically handicapped who have a permanent physical disability, and who experience great difficulty, or find it impossible to vote because of their handicap. I am very pleased to support the resolution put forth by the member for Russell. And in so doing, I would hope that the following suggestion would be considered for the benefit of the citizens about whom I have been speaking:

That special advance polls be set up in one or two areas in each riding and so situated that wheelchair patients and other physically handicapped citizens have no difficulty in gaining access to the polling booth.

Now, this may be in a polling booth where there is a special ramp provided, or may be in an area where there are no steps at all so that it will make it very easy for anyone who is physically handicapped and in a wheelchair to go in and cast their vote. In this way we would no longer be denying the franchise to those of our citizens who have just as much right to cast their ballot as we have but who, up to now, have been virtually disenfranchised because we have not made the necessary suitable, physical arrangements to enable them to exercise their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that such action be taken immediately and I think it is within the power of the electoral officers to have these arrangements made. We have delayed too long already looking after this most important requirement in our voting procedure.

Of prime importance to the handicapped is his independence, and this includes the independence to be able to go and come as one pleases. Very often a handicapped person is accused of becoming withdrawn and this is because it is very difficult for the disabled person to get around in a community designed for those without disability.

Dr. M. C. Misick, national director, patient services of the multiple sclerosis society of Canada, says, and I quote: "The most important discovery to be made by the patient is that the disabled person must learn again to do things for himself." Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we in this province make the necessary changes in our election regulations to give them the right, as Canadian citizens, and residents in Ontario, to vote in our election? Surely, this must be an obvious and necessary revision, so let us do it, and let us do it now.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the resolution. I rise to speak against the resolution for the reasons given by the previous speaker. I deem this resolution to be discriminatory, and I will not support any resolution that creates a special class of people in this country.

The resolution, frankly, Mr. Speaker, is not worded in quite the restrictive terms that the previous speakers have indicated. It does not speak of civil servants; it speaks of people—all persons absent from the province, in the service of the province or the Dominion of Canada. This remark has been interpreted by the previous speakers to refer to civil servants.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are very many people abroad at the present time who are not civil servants, but are, nevertheless, servants of this province or servants of Canada. I need only refer to the people who are

serving with the corps of young Canadians or the people who are serving in Africa—teaching in the jungles of Africa—or trying to help the developing nations. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they are every bit as much servants of this country as—if perhaps not more—than those who call themselves civil servants. I believe that they, as well as anyone else, are entitled to be called servants of Canada. There are still others who, by virtue of their calling, for instance if they work for large corporations like Massey-Harris, are stationed abroad for long periods of time.

The members here say how they are trying to increase our exports abroad. I suggest that those people who are trying to sell Canadian products abroad, who are trying to stimulate Canadian industry through sales abroad, are just as much persons who are the servants of this country as are those who call themselves civil servants.

It is fine for members in this House to get up and say they support this resolution but I think, sir, that these people should also be entitled to the franchise. Fine, I can go along with that. I agree that no one should be deprived of the franchise. But, this resolution does not purport, nor does it have any indication of intending to give all those people the franchise. It only deals with one specific class. It is setting up a special class of citizens who are going to have rights above other citizens.

Now, it is also fine, Mr. Speaker, to say our servicemen are entitled to obtain a vote overseas—when they are abroad. I point out that our servicemen are usually in encampments, in a large group, and they are restricted in their distribution whereas the civil servant that the members have spoken of can be found in almost every country in the world. Furthermore, I would suggest our servicemen do not go abroad by choice; as a matter of fact, they have no choice. They are there at the will of our Sovereign. They go where our Sovereign says they go. A civil sevant is not bound by the same rules and regulations. No civil servant has to submit to going abroad. He can resign from the civil service but a serviceman cannot resign saying, I do not want to go to the Congo; I do not want to go to the Gaza strip, or I do not want to go on a peace commission to Vietnam or to Korea.

He is bound to his Sovereign and he goes where the Sovereign sends him. I suggest that there is a distinction between those. And if you are talking about people who are the servants of this country, why forget about those who have been in the service of this country? How about the many thousands of people who have spent their lives in the service of this country and now this country has awarded them a pension which enables them to live in a more salubrious climate or, perhaps, go back to Great Britain and spend their declining years with their friends or brothers or sisters?

Now, they are no longer in the service of Canada or this province, but they may have spent a lifetime in such service. Are we going to forget about them? Are these civil servants that you speak of going to be the special class that are going to get special treatment above all? And what is this chief concern—why so much concern with their rights—the right of people to have a franchise? Should not the chief concern be that we have an intelligent franchise? How are we going to get election material to these people? Are you only concerned that they put an "X" on a ballot? Is anyone in this House concerned that they put that "X" on the ballot after deliberate and mature deliberation based on the material that the candidate distributed?

Should not that have some bearing on it? And how are we going to distribute this material? Is the government going to supply the candidate with the names and addresses of all these people serving abroad? And if they are, are they going to give these names and addresses to any candidate including the Communist candidate or someone else belonging to a party of similar beliefs? Are we going to go that far? And if we are not going to give the names, is the government going to undertake to send this literature abroad so that these people in the service of this country can make an intelligent decision as to how they are to vote? Or are you only interested that somebody in some distant place may put an "X" beside some name? Is that the prime concern of this House? If it is, then I say shame to this House. I think there is much more to casting a ballot than merely putting a cross beside a name.

Surely, this government, and any government, should do all in its power to see that every citizen has the right to exercise his democratic right to vote for the candidate of his choice. But, surely, after all the amendments that have been brought into this House to wipe out discrimination, are we now going to proceed to legislate into being a form of discrimination? Is that what this House intends to do? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we do support this motion as it stands we are in essence doing that. If the motion had read in such a manner that it incorporated the

remarks made by the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for Woodbine and the hon. member for Kingston, then I, too, would support the motion but when it is restricted to one particular class of people I say it is discriminatory, Mr. Speaker, and I for one will not support the motion.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this round of applause meant that there is division here and very little support, but it is always interesting to listen to the two voices of the Liberal Party in this House. In the one case I listened with a great deal of interest to the Nixon wing of the party and agreed fundamentally with what was said there. And then I listened to the Ben wing of the party with rather mixed feelings because here we had an idealist, who was determined that he is going to vote for nothing unless it is all there. You see, the Nixon wing is willing to take a part of the package providing it is good, and this, I suppose, is the view of almost every politician. We take what we feel we can get in legislation providing we agree with it and providing it is good, even though it may not be complete at that moment. This is the genius of the politician I suppose of many governments that they will throw out a little bit now, a little bit later and a little bit later. The Opposition generally, if they agree with that little bit, will take it and say: All right, we agree with that. We hope you will give us more next time. And generally that happens. But now we have the Ben wing of the party which says: Unless everything is wrapped up in one parcel, everything is complete, we will not vote for that partial good. I can see here that forever, from this point on, this division must be here and must be complete.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I get a little tired with this kind of tattered argument. As I understand it, this is a private members' hour. Thank you.

Mr. Bryden: Well, thanks for the information, and everything the hon member said was right to the point.

Mr. Young: We are delighted to hear this.

Mr. Speaker: I should perhaps advise the member speaking that in referring to other members of the House he should refer to the hon. member for such-and-such a riding.

Mr. Young: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, and I will call it then the hon. member for Brant wing and the hon. member for Bracondale wing.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not think the hon. member should be interrupted. He is just giving you an impression of how the unions should now negotiate. They should not go for a package deal, they should just take one little item and not go for the whole contract.

Mr. Young: This is exactly how unions do negotiate and we take what we can get, when we can get it, and we hope for more next year. However, Mr. Speaker, I will not take up the time of the House. I think that the idea put forward in the resolution is a good one. I would like to see it expanded, as the hon. members have said, into other fields.

I also feel that the hon. member for Bracondale has brought forward an idea here which I do not need to dwell upon, but which I intended to put forward. We ought to make, in a case like this, provision so that every candidate who is named does have sufficient information so that he can get his message to these people who may be outside the country. I think this is vital to the process of democracy.

I agree with this idea that the hon. member suggested. I am always willing to agree with the good part of anything. I do not have to take everything wrapped up completely finished. So I think we ought to finish this debate and perhaps come to some resolution so that we can recommend that this be incorporated in the legislation of the future.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I certainly had not intended to participate in this debate but I do see we have a few moments left by the clock. From my point of view, sir, I first of all want to say that I support the resolution as presented by the hon. member for Russell. Further, I would like to dwell for just a moment on that part that was touched on by several hon. members, namely, those constituents of ours who are confined to hospitals and confined to nursing homes, and confined to other similar institutions.

For example, there is a small home in my riding for cerebral palsied people. During the last election we had a tremendous job on our hands to try to get a ballot box in there. Finally we did. But I do not feel that either myself or any other candidate should have to run around at election time trying to make sure that all these people do have a vote.

I would like to just emphasize the point about people who are in hospitals. I happen to have spent a short period of time in hospital during March and April 1963, and the federal election, you might remember, took place in April 1963. Fortunately, I was able to have a few friends of mine carry me out to a polling booth, but I know there were many people in that hospital who were most frustrated and discouraged because they were not able to cast a ballot at that particular time.

I would only emphasize that one point and also support the resolution of the hon. member for Russell and say that in no way, as far as the hon. member for Bracondale is concerned, do I think it is in any way discrimination. He is trying to move in one area here; I would like to see it extended in several other areas.

Mr. Speaker: The debate being concluded, resolution No. 26 is discharged from the order paper.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, having a few moments at our disposal and in order that we might make an economic use of our time, would the leaders of the Opposition parties agree to proceed with the third readings which are on the order paper?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I thought the hon. Minister was going to go back to the racing commission.

THIRD READINGS

Clerk of the House: The first order, third reading, Bill 45, An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of nursing homes.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, when the bill was up for second reading I asked for leave of this House to refer back to the bill as it had been disposed of. The hon. member for Riverdale rose on what he called a point of order and he was supported by the hon. leader of the NDP, saying that I was out of order.

An hon. member: You were.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member referring to Bill 45?

Mr. Ben: Yes. I had always deemed it to be a rule that any item could be reverted to with the unanimous approval of this House. It is in the book. I was not given that opportunity because evidently the NDP was more interested in stifling debate than seeing that legislation was properly drafted.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think any member has any right to say that any other member or group of members in this House was interested in stifling debate merely by asking that the rules be complied with. I am not going to ask for a withdrawal because I do not really care too much about the statement in view of the source from which it came. I want, however, to put my protest on record. We supported a ruling the Chairman made and I do not think there is any ground for imputing any other motives to us when we did that.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the NDP professes to—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think the member now is getting completely out of order. Does the member wish to speak to the third reading of this bill?

Mr. Ben: I wish to speak to this bill.

Mr. Speaker: If you wish to speak to this bill you will have to keep your remarks confined to the bill and not on some other subject.

Mr. Ben: Immediately after the bill was introduced for first reading, I pointed out to the hon. Minister that there were no provisions in this Act which made it an offence to operate a nursing home without a licence —I believe the phrase is to open, maintain and operate, or to establish, maintain and operate a nursing home without a licence. Furthermore, there is no provision in this statute or this bill which makes it an offence to use the name "licensed nursing home" and the hon. Minister said he would speak to his experts.

I would suggest that he had better get some experts. I have reviewed all the legislation contained in the RSO in the possibility that there was some section in some legislation passed by this province which would make something an offence which was not stipulated to be an offence in a bill, and there is no such section. I have checked The Judicature Act and I have gone through The Summary Convictions Act and I would suggest that the hon. Minister, instead of saying that his experts tell him something, should look into that.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): May I just ask the hon. member, is it his

intention to make a motion with respect to third reading of this bill?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What business is that of the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I think it is. Of course, it is.

Mr. Ben: I am interested that the legislation be proper, Mr. Speaker, and I am intending to move that this bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to—

Mr. Speaker: The member has to submit his amendment to me in writing.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, in order to indulge the deputy leader of this House, who asks for the leave of the leaders of the Opposition parties to take advantage of the time, we are now on third readings—which we ought not be at the present time—so surely this House can have a little indulgence in that regard.

An hon. member: The Speaker must have a motion to put before the House.

Mr. Ben: I have to phrase it now. I move:

That this bill be not now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: The chair must have a motion to put before the House. If the member does not have a motion to put before the House, I am afraid we will either have to proceed with the bill, or the leader of the House will have to withhold the bill for future debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, we are content to withhold it, to permit the hon. member to make his motion, if he is really serious about it.

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 53, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill 79, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act.

Bill 84, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Bill 85, An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Bill 105, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Bill 111, An Act to amend The Private Sanitaria Act.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

(January 28, 1966)

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
85	1	41	Change to read: Negroes, Roman Catholics and, in some instances Freemasons. I will not dignify these

No. 128

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan, continued 4211

Estimates, Department of Civil Service, Mr. Allan 4232

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Spooner, agreed to 4242

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-third order: House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT
(continued)

On vote 2207:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kingston.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I do not get in there very often in this particular case, but as I was standing up when this debate was adjourned this afternoon, I thought it only right and proper that I have the first opportunity of speaking to it this evening in connection with the granting of racing charters.

I have a good deal of sympathy for the hon. Provincial Treasurer in this connection because I know that he has been doing his best to make racing dates available to many of the smaller clubs throughout the province.

I think he is in rather a difficult position and I do believe that he is doing everything he can in trying to find a way to provide these charters for these smaller clubs. The only problem is that I wish he would try just a little bit harder and a little bit longer.

However, it has been indicated that he has been carrying on conversations with the appropriate powers in Ottawa and whether it is because of difficulties with Ottawa that we have been brought to this situation or not, I think if this is so it should be made clear. It is very apparent to me as I go through my own riding that most of the people down there feel that it is the responsibility of the provincial government to see that these charters are, or are not, made available. If this is not the case, I think that this should be very clearly pointed out and the blame put where it should be, particularly if it should be with the federal government.

I would like to give you an example from my own riding of Kingston where last year they had 18 days of racing with parimutuel betting. In good faith, I think, they made plans for this year and expected to have at least that many days again. The Kingston horsemen's driving club, which has been in operation for at least 15 years and has carried on parimutuel betting in its races for the last six years, felt that it could operate this year on the same basis on which it operated last year.

Unfortunately, when it went to get the charter to give it the days that it required, the charter was not available. The club contacted me to find out if it would be possible to get some help to get the charter through the government. Well, this was impossible, because there were no charters that the province could make available to this particular club.

I was able through a lot of hard work and scratching around, to arrange to get eight days of racing, which is a start, but that is far from sufficient to look after the club's particular needs. Last year the club spent more than $6,000 to instal lights and fix up the track and the fences, in the anticipation that it would be able to get charters this year.

These are responsible people. They have on their executive, three men from the Kingston and district agricultural society, three aldermen and three prominent citizens of Kingston. They maintain the track, the fences, the judges' stands and they have done so over the past 15 years, and I might say that the track down in Kingston is one of the better ones throughout eastern Ontario. The stands are good and the track has been kept nicely conditioned.

There is a wide acceptance for racing down in Kingston and surely there must be some way for the province to solve the problem in which it finds itself at the present time.

I would like to read an excerpt from a petition that was sent to the hon. Provincial Secretary this spring—I think it might have gone to the wrong department—but in part it says:

> In the past, the Kingston clubhouse conducted parimutuel betting by means of leasing charters from larger clubs situated in Windsor, Toronto and Ottawa and due to the fact that the larger centres have at this state virtually reached their maximum

capacity under the existing charters and will, within the next year, be required to employ all of their charter facilities for their own purposes, it is obvious that in the very near future, the smaller centres will be unable to carry on parimutuel betting as they have in the past. Consequently the larger centres will, in effect, monopolize parimutuel betting at trotting and pacing races.

If this should happen, the applicant, together with numerous one- or two-day racing centres, will be unable to operate with parimutuel betting as they have in the past, and this in turn will deprive the racing profession of valuable training grounds for horsemen and officials, not to mention the great inconvenience and disappointment which will be caused to the general public.

In addition, the very prospect of such a situation developing renders it impossible for existing raceways to effectively plan their 1966 operation.

As I mentioned, the Kingston club has eight days of racing this year. As I mentioned before, this is inadequate for its needs and it would appear to me, that somehow, somewhere, the province, either by a special Act of this Legislature or by a special permit, or by a limited charter, without power to sell or transfer, or a licence or permit for betting privileges on the day of the races, could make it possible for the Kingston club and many other similar well-deserving clubs in smaller areas to carry on the racing that they have been carrying on over the past few years.

As I mentioned earlier, I know the hon. Provincial Treasurer has been working very hard and very diligently in order to make this possible. I say again, I hope that he will work a little bit harder, and work it somehow and some way for Kingston and these other tracks to get the days that they really are entitled to have.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, would you clarify an issue for the House? I was just wondering how charters and the issuance of charters would come under this vote? I know that the racing commission is the authority for establishing the number of days of racing and other things, but I wonder if the issuance of charters would properly come before this vote?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I do not think it does properly come under the vote, but the hon. members of the House are such fine persons.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): What vote does it come under then?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Really, we have nothing to do with the charters in procuring them, no.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Have you read section 178 of the Criminal Code?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think it properly comes under this vote, but I have no objection to discussing it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, with great respect both to your question and to the hon. Treasurer's answer, if it does not come here, then really it does not come anywhere. This is the vote for the racing commission. They are the gentlemen, who under the aegis of the watching eye of the hon. Provincial Treasurer—

Hon. Mr. Allan: They have nothing to do with racing charters.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Provincial Treasurer, in his all-embracing responsibility certainly has the responsibility for racing thoroughbreds and standardbreds in the province, and he accepts that, and let us let it go at that.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are many hon. members of this House, particularly members from rural-oriented ridings, who are most concerned about the fact that the charters for racing both thoroughbred and trotting, and particularly the trotting races, seem to be concentrated and are in fact concentrated in the large centres—in Toronto, in Windsor, in Ottawa, in Fort Erie, in St. Catharines—all by and large within rock-throwing distance of the Great Lakes, with the exception of Ottawa. There is nothing in the north at all.

North Bay was thoroughly discouraged when it came down here to ask for a private Act.

Hon. Mr. Allan: And it was told to come back next year.

Mr. Singer: What could be more discouraging?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, not to discourage it.

Mr. Singer: The representatives came down, they asked for a private Act and you said, We are sorry fellows, we cannot do anything for you this year, try again next year, but you did not even bother to bring the bill before the House. They being intelligent fellows, they read the message that you gave them. You told them that if it came before the House it was just going to be a waste of time.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not sure of that. I do not see how you can be so sure. I do not know that.

Mr. Singer: If they cannot accept the word of the hon. Provincial Treasurer when it comes to government policy, insofar as a private Act is concerned, whose word over there can they accept at all?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Nobody's!

Mr. Singer: Sometimes we wonder if one can accept anybody's word over there. But certainly one can accept the word of the hon. Provincial Treasurer and when he whispers in the ear of those good people from North Bay, who wanted something as simple as a private Act, one would have thought that he was speaking with some authority. Mind you, occasionally he does not speak with all the authority of government.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Singer: If he wants to make a speech, he can.

Mr. Chairman: The Provincial Secretary has stood in his place on a point of order.

Mr. Singer: Oh, all right, let us hear his point of order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is my understanding that the Provincial Treasurer did not have any conversations with those people at North Bay. I did have some conversations with them.

Mr. Singer: Oh, you are the culprit. All right, I remove all of that opprobrium from the shoulders of the hon. Provincial Treasurer and without repeating it, everything that I said that applied to the Provincial Treasurer now applies to the Provincial Secretary. Okay. So we will accept that as read.

Mr. Chairman, it seems more than passing strange that these charters and these racing days are concentrated on the shores of the Great Lakes with the exception of Ottawa and that very good people, very good public representatives—the hon. member for Kingston, the hon. member for Victoria, the hon. member for Brant, a dozen or 20 other members here—who would like the same sort of privileges are being denied them. Why are they being denied them?

The hon. Provincial Treasurer says there is something in the law that makes it very difficult, impossible, and I am sure he is referring to section 178 of the Criminal Code. Section 178 of the Criminal Code is part of a federal statute which says, amongst other things, that races can be run upon the racecourse of an association incorporated on or after May 19, 1947, by special Act of Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of the province. That is really all it says. It goes on to say that once the parimutuel system is set up, there would have to be approval by the federal Minister of Agriculture and there has to be an inspector of the federal Minister of Agriculture there.

Let us look at the wording, and I do not think really that the wording is that complicated that all of the collective legal wisdom that either resides on the Treasury benches or is at the beck and call of the Treasury benches could not have found a very simple way of passing legislation in the province of Ontario to accomplish what seems to be the overwhelming desire of so many members of this House and what seems to be the desire of the Provincial Treasurer. He told us he was searching for a way. What is a special Act of the Legislature of the province? For some peculiar reason, that has been interpreted to mean a private bill. Now, why? There is no body of law in this at all. The federal legislators chose to use the words "special Act." My friend the Provincial Treasurer is getting restive again and I am sure if he follows this through he will be in complete agreement with me—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If you read the section right through from the very beginning, you will probably clarify it in your own mind.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry that the hon. Provincial Treasurer is a little slow, but just let him mull this thing over as we go along and I am sure by the time we are through, he will agree with us.

I am certain that the province of Ontario has the right to determine what is a special Act. And it need not be what we call a private bill. Surely a special Act means nothing more than an Act which the province of Ontario calls a special Act. And surely a very simple amendment to The Racing Commission Act, to The Corporations Act, could say something like this:

> Every association incorporated under the laws of Ontario after this Act comes into force—

and this is after May 19, 1947:

> —that has for its object the holding of race meetings at which there are trotting or pacing races exclusively, shall for the purposes of this Act and for all other

purposes be deemed to have been incorporated by special Act of the Legislature.

Mr. Sopha: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Singer: What is wrong with that? It is simple, it is clear, and it comes within the provisions of the Criminal Code. So you will not insist that the people from North Bay or the people from Kingston or the people from South Dumfries or the people from Sudbury or the people from Grey South all have to come down here, hat in hand, pay their fees, do the advertising and so on. All they have to do is get a charter after May 19, 1947, and one of the objects as set out in the charter will be that they want to hold race meetings at which trotting or pacing races shall be held exclusively.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No. Anybody can hold a race meet.

Mr. Sopha: Having done this, they have been empowered by a special Act to do—

Hon. Mr. Allan: They can have a race meet without all that.

Mr. Singer: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Allan: They can have a race meet without all that.

Mr. Singer: No, no, no. But my friend missed the whole point.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I did not.

Mr. Singer: Certainly he did. He has set up either a straw man to provide him with an excuse for not taking action, or he has not properly understood what I am trying to say.

Section 178 of the code says that only in certain circumstances can parimutuel betting be carried on in the Dominion of Canada and/or in the province. One of those special circumstances is that the association that wants to carry it on must have been incorporated on or after May 19, 1947—we have passed that date by a few weeks or a few months, and even a few years—by special Act of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislature of the province. Unless I am wrong, we are the Legislature of the province. We have the power of passing Acts, special, private, public—any kind of Act.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Can I ask my hon. friend one question?

Mr. Singer: Sure.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Who conducts the race; who conducts the betting at the track?

Mr. Singer: The Department of Agriculture. May I ask my hon. friend if he has followed through section 178?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I am asking my friend.

Mr. Singer: The Department of Agriculture supervises.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The federal—

Mr. Singer: Yes, that is right, that is right.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Singer: The roadblock appears to be that unless we can revive charters dated before May 19, 1947, and this is why we had a fuss in the past, or come within another series of combinations as set out in the Act, the hon. Provincial Treasurer throws his hands up in horror and says, "What can we do?"

I am suggesting to him that if he looks at section 178, the provisions are there. Section 178 says very simply that if a racing association is incorporated after May 19, 1947 by special Act of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislature of the province it can, provided it does certain other things, carry on races and have parimutuel betting. In other words, the province of Ontario can put associations into the position where they can then go to the federal Minister of Agriculture, and say: We ask for your approval; we ask for your supervision; now let us carry on.

That is what the section says. The hon. Provincial Treasurer or his advisers has chosen to interpret this, and I think wrongly, as limiting the power of the province of Ontario to create these associations only by private Act. I suggest to you that there is no logic and there is no jurisprudence that indicates that this is the way it should be done. And, I further suggest to you that we could put into The Racing Commission Act a section which will say—and I will read it again:

> Every association incorporated under the laws of the province of Ontario, after this Act comes into force, that has for its object the holding of racing at which there are trotting or pacing races exclusively, shall for the purpose of this Act and for all other purposes be deemed

to have been incorporated by a special Act of Legislature.

We, sir, in my opinion and the opinion of my learned colleague from Sudbury, believe that the section of the Criminal Code can be interpreted very simply and very obviously in this way. Then, if the government does this, and it accepts the charter from the South Dumfries racing association, and the hon. Provincial Secretary issues the charter with these objects in it, then the South Dumfries racing association or the Downsview racing association, or the Sudbury racing association, or the Windsor one, whatever one you have, can have racing and parimutuel betting.

Mr. Sopha: The Duntroon racing association.

Mr. Singer: The Duntroon racing association. Go to the federal Minister of Agriculture and say: We now come within this much of section 178; we ask for your approval of our having a parimutuel system, and we ask for your supervision. And I say, sir, I can see no hindrance, no deterrent to doing this at all. I suggest very simply, that if the hon. Provincial Secretary and his advisers had sought seriously—really seriously looked—for a way of complying with this Act that this would have occurred to them.

I think this is a simple solution, an obvious solution. It comes within the meaning and the wording and the intent of the Criminal Code, and there is nothing to stop you if you want to do it. There is no reason at all, sir, why there could not be and should not be, in these smaller centres in the province of Ontario, racing days without putting these people to the very substantial expense of coming in here and asking for a private Act.

The expense is substantial. By the time they get through with advertising charges and filing fees and hiring counsel to come down and act for them, and all the other things, they are in for a very large sum of money in relation to what they are going to make out of what may be a business investment. These are not the big people; they are not operating New Woodbine or Greenwood or the big raceway where the millions of dollars are invested at Windsor. These are people who want to operate a few days of racing or trotting at the county fairs, in the rural centres, and so on. They can get 14 days under this section of the code without anything more than having some enabling statutes.

I suggest to you, sir, that you can give them the power by having the enabling statutes put in a section—such as the one I have read—in The Racing Commission Act and The Corporations Act. Then, in due course, applications will be made to the Provincial Secretary. If the charter is granted, then they can go to the federal Minister of Agriculture and say: We have got our charter, we come within section 178 of the code, now off we go and have our races.

Just as simple as that. And I say, sir, that we are not going to charge the Provincial Secretary for giving this advice.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You should not.

Mr. Singer: Perhaps we will submit a bill later, but we are not going to charge him. This is free advice.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You know what free advice is worth.

Mr. Singer: I think it is worth a great deal because if the Minister has sought as seriously as he claims he has for a solution, then either he sought it from the wrong people, or he has been paying people to give him advice and he has not come up with the obvious answer.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Come up with your answer.

Mr. Singer: This is an obvious answer; it is a correct answer; it is a legally sound answer. I think it is there and I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer should take advantage of it without letting another day pass. I think he should bring in this bill himself tomorrow. If he does not, he is ignoring the request or the demand from so many members of our Legislature, including many people on his own side of the House.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): If he wants to pay for that advice, he can.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands was commending the hon. Provincial Treasurer for his great efforts, and the great difficulty he faced in extending these efforts to provide charters for all the people across the province of Ontario who wanted them, I was a little puzzled.

Mr. J. C. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): You are always puzzled.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): That is right!

Mr. MacDonald: I shall take the word of the member for Kingston and the Islands that the Minister has been preoccupied with this very difficult task in the past year. I do not know whether he has. I will take his word for it.

If the hon. Provincial Secretary has, Mr. Chairman, I want to say two things: (a) you worry as to whether or not we are out of order—obviously we are in order.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, you are out of order but—

Mr. MacDonald: (b) If the Minister—as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands says—has been engaged in this, I want to submit to the Minister it is none of his business. He should no more have been engaged in it than the Provincial Secretary was in what degenerated into a racket—in reviving charters that had been dead for 50 years to meet the needs of Tory friends at the federal and the provincial level and even other higher offices.

I will congratulate the hon. Provincial Secretary—although I do not know whether congratulations are really in order, because only when the political storm broke over his head with such fury that he had no alternative did he get out of it. Only then did he, rather belatedly, in the debate two or three years ago, reveal that he had issued an order some months or some weeks prior to that particular speech, that henceforth there would be no more revivals of charters.

We had a very sorry situation in this province in which, as the interest in charters in this current age developed, they were pulled out of closets and trunks and attics all across the province of Ontario, and people engaged in doing it were invariably well-appointed friends of the government, including people who had been in the Provincial Secretary's office as the chief solicitor and were out working with them until they corralled all of the existing charters. However, I repeat, the hon. Provincial Secretary brought that sorry chapter to a close.

Mr. Chairman, one of the unfortunate things at the conclusion of that chapter was that not only did all the friends get their necessary charters for operating their raceways—whether it be Greenwood, over in the Niagara peninsula, or down in the Windsor area, and so on—but it ended up a couple of years ago with the jockey club having a bank of extra charters.

All the existing charters that were not being used, virtually all of them, were in the hands of the jockey club; indeed, I believe it was two years ago that I asked before the standing committee on government commissions what charters the jockey club had and the chairman of the racing commission wrote a letter to me—which is in my files—indicating that these were the only existing charters. The jockey club had them, and the jockey club was renting them out in the fashion that has been described earlier in this debate.

I want to suggest to you that this is fundamentally a wrong situation. What, in effect, you have was the jockey club in the position of usurping the functions of the racing commission—presumably the racing commission has responsibility for supervising racing in this province.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have nothing to do with charters.

Mr. MacDonald: The people who wanted to get into racing would go to the jockey club and they would rent a charter for "X" number of days. Having rented it for that period, then they could go to Ottawa and they could conform with the requirements of the supervision that The Department of Agriculture imposes. For a time it was the jockey club that was in effect not only controlling its own interests, but controlling all the possible expansion. I was interested to learn—and it was news to me—that because of the developing interest in racing across the province, all of this bank of charters that the jockey club apparently had, is being used and now there is a great shortage of them.

If this is the case, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we have reached the stage where we should finally clean up this situation. I was under the impression—and I will come to the comments of the hon. member for Downsview in a moment—that the only way that you could get a racing charter now, if you could not rent or avail yourself of one of these old revived charters, was to have a special Act of the House of Commons or of the provincial Legislature passed.

I will bow for the moment to the legal acumen of the hon. member for Downsview as to whether or not this is an unnecessarily elaborate procedure—and whether or not by passing some amendment to the racing commission Act, you could empower that body to grant charters or whether you could do it at the Provincial Secretary's level. But I suggest that the way you are going to avoid the difficulties that the hon. Provincial

Treasurer, fearful as he is now after the storm that he went through a year or so ago—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I did not go through any storm.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, Provincial Secretary. Do not get excited.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not getting excited; why do you not tell the truth?

Mr. MacDonald: By mistake, I meant to say the Provincial Secretary. You are obviously getting a little bit too exercised.

Hon. Mr. Allan: But you have been saying Treasurer all the time.

Mr. MacDonald: And I meant the Provincial Treasurer most of the time, but I am now going back to the Provincial Secretary who has accepted responsibility for, in effect, sending the people from North Bay packing when they came down to get permission to have a private bill last year. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that either as a private bill or through the easier procedure that the hon. member for Downsview has suggested, if it is feasible, any responsible group in this province should be able to get the right to a racing charter. But along with it there should be the clear understanding that if it is not used for a certain period of time, it will lapse, and it cannot be sold—

Mr. Singer: It goes with the charter.

Mr. MacDonald: —and that it cannot be rented. You would simplify your procedure across the whole province. It can be done to meet the needs of everybody who is entitled to get it. The hon. Provincial Secretary could then sleep with a clear conscience at night that he was not having charters floating around that some Tory friend of his might gather up and get into the hands of somebody who would cause the hon. Provincial Secretary some political difficulties at a future date. It would be all clear-cut.

An hon. member: No NDP in it at all.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, an NDP could come down and get along with another group of people. I would hope that in the future these might not be a special prerogative of Tories.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The intervention of the hon. Minister of Mines is a rather unfortunate one because he seems to underline the suggestion that charters should always be the exclusive prerogative of Tories. They should be the right of any citizen, or any group of citizens in the province of Ontario who can come and present their bona fides and say that they are intending to have racing in a certain community in this province. I would suggest that having made the first major step to clearing up a sorry situation two or three years ago, the hon. Provincial Treasurer should take the advice of the hon. member for Downsview and examine it as to whether that simpler procedure is a feasible one.

If it is feasible, fine, adopt it; if it is not, say clearly to any of us: If you want a racing charter, you come down here and you present a private bill. And that private bill will be examined on its merits, as all private bills are examined on their merits when they are introduced in this Legislature and go to the private bills committee.

I think we have reached a time when the hon. Provincial Treasurer should tackle this situation and certainly if he is involved—I repeat, as I started out—if he is involved in trying to gather charters together and to meet the needs of the people, I suggest that he is in a business that is none of his business. And he should regularize it in the law so that it can be handled in an appropriate and regular way.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, this subject is just about exhausted and perhaps there is really no need to treat of it any more at any great length. But I think there is an aspect of it that the hon. Provincial Treasurer does not understand and I hope that he will not be difficult about this, and he will look upon the original suggestion from the hon. member for Grey South, who discussed it with me at great length yesterday.

He is going to introduce a bill tomorrow morning to amend The Racing Commission Act, and being a very wise politician as he is with long years of experience, in respect to his bill that he is going to introduce tomorrow he issued a press release yesterday. That has had currency all over the province, for he tells me that he has had telephone calls from racing enthusiasts from the smaller local areas, from the four corners of the province.

He did not realize how much interest there was generated in harness racing among rural folk in this province. Not only do they get a lot of pleasure out of driving the horses, breeding the horses and training them, but the people of Duntroon under the watchful caretaker eye of our clerical friend even

make so bold as to go and watch them and bet a few pennies—those pennies they do not put in the collection plate on Sunday.

I want to point out to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that The Racing Commission Act, in section 3, says:

> The object of the commission is to govern, direct, control and regulate horse-racing in Ontario in any or all of its forms.

Notice how the draughtsmen use four synonyms there; they used four verbs so that there would be no doubt at all about the power of the provincial government exercised through the arm of the racing commission in respect of horseracing in Ontario—govern, direct, control and regulate horseracing.

The federal government is well aware of the existence of that Act; it is well aware of the good work the racing commission does. The federal government is well aware of the very unsalutary state of horseracing prior to 1950 and the great improvement in the regulation of it in the 16 years since the racing commission was set up under the chairmanship of Magistrate Tupper Bigelow. It is well aware of the very excellent qualities of Mr. Reiswick, the supervisor of racing in Ontario, a very dedicated civil servant who keeps a very watchful eye on horseracing.

Ontario, as a result of the legislative measures this Legislature took in the creation of the Ontario racing commission, enjoys a reputation of integrity for that sport that is unequalled anywhere on the continent. The $2 bettor gets a protection against the criminal element, against those who would not be averse to fixing a race by doping a horse. In fact I can say that the tests conducted on the horses, after a horse has won a race, will detect any drug known to medical veterinary science in existence in the world—any drug that will stimulate a horse to run faster or indeed anaesthetize a horse to decelerate him so that he will lose the specific race.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): That is what happens to your horses.

Mr. Sopha: That is what happens to my friend from Essex North—his horse.

Mr. Singer: To him or his horse?

Mr. Sopha: The deceleration is what happens to the hon. Minister of Public Works' horses too, I might say.

To get away from those personal references, I then go to the next step and I say that the federal government would recognize any valid and sincere effort of this Legislature to get within the four corners of 178-1(c). I defy any lawyer in this House, be he the hon. Provincial Secretary, the hon. Attorney General, or any expert in that branch of the law, to say that the federal government would be so capricious towards this Legislature and this government that it would attempt to forestall a sincere effort to get within 178-1(c). It simply would not; it would co-operate with this government to allow parimutuel betting.

Let us remember that 177 outlaws bookmaking—it makes it a criminal offence—but 178 sets out the conditions under which it is not an offence. I do not have to retrace the steps so ably taken by my hon. friend from Downsview about getting within 178-1(c). If this government chose, it could pass an Act, I daresay, a special Act, and call it a special Act. A special Act is not defined in The Corporations Act, it is not defined in The Interpretation Act, it is not defined in the Criminal Code, it is not defined anywhere.

But supposing we passed an Act and called it a special Act, for the purpose of complying with 178-1(c) of the Criminal Code, the federal government would then recognize a sincere effort, an honest effort by this Legislature to grant charters. Apparently the federal government contemplated it, because I point out to the hon. members through you, Mr. Chairman, that it specifically refers to "a special Act of a Legislature."

I do not think that the hon. Provincial Treasurer really will get up and seriously argue against the proposition we stated. Where does that lead us? It leads us to this that if they want a few days of racing in Hanover in conjunction with their fall fair, if they want 20 days or 24 days in Kingston, if they want two or three weeks in North Bay, if they want a few more days in Chelmsford—my friend from Nickel Belt, his riding—any place else in the province, any of the local areas, then the enabling legislation would be there to comply with 178-1(c). I heartily endorse and approve of the restrictions placed upon those statutory charters—that is what they would be, statutory charters—and there are many statutory companies. I heartily agree with the restrictions that the hon. member for York South placed upon them.

Really, the hon. member for Grey South, who is not a lawyer, but who is assisted in legal matters by the hon. member for Downsview, is not making on behalf of these rural folk an outrageous request. He is not. It is a very modest request. Bear in mind that previously they had the rental of the jockey club charters, which they do not get now; they are not available because Mohawk is

open, Garden City is open, and many others no doubt have gone to Windsor, which has prolonged periods of racing in spring and fall at Windsor, so that these are just not available.

There is a vacuum created that has been very oppressive and very harsh upon plain ordinary folk in rural Ontario. It ought to be filled by this government and I am enthused that my good friend—and he is my good friend, one of the more likeable young members in the House, my friend from Victoria—nods his head at me. He does not know how much that encourages a member of the Opposition—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria): You do not need encouragement.

Mr. Sopha: —to have an otherwise political foe nod his head, when one is speaking.

We hope that the hon. Provincial Treasurer will not be difficult and obstreperous—I hope he does not think that is an unparliamentary word—and that he will not pose a roadblock here. Perhaps before the session ends, my friend from Grey South would not be offended a whit if his bill was not accepted as long as some legislation which effected the purpose which he seeks to achieve was forthcoming from the government benches.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the subject over here has been exhausted and it is time, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer so chooses, for him to get up and tell us his views on it. This is a democracy, but I really do not think there is any necessity for intervention by the hon. Provincial Secretary.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this great burst of legal oratory and I am not going to argue about the arguments that were presented, but I would like to tell you what has occurred.

First of all, I might reply to my hon. friend from York South, who said that I had no business to be looking for charters. I think perhaps that is correct, sir, but on the other hand, when the hon. member for Grey South and the hon. member for Nickel Belt and the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, and other hon. members come and say—

Mr. Singer: And the hon. member for Victoria.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think he came.

—other hon. members come and say: What are our tracks going to do for charters this year? I speak to the racing commission and I say: Could you see if there are any charters that are available to be leased or to be loaned, anywhere in the province? Could you canvass the situation and find out if any such are available?

Mr. Singer: If you had only come last week, we had lots of them.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think anyone had lots of them last week. A year ago there were plenty of charters and everyone seemed to think there would always be plenty of charters.

Let me say that I am advised on excellent authority that many of these small tracks were warned that they should make plans to introduce a private bill in order to have charters for racing this year. In fact, I was told this by an official who works in this area, and he said he had warned many of them, and some of them twice.

Mr. Bryden: A government official? What kind of an official?

Hon. Mr. Allan: An official who had to do with the carrying on of racing.

Mr. Bryden: You mean an official of the jockey club?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, no.

But no private bills were introduced. So, when charters were scarce, we got in touch with the gentleman who is responsible for the conduct of the betting, an employee of The Department of Agriculture at Ottawa. He came down and we had a meeting with him to explore any possibility of obtaining charters so these small tracks could race.

Regardless of the legal argument that I have listened to tonight, let us remember that it is The Department of Agriculture that conducts the betting. The hon. member for Sudbury pointed out the duties of the racing commission. They do not have anything to do with the betting, not a thing. It is carried on by the federal Department of Agriculture, and the official who came from the federal Department of Agriculture told us that the only bill that would get them a charter was a private bill.

Mr. Singer: How does he know how the Legislature acts?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, no.

Mr. Singer: How does he know the procedures in all the Legislatures of Canada?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Maybe he is a QC, too.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This was the information that he gave to us and I will say this for him that he was endeavouring to be as co-operative and helpful to these small tracks as anyone could possibly be. I think as a result of some of his searching there may be active charters in other areas that can be purchased and would come to Ontario and provide some days.

Mr. Singer: They should not be merchandisable, that is the whole point of it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Are you trying now to keep these tracks from getting days?

Mr. Singer: You miss the point again.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, what are you saying?

Mr. Singer: This beclouds the issue in a fog of words.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, we are not; the fog of words is over there. I say this seriously to the hon. members of the House. I am trying to lay the facts before you as they are. The federal government is responsible and determines whether betting will go on at the tracks or not. If the federal government says that only one type of bill will get a charter that will be acceptable to it—

Mr. Oliver: I just simply cannot swallow that!

Mr. Singer: Have you got that in writing from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not have it in writing but I have witnesses that—

Mr. Singer: —that an official of The Department of Agriculture gave you a legal interpretation. Well, that is no authority at all.

Mr. Sopha: What does Mr. Greene say?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will get that information for you, because some of the members of our government went down there yesterday to see Mr. Greene.

Mr. Sopha: He is a very pleasant fellow.

Mr. Singer: Most co-operative!

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am sure he will do anything he can to be helpful to these small tracks.

Mr. Sopha: Do you want us to speak to him?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, of course—any way that we can be helpful to these small tracks.

The agricultural committee at Ottawa has been holding meetings and has been endeavouring to do what it could do. That is the situation, and as I have pointed out before, the racing commission has no control over the betting, and nobody in this government has any control of the betting. The fact is that I was trying to be a good Samaritan, may I say to the hon. member for York South and I hope he is not too hard on me for it.

It was not all year, it was not until after the time for introducing private bills had expired that I learned that there was any shortage of charters. Then, with the hope of trying to help someone, I did ask the racing commission to explore all the possibilities it knew. I think the charters that were being unused—the hon. member for Kingston has said that their people found eight days; Peterborough has found a number of days—I think that those persons who own the charters have, and are quite willing, to make all available that they are not using.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in conclusion. If the hon. Provincial Treasurer was in a bind because of the Legislature's sins of omission in the past in not anticipating this need—be that as it may—but the hon. Provincial Treasurer is not as definite as I think he can be at the moment.

If the federal government sticks to its guns in terms of the advice that you have had; that the only way of getting a new charter is by a private bill, fine. I suggest that you should explore the simpler procedures that have been suggested by various spokesmen from the Liberal Party here. But let us have it explored now, and let it also be clearly indicated in the kind of charter that is going to be available—that they are not transferable, that they cannot be sold and that they cannot be rented—and then you will free yourself from the kind of problem that is created when these can float around and get away from your control altogether.

In other words, clarify this, and clarify it whether it be by the bill that the hon. member for Grey South has put in, or by any bill which the government might bring in, or any public statement you want to make. Clarify it now so that next spring you do not find yourself in the same bind. Do not drift through inactions, which is so often characteristic of the government.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the hon. Provincial Treasurer and some of the people who want racing days are play-

ing that little game: Button, button, who has the racing days? Where can we find a couple to put into Peterborough and into Kingston? How long is it going to take to put a simple amendment like this on the statute books to issue one charter, and then to ask the federal government if they will not grant the other privileges of parimutuel betting that are set out in section 178? How long will it take to face that issue?

Surely when the government of Ontario wants something from the federal government, they do not just inquire from an official of a department. Surely, they go to the top and they—

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have gone to the top.

Mr. Singer: Is this the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture? Is this the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture? Is there any written advice to the government of Ontario that this is, in fact, so?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will have that tomorrow. The member of the government who has gone to see the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa has not returned as yet, and when he does, that is when we will have that information.

The hon. member for York South has gone out now, but I always agree with him when he is wise and sensible.

Mr. Bryden: Which is most of the time. But you do not agree with him now.

Mr. Sopha: Another section of The Racing Commission Act—and it might be useful to have this on the record—section 4, says:

> The members of the commission shall hold office during the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in council—

which means that any member of the commission can be fired at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in council acting through—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, could I inform the hon. member that I think his statement is incorrect? The members of the racing commission are appointed for definite terms.

Mr. Sopha: That may be so; that may be so. Let me read the section again:

> The members of the commission shall hold office during the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

Now, it may be that they are appointed for a definite term, but when that term expires the government can refuse to reappoint them, which is, in effect, firing them.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it is not.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. No matter which way you turn the coin—now if you want to get argumentative about this! I was going to approach this quietly and peacefully; I was going to approach this with the olive branch, but I will not now.

And fire the chairman, he did, this year; a man who had given sterling service to the racing commission and to horseracing in this province, and had brought it from the farthest depths of distrust and dishonesty from the day of the Lady in Black at Fort Erie when she slugged the $1,500 in American dollars into the mutuels, and the RCMP caught her—the lowest point in horseracing in this province. I think it is safe to say that the appointment of Tupper Bigelow, His Worship Magistrate Tupper Bigelow, was made on the recommendation of no less a friend of this government than the late George McCullagh acting in concert with Hon. Leslie Frost, if you want the history. The late Mr. McCullagh, publisher of the *Globe and Mail,* suggested the setting up of a commission, and the late Mr. McCullagh suggested to Mr. Frost an appropriate man to head up that commission would be Tupper Bigelow—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): And he did!

Mr. Sopha: —and he did. And he performed a job that won the admiration of racing jurisdictions throughout North America for the high point to which he brought the integrity and the honesty of the sport in this province, using as an executive arm the very capable former American, now a Canadian citizen, William Reiswick.

Now, what is the end result? What can a faithful public servant look to after 15 years of dedicated service to his government—being tossed out? All of the papers contained criticism of that act, all of them. When I say all of them, I refer to the three great metropolitan dailies. To a man, the editors, the sports writers, those connected with horseracing, came down on the side of Tupper Bigelow. Not once in the whole sordid piece, at no time, did the hon. Provincial Treasurer ever utter a word that pointed in even the faintest way to criticism of that magistrate. He did not even offer an excuse that was of any substance. He just kept saying as they called him up and asked for an explanation: "We decided not to reappoint him."

Well, that was perfectly obvious when they fired him, that they decided not to reappoint him. So he went out and he got a chairman. I do not even know the man, and the strange

thing is nobody else in the horseracing business knows him either, although it is said that the present chairman, formerly with Canadian Pittsburgh Industries, has some jumping horses and hunting horses.

Now, I do not know anything about that breed, but they are not related to the steeds, the cavalry charge that goes down the stretch at Greenwood or Woodbine. It is not the same type of horse. The chairman is Brigadier Wallace and the vice-chairman is Brigadier McKee.

I take a little exception myself to this brigadier business, you would think they were the only people in the war. We had better start calling ourselves, we will say, Commander Robarts, Captain Singer, Colonel Mackenzie, Able Seaman MacDonald, Chief Petty Officer Sopha. This military business! Are we a military country? That is a digression. Brigadier! Sounds like narcissism to me. Stand and look in the mirror and say, "I'm a brigadier." Well, I was only a petty officer.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: It is well known that the chairman of the racing commission does not run horseracing the way Tupper Bigelow did. Everybody connected with it knows that.

They held their first meeting after his appointment and since this is not a public domain I do not think it is unfair to say they held the first meeting after his appointment at the handsome sum of six or seven or eight thousand dollars, whatever he gets. He is in Florida for his meeting.

The commission is being run by Mr. McKee. That is the way I will refer to him, Mr. McKee. And, of course, the executive work is being done by Mr. Reiswick. So the chairman of the racing commission has changed from a man who took a deep personal involvement in its daily workings, Magistrate Bigelow, to a figurehead. We were quite merciful this year in the government committee, we were fair enough not to call them before the committee because we did not want to embarrass Mr. Wallace by his lack of knowledge of thoroughbred racing and harness racing in this province.

Perhaps I will never know who Tupper Bigelow offended in the horseracing game. He seemed to be friendly enough with the jockey club because he used to advocate lowering the tax, which was out of his field. He had no business ever making any references to the tax levied by this government under The Racetrack Tax Act, because that is a matter of government policy and it is none of the business of any member of the commission. My friend, the hon. member for Carleton, will agree with that.

They say in the racing commission that they do not even know the parimutuels exist, because they have nothing to do with the parimutuel betting. That is the RCMP working under the Minister of Agriculture of the federal government.

And I think it is a sorry blot on the record of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I cannot look at it any other way, that after 16 years of faithful service by that man and the great results he achieved in horseracing and bringing it up to the highest level of regard that it has in this province, that he is just turned out like that—no explanation apparently made, did not even know it was coming. It came as a sudden blow.

Really, there is not a great deal of knowledge in this department about how horseracing works, and I do not suppose that matters. But when they turf the chairman out, they move Mr. Reiswick up to the commission and he is supervisor of racing. And then they suddenly realized that if he is on the commission he cannot be in the stewards' stand.

They had not thought that one through; Mr. Reiswick was formerly in the stewards' stand, supervising the running of the races. And if he is on the commission, he cannot be in the stewards' stand, because he would be judge, jury and executioner. It would be a complete conflict of interest, because, as you see, the commission is the final body of appeal in respect of the regulation of horseracing. Mr. Reiswick formerly performed a very useful and necessary task in being present in the stewards' stand as the representative of the commission. That is all right, I will leave that.

A terrible situation existed in London last year in the stewards' stand, which I hope is being corrected. I will draw attention to it and I think public pressure will bring about the correction. The commission fired a man from its staff because he gave advice to a person under review by the commission as to how that person should meet the charges against him.

That was inexcusable, for a paid employee of this government, this commission, to give advice to an alleged malefactor, a person under suspicion and, indeed, under charge. And that employee told the individual how to write the letter to the commission, making his defence. The commission properly fired him. So what did the harness people do?

The harness people, just to show the hon. Provincial Treasurer and just to show Tupper Bigelow how big their boots perhaps are and how powerful they are in the province, took that individual down to London and put him in the stewards' stand, an individual who was unacceptable to the commission from the point of view of having anything to do with horseracing. And very arrogantly the harness racing people put that man in the stewards' stand and said, "How do you like that? If you don't like it, you can lump it," and the commission apparently had to back down.

That is one aspect of the unsalutary situation that existed at London last year. And many hundreds of thousands of dollars are bet at harness tracks in that otherwise saintly city of London. It is a very popular track, in the Prime Minister's riding.

What was the other thing that was wrong? It was even more gross in its lack of protection to the $2 bettor, who is the most important man at the track. I do not care who parades out the finest looking horse with the most glorious bloodlines. They can have his mane all braided and ribbons on it, and he can have in the barn gold cups that he has won, but there is nobody at the track more important than the $2 bettor. He is the king of the road. He keeps the sport alive. He is the one who deserves protection.

Down at London, one wonders if he was getting it. Because the harness racing people, the Canadian trotting association, had two stewards in the stand. They had two and the racing commission had one. The person there to protect the public interest, to save the $2 bettor, harmless from crookedness, was in the minority and could be voted down by the associates, the colleagues, the friends of the people out on the track driving the buggies. Down at the thoroughbreds, of course, they do not get away with that. Two from the commission, one from the jockey club. The public interest is always in the majority.

What happened in London? They had a wonderful court case down there. There was some wild Irishman called me up, all the way to Sudbury. He was before the justices—one of the owners—and he told the magistrate in the course of the proceedings: Races are fixed all the time at London. Both races were being run, that is what he said in a court of law. He was up for assault, he got into a fight with an owner of a horse, and he was charged with assault. I do not know if the man is wild or irresponsible, but he was facing a criminal charge and that was part of his defence.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: If they were, it was not being improved by the conflct of interest in the Canadian trotting association, a very powerful group indeed. I used to say to Tupper Bigelow—I cannot say it to Mr. Wallace, because I do not know Mr. Wallace, but I knew Tupper Bigelow—and I used to say to him, there is only one attitude to take towards these trotting people. If they do not like the way we race in Ontario, go and race in Manitoba, or go and race in Quebec, or the Maritimes, or British Columbia, or Arkansas, or wherever you want to race. They will not.

My hon. friend from Scarborough East will not take his horses out of the jurisdiction. They will not, because the plants are too beautiful. The jockey club has provided plants that are just too grandiose, elaborate, for the attraction of horse players. When the chips were down, and if the commission dug its heels in, the trotting people would back down.

I read the section. The object of the commission is to govern, direct, control and regulate horseracing in Ontario in any or all of its forms. A command of this Legislature. What power could be more all encompassing than that one sentence in section 3?

But of course, the commission has always got great co-operation from the thoroughbred people. Look at the calibre of people. Just look at the leaders in the thoroughbred side of it. I do not say this to discredit the trotting people, many, many of them are very fine people. But on the thoroughbred side you have got Edward Plunkett Taylor, the most successful and intelligent businessman this country has ever produced. Conn Smythe, who is a great Canadian—let his epitaph say that he is a great Canadian, for Canada.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You should have been here this afternoon.

Mr. Sopha: Many like them. Their attitude is one of co-operation with the commission for the improvement of this sport. The attitude of the trotting people is and always has been obstreperous; threatening strikes; wanting to run the élite according to their own rules. The only rules and sense that a horseracing meet can be run by are the rules of the racing commission, acting for the people of Ontario. They are the arbiter of the rules.

Well, where was the racing commission when the second strike took place at Greenwood?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Settling it.

Mr. Sopha: Where was their intervention? They did nothing, they did nothing at all.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You are quite incorrect.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, and yet the statute says the function is to govern, direct, control and regulate horseracing in Ontario. They sat on their hands. They might at least have been a mediator, a conciliator, pouring oil on troubled waters, because after all the horsemen and the jockey club were not that far apart—$1,000 or so apart, it might even have been less than that. But our racing commission, under the new direction of Mr. Wallace, he did not intervene because he does not know anything about horseracing. Mr. McKee did not intervene and no one else. Then I understand from the little birds that the failure to intervene meant the hon. Provincial Treasurer got his ear full.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Hear anything from the bees or from the birds?

Mr. Sopha: He heard representations about it. However, if he tells me that is not so then it is not so. One wonders where we have got to in this sport, a very fine sport that gives enjoyment to many thousands of our people across the province, and harness racing is becoming more and more popular, at these tracks like Mohawk and Garden City. The public deserve better than they are getting from this commission.

Now, I am not going into the subject of the take; the tax on the take. It is safe to say we are way behind other jurisdictions. The hon. Provincial Treasurer certainly applied himself, albeit reluctantly, to increasing taxes on other things when he brought down his Budget. He did not hesitate to raise the sales tax and a few other taxes—the gasoline tax—so that the little man gets hit in the neck. But he did not make any increase in the racetrack tax, not that at all. Ontario, at six per cent, is just about the last on the continent at that figure. Florida is nine per cent. New York is nine per cent. California is nine per cent, but not Ontario. No!

I take my wife out for dinner and we have a meal to relieve her of the obligation of cooking—the only thing we will ever get out of this life is perhaps the food we digest—I take her out to have a meal and I have to pay the hon. Provincial Treasurer a tax on the food I eat.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): I do not have to pay it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, if we spend more than $1.50, my wife and I, we have to pay him a tax. I take up the cheque. We have to pay him a tax.

Mr. Thompson: I would like you to repeat that to your wife.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: She does not eat much, it is under $1.50.

Mr. Sopha: No, but I can make a suggestion to you, if you are in the market. The hon. member for Nickel Belt is getting married, and he can give you his list.

So it goes. The hon. Provincial Treasurer leaves these people alone. I have always said we do not get enough. I would like to see a survey carried out some time by this government to find out in the matter of public welfare, in what cases and to what extent the contributory factor of gambling is towards the economic dislocation and degradation of the people in receipt of welfare. I would like to see such a study; to see how much of that $9 million that we get, goes back into eleemosynary channels, perhaps even in The Department of Health there are some.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I do not know what eleemosynary means.

Mr. Sopha: Charitable, that is the word in The British North America Act. Charitable. That is the word used in 1867 to describe it. That would be a very fruitful and a very interesting study for the hon. Provincial Treasurer to conduct.

Another matter, I was not satisfied with the hon. Provincial Treasurer, though I think I have something to do with stimulating him into it, when he raised the per diem rate from $200 to $400. Is it $400 now, I ask him, through you, sir? $400 daily?

Hon. Mr. Allan: It has been reduced since the federal people took over some of the cost.

Mr. Sopha: Well, whatever we charge them on the per diem basis, it does not meet the expenses of the commission, and I feel that it is only fair the industry should pay the total cost. Certainly, in other forms of entertainment, we collect enough to meet the total cost of inspection and supervision. Cer-

tainly in liquor we do. Many times over we get enough to meet the cost.

Certainly in hospitals tax, which stands at almost $5.5 million, Mr. Chairman. We get back the total cost. But we do not get it in racing. That is unjust and unfair. There would be nothing wrong at all in the hon. Provincial Treasurer saying to the industry, you are going to pay a sufficient per diem rate to meet the cost of your supervision. It is most unfair, in my view, that people in Kenora, who have no interest in horseracing at all and never see it; or in Kapuskasing or in Tobermory; that they should have to bear the brunt of the consolidated revenue fund for an activity that is only attractive to a minority.

How many people go to the racetrack in Metropolitan Toronto? How many in this area? One and three-quarter million people; 7,000 go to the racetrack on an ordinary day? When my friend, the hon. member for Essex North is not there, there are 6,999. That is about all who go. What a minority they are. And if it panders to a minority, then let the industry pay the full cost of regulating it.

I do not know if I have asked the Chairman any questions. I have put my own point of view because I am very interested in this sport and the way it is regulated, and I am one of those who has a great fear that the sport will descend to the level of lowness that it reached prior to 1950 in this province. It will not descend to these murky depths as long as we have competent people supervising it, people of the calibre and the dedication and the integrity of Tupper Bigelow.

I am not making any aspersions against Mr. Wallace at all, he is probably a very fine, very honourable, very honest, alert, intelligent dedicated person. My only complaint is that he is just an amateur in this field, and that is agreed by everyone. He cannot supervise a commission, he does not know anything about it. I always thought government hired administrative ability on the basis of special knowledge.

Politicians do not have to have any knowledge about anything; that is proved many times over. But administrative people are supposed to be experts in their field. We hire brains. The Minister of Highways does not have to be a highway engineer, he can hire all kinds of them. And so it goes. But in the administrative side—well, I have made my point.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to get into a discussion of personalities. I would disagree with the hon. member for Sudbury when he said the former chairman was fired. The former chairman's term ran out and he was not reappointed. I would point out to the hon. member, as well, that he mentioned the fact the commission had done nothing at the time of the strike at Greenwood, and I would say to him that the commission is being exceptionally well run at the present time, and both horsemen and track agreed that the commission were intensely helpful at the time of the strike in bringing the two parties together and getting racing underway.

I would suggest to him, too, that the figures he quoted were misleading. I have the figures, the taxes on the various tracks throughout the United States, and although New York do collect a higher tax than we do, it is generally agreed that the tracks with the very large attendances, and thereby the greater handle of betting, those tracks are taxed at a greater percentage rate than those with smaller. I notice here that California, for instance, has a sliding scale, from 5 per cent to 8 per cent; Delaware, 5.5 for thoroughbreds and 4.5 for harness; Kentucky, 4 to 6 for thoroughbreds and 4 per cent for harness racing; Maryland is 5 per cent for thoroughbreds, 3.5 to 7 per cent—

Mr. Sopha: These are small jurisdictions—leaky roofs.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Maryland is not a small jurisdiction. Maryland has some very large tracks.

Mr. Sopha: New York and California?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Very busy tracks. Massachusetts, 7 per cent, the harness horses 5.5 to 9.

Mr. Sopha: What is Florida?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Florida is 8 for thoroughbreds and 7 for harness. There again you have a much larger take than we have at our tracks here. However, this matter will be reviewed from time to time. Certainly we are anxious to get as much revenue as is possible.

I noted also the member's remarks with respect to the licences not paying the entire cost of the administration in connection with the operation of the tracks. I would point out to the hon. member that the residents from Sudbury benefit as a result of the taxes that are collected, and they do share in the benefits that come from these tracks. So it is entirely one-sided.

Vote 2207 agreed to.

On vote 2208:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on this vote, I would like to ask a number of questions of the Provincial Treasurer through you. My first question is really that I am presuming that the pension commission of Ontario is a commission which will be looking at the forms of pensions which are being provided through companies, the designs of pensions by companies for employees. I am also thinking that they would have some knowledge of the overall pension programme by industries across the province. Could I pause at that point—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am afraid that—

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry—that the pension commission is a commission which will be in a position to see the types of pensions which are being provided by companies for their employees across Canada, designs of pensions. Even, I would think, knowing the names of clients, if they felt they wanted to, that certain pension plans include.

However, assuming that that is the situation, I would say that if there is a person who is on the pension commission and is also employed with a private insurance company he surely is in a difficult situation. He would know the position of passing pension plans designed by his own company; he would be in the position of learning how other companies design pension plans for their clients; and he would even be in the position—I add this third one, the hon. Provincial Treasurer indicated he agreed with the first two—of knowing all the clients that the other companies have.

If the man is on the pension board and if he works for a private company, he is in an untenable position. The person about whom I now raise the question is certainly a thoroughly able civil servant; I am referring, of course, to Lawrence Coward, who was, I think, a close advisor to the hon. Prime Minister of the province through the negotiations with the Canada pension plan and Ontario's role in it. I have read the minutes of the committees on the Canada pension plan. I cannot say I agree completely with the philosophy of Mr. Coward but I have a great deal of respect for the kind of remarks that he made in the inquiries in Ottawa.

However, apart from that, I raise this with the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Is he at the present time employed by William Mercer Limited, an insurance company, and also employed on the pension commission—may I ask if he is with William Mercer Limited?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, but that is not an insurance company.

Mr. Thompson: It is not connected with insurance?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Mr. Thompson: He is in no way connected with an insurance company?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, they are actuaries.

Mr. Thompson: And not with insurance?

Hon. Mr. Allan: They are independent actuaries.

Mr. Thompson: They are in no way connected with advising companies about—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh well, I think they would advise people just as they advise us, but they are independent.

Mr. Bryden: That is their business.

Mr. Thompson: Well, if that is their business, then surely this is a serious conflict of interest. If, on a private basis, the business of a person is to advise companies how to shape and design their pensions if it is private business, and then if on public business he is placed in the position where he can see all the designs that come in from across Ontario, he is definitely in an untenable position. I would feel, sir, that it is an obligation on the part of this government to arrange that he should not have this conflict of interest. That is my first point that I raise the question on.

My second point is this: It is clear that the Ontario pension benefits only affect persons who are at least 45 years old or over, and have had ten years' service with a single employer. I would like to know how many people this covers, because the impression I have is that certainly for people with a lower income level of employment there would not be too many of them in this bracket. I base that conclusion on the fact that the Act comes into play only when a man reaches age 45, after ten years' service with an employer. I believe there is a large number of people in a lower income group who change jobs a number of times and would not have the ten years' requirement, the ten years with a single employer. I am interested in knowing the figure, and I raise that question with the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

If it is a small figure, I raise this question: Is it possible to broaden the grounds of the Act to make it apply to more persons? Or is

this Act so cumbersome in its present state that such a change would be impossible?

It seems to me that the Canada pension plan has made this commission less crucial than it once was. The Act never really was tremendously significant because of this fact. Nowhere in the Act is an employer forced to give an employee a pension plan.

I can see some things that this Act did, that is, that the commission did, and I think they are fairly useful. It can make sure that plans are actuarily sound, and yet I am not sure this can easily be done by reviewing the actuarial report of a pension plan on an annual basis. I think the commission can check the investments on a pension plan, and again I say that this also is not terribly difficult to do. The trustee of the pension plan submits a list of the investments and the commission makes sure that they qualify. In other words, the commission makes sure that trustees are not purchasing penny stock with the life savings of employees.

But this is the point, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to raise with the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that the commission, it seems to me, runs into trouble when it tries to check the administration and design of pension plans.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think they do that.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I raise that question if you do that, because the question I raise is that if you try to do that, if that is part of your role, with the very small staff the commission has it would seem to me almost impossible.

Let me then turn to some other points. I think there is a widespread feeling that this Act makes pension contributions portable and I do not think that is quite the case. True portability would come with a central pension agency and with this agency workers would be able to take their pension benefits with them when they changed jobs. Such an agency, as I understand, was considered by the government but it never was set up and instead I think you settled for second best.

Let us see how it works: A man is 45 and he has ten years' service with a company. He goes and gets another job and he thinks he can take the contributions that he has made and the contributions his employer has made and transfer them to his new pension plan. But I do not think this is so. Such transfers are at the discretion of the employer, not the employee. And it is to the employer's benefit not to allow such a transfer. If he did allow the transfer, his fund would lose both his contribution and the employee's contribution. But if he rejects the transfer, he has a good chance of playing the odds.

The catch is this, if an employee dies before the age of 65 the death benefit is only the employee's contribution. The employer's contribution stays in the fund to sweeten the pot. An employer is far better off to play the odds—and I do not think there are a large number of employers who are cynically hoping that someone will die or something, I am not suggesting that. But on the other hand, looking at the statistics, he may feel that he wants his contribution to stay there with the employee's and therefore, he does not allow the transfer. As I understand it, there are a number of pension consultants who are giving such advice.

What does this mean to the employee? Let us take the employee again with ten years' service and aged 45. He goes to his new employer. In all likelihood he will not be able to transfer his contributions to that new employer, in fact in this case he is little better off than the man who comes in off the street with no pension plan at all. We know one of the reasons that this plan was supposedly set up was to protect the man who is aged 45 and had trouble getting a job because he was a liability on a company's pension plan.

I would like to put this in categories through you, sir, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It seems to me the man in the best possible position is the man who can transfer his contributions and his old employer's contributions to the new pension fund. He is able to make a substantial initial contribution to the pension plan, a contribution on which the new employer with proper management can gain at least a percentage point or two.

It seems to me the man in the next best possible position is the man who has a pension with a former employer but a pension which he cannot transfer. At least the new employer knows that this man already has a pension and when he retires at age 65 he will have a fair income with his old and new pension. This is a factor in employing a person. All other things being equal, some employers will not hire a person when they realize that when he retires at age 65 he is not going to have a decent pension. They do not like making cash contributions to supplement an inadequate pension.

The man worst off, of course, is the elderly man who has no pension and has had many

changes of jobs. This commission is no good to him at all because it only applies to persons with at least ten years' service. In short, the point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is this: The commission makes sure that benefits of a plan are portable but it does nothing to make the contributions to a plan portable.

My fourth point in this: Although the commission has been in operation for some time, I understand there are still pension plans which have not been registered with the commission. The deadline for registration for most pensions passed a long time ago. Then I would like to ask through you to the Treasurer, why are there still some that are not registered and what are the problems?

There was a great deal of fanfare that the commission was going to work for portability across the country. So far Quebec has an Act similar to Ontario, and Alberta has introduced one. Where are the other provinces? Is there any likelihood that they will ever come in? It is obvious that without the Canada pension plan, which this government fought for so long, most people in this country would be in dire straits.

Mr. Chairman, I will stop with those questions.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition that this pension benefit Act was not set up with the thought in mind of being the draft for pension plans. It was set up for three reasons. First perhaps it was to enable the employee, either after he had been employed for ten years or having reached 45—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Not either, both.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Both, or ten years.

Mr. Bryden: Not either, but both ten years and 45.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, but he could vest it with ten years' employment.

Mr. Bryden: No, at age 45.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, that is not the information I have. A man with ten years' continuous employment is permitted to vest.

Mr. Bryden: And he has to be 45.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it is locked in at 45, but he can vest it with the ten years' permanent employment.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sorry, Mr. Chairman, that is a fairly crucial point to me. As I understand, it is ten years and age 45.

Mr. Bryden: It is both vested and locked in at that point.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The vesting rules require full vesting in the employee of benefits arising for service after January 1, 1965, subject to the employee member having attained age 45 and having had ten years as a member of a multi-employer plan or ten years of continuous service with his employer.

Mr. Bryden: It is a pity that the Act does not say that.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I might mention here your reference to portability. I am afraid that some of us who are not as familiar with the operation of pensions as are those who are associated with them all the time, give a different meaning to the word "portability" than we do. I find that the pension is supposed to be portable if it enables the person to leave his employment and to invest his pension. Then that pension is considered to be portable.

I am afraid that in the beginning I had the same thought that the hon. member has expressed, that portability meant that you took your pension with you, but that is not so. I am told by the pension experts that this would be a very difficult undertaking. Actuaries have worked on this for a great deal of time and have spent a good deal of effort but have never come up with a plan that would really enable people to move around and take their pension with them. Even the Canada pension plan remains in one place.

Mr. Bryden: Well, that is in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is so.

Mr. Bryden: That is a lot different from remaining in a private employer's hands.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask you something on this particular point and I appreciate that you will give me an answer on it. First, you had thought of a central agency at one point —that is my first question. Second, it seems to me, as I mentioned in my remarks previously, that there could be a reluctance on the part of the employer to let a person transfer. The employer as well as the employee has put money into the pension plan of the company, and if the employer can get the employee to stay on with the company and if unfortunately—and I am not necessarily saying that the employer is cynical—the employee should die, if this happens, it is only the employee's contribution which is with-

drawn and the employer's contribution stays in the pot. Therefore, it seems to me that would be a certain financial pressure for the employer to say that it should not be transferred.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think it is correct to say that, because the pension plans are developed by the employers very often as a result of a bargaining arrangement and there is such a great number of pension plans that are not similar—

Mr. Bryden: May I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer a question on that point? Is there anything in his legislation that could prevent that?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Mr. Bryden: It could happen if the terms of the plan itself—

Hon. Mr. Allan: An employee who has been in continuous employment for ten years has the privilege of vesting.

Mr. Thompson: That is not answering my question; that is a different point.

Mr. Bryden: Your legislation does not say anything about survivor benefits. If the employee dies—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The purpose of the legislation was to do three things, or principally three things: to look at pension plans and to make sure that when the person reached the age when he expected to receive the pension the money was there to pay him. In doing that they look at the investments.

The second was to give the employee the privilege of vesting his pension and moving somewhere else, if he wished to do so. The third provision was that when he reached age 45 a percentage of his pension was then locked in if he did leave the employment. This was to endeavour to assure the employee that he did have a pension. He could take 25 per cent out, but 75 per cent would be locked in at that time. That was really the purpose of the Act.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer would answer the other questions that I had?

My first question was, does he see an area of conflict for Mr. Lawrence Coward, who is working as—I thought he was with an insurance company, this Mercer company, but it is to me the same thing.

If he is examining pension plans on an actuarial basis and this is a private business, and yet if he is in the public domain—if he is on the pension commission—he has been able to look at every kind of new development in pension plans that come from across the province. He has been able to take this material that he gets, which no other private company would get in a position to be looking at, and then he goes back to his own company and says: "Look, the new technique which the Ford company"—or some other company—"just developed. I saw it when I was on the pension commission. Let us start advising our clients to use that kind of technique." Now, I ask is this not surely a position of conflict for him?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I cannot see a position of conflict. I think the first person the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to was possibly Mr. Rudd and he has been on this commission. He has been a valued member of the commission. Naturally, at this time since the commission has been operating for a year and a half the administration is greatly routine. The commission meet very seldom and I would doubt, except in exceptional cases where the opinion of the commission was desired, the superintendent of pensions would handle the whole thing.

As far as Mr. Coward is concerned, I can see absolutely no conflict of interest there. Mr. Coward is a professional man and just as a lawyer might be working for labour today and business tomorrow as a professional man, I think we accept that. He gives the professional services that are required of him. We have never had one particle of suggestion from anyone that there was ever a conflict of interest in this area.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to make clear in my remarks that I am sure Mr. Coward—that I have just read of his work and the remarks that he made in the minutes of the Canada pension plan and I think that he is a man of a very high order.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He is chairman of the commission.

Mr. Thompson: I am not referring in any way to his professional ethics. I just raised the question because it appeared to me that there could be a conflict of interest and I would not want in any way to suggest that there was a question on that point.

I mentioned a number of other questions which I do not think you answered. Do you want me to detail them or would—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not seem to have any notes here.

Mr. Thompson: I asked you about portability, for example.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I thought I answered the one about portability.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Really, he has a deferred annuity which in the parlance of pension people seems to be considered portability.

Mr. Thompson: What about the fact that we have Quebec and Alberta and this province permitting portability? What is the position of the other provinces?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not able to give you the details, although I know this, that Mr. Coward endeavoured to have each province in the whole of Canada adopt the same pension plan. Meetings were held here and representatives of the various provinces attended and there seemed to be complete agreement. I should think that finally this would come about. There is the plan in Quebec and the plan here and, as you say, they are the same.

Mr. Thompson: But you know nothing in connection with the other provinces? What about my remark that you had a deadline for registration for most pensions that had been passed? I raised the question that there were some pension plans that have not been registered with the commission. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would think not. I asked the superintendent of pensions soon after the deadline, if he thought that they were generally registered, and he assured me that he thought they were. I will speak to him about it, but my understanding is that they are.

Mr. Thompson: If they were not, is there some encouragement?

Hon. Mr. Allan: There is more than encouragement.

Mr. Thompson: There is the penalty attached to it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They are requested to register, so far as I know when they have been, they did register.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I was a little surprised at the hon. Provincial Treasurer's statement that vesting is required under The Pension Benefits Act after an employee has either been in the employ of the employer or a member of the pension plan for ten years. That certainly is a new interpretation of the Act. It was never suggested at any time when this legislation was before this House, and it was before this House a good many times. The governing statute as far as I know at the present time is The Pension Benefits Act, 1965, and the governing clause in that is section 21, subsection 1, which reads—clause (a) is the only relevant part of it:

> A pension plan filed for registration in accordance with section 18 shall contractually provide that (a) a member of the plan who has been in the service of the employer for a continuous period of ten years or has been a member of a plan for such period, whichever occurs first, and who has attained the age of 45 years—

Surely that is plain enough.

> —is entitled upon termination of his employment prior to his attaining retirement age or upon termination of his membership in the plan prior to his attaining retirement age to a deferred life annuity commencing at his normal retirement age equal to the pension benefits—except pension benefits provided by voluntary additional contributions—provided in respect of service as the employee in Ontario or in a designated province (i) under the terms of the plan in respect of service on or after the qualification date; (ii) by an amendment to the terms of the plan made on or after the qualification date; or (iii) by the creation of a new pension plan on or after the qualification date.

There is a lot of legal gobbledegook there, but what it says—as I read it and as I always understood it, and as it was always explained in this House—is that there is neither vesting nor locking in until an employee has been in the plan for ten years and has attained the age of 45. He has got to meet both requirements.

The bill, of course, is so close to a dead letter that it is hardly worth discussing. It certainly does not provide portability. A man could spend the whole of his life in various lengths of employment and never get any of the benefits, except the benefit relating to registration.

It is true this statute is of some benefit in that it prevents, or it should prevent, outright fraud. There were cases of outright fraud before the Act came into force, of employers setting up pension funds and then absconding with the money. If the Act is properly enforced, that would now be impossible. They must register their plans, they must meet the

requirements laid down by the government authorities so as to ensure that when the employees come to claim the pensions, the money will be there for them.

I was a little disturbed when I heard the suggestion from the hon. leader of the Opposition that there are still some plans not registered, but I hope the hon. Provincial Treasurer is right, that that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, that is not true; that is the information I have.

Mr. Bryden: That is about the only benefit of the legislation. If it does not even protect the employees from fraud, then it is a complete dead letter. To say that there is vesting or locking in, as far as that goes, is a very large statement. There is a limited degree of vesting provided under this plan, or perhaps a better way of stating it would be that vesting and locking in are required under this legislation, in a very limited number of cases. It is of very little benefit from that point of view.

It was another of these election dodges of the government, a great piece of ballyhoo as to what they were doing about making pensions portable, but with very little substance to it. And it just is not true, as far as I can see, that an employee who has been in the employ of the employer for ten years, regardless of his age, can have the employer's contributions vested. If that is true I would like the hon. Provincial Treasurer to indicate the section of the Act which provides it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would be be very glad to check that. My authority is the superintendent and these are the words:

> Private pension plans are affected in the main by the following requirements of the Act: Vesting rules which require full vesting in the employee of benefits arising for service after January 1, 1965, subject to the employee member having attained age 45 and having had ten years as a member—

Mr. Bryden: That is what we have been saying all along.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No. Let me finish. Continuing to quote:

> —of a multi-employer plan or ten years of continuous service with his employer.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to see the statutory authority for that, because I read the government section of the Act. That is not what that section says.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have given you my authority for the statement.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I just ask, in view of the fact we had raised the question that there may be some pensions that have not been registered, did the hon. Provincial Treasurer reply that he would inform us whether that is the situation?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will check with the superintendent.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Vote 2208 agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you would permit a question on the statutory section entitled "loans and advances"? It is just for information purposes.

The third one in the list there, the Ontario universities capital aid corporation, requires $150 million this year. I know that in another estimate we provide moneys for the universities to make their regular payment, which would be a combination of principal and interest. Is that so? Is the interest calculated at 5.5 per cent rate?

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer if there is any responsibility with the universities themselves to honour their commitments in these capital loans, or if all the responsibility is accepted by the government?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The responsibility is the universities', but in the grants that are made to the universities — that is the operating grants—the cost of meeting the payments on these debentures is taken into account.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I can remember discussing this when the corporation was first set up. I would like to know if there is an ironclad agreement between the universities who are taking on this heavy load of indebtedness and the government that although the responsibility is theirs—in the words of the hon. Provincial Treasurer—they will never have to honour it in terms of the multi-millions of dollars that must eventually be repaid.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know what you mean by an ironclad—

Mr. Nixon: Up until now we have lent them the money—Mr. Chairman, excuse me—

Hon. Mr. Allan: —agreement, but I think there is a very definite understanding.

Mr. Nixon: Up until now we have lent these tremendous sums of money—and these are required and more, as we have seen—with the understanding that the universities can proceed with their expansion without worrying about the repayment. All of the responsibility for repayment is really from the other pocket of this government, but it seems to me that it is going to be a long time before the repayment is made in total, in fact it is probably never.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Thirty years.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but of course each year we continue this business, and it may go on for more than 30 years. It must be sort of a residual fear in the minds of those who have the responsibility at the universities, that perhaps the government—which has not given this ironclad undertaking that it will in fact assume the final responsibility—will shut it off on them.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think there is any worry on the part of the universities at all.

Mr. Nixon: But you have not given any long-term undertaking? It is a year-by-year amount that is paid to the universities?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Perhaps you should ask the hon. Minister of Education regarding the repayment of the money. The Treasury buys the bonds, the debentures of the university. This is the advance that is spoken for in this estimate.

Mr. Nixon: It is really high finance, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Treasury Department.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, the estimates of The Department of Civil Service, which previously appeared as votes 301 to 308, inclusive, for the fiscal year 1965-66, now contain two additional votes. The new ones are 306—data processing services—and 310—personnel research. The separation of these programmes into individual votes carries out the policy to present to the House requests for moneys on the basis of votes representing programmes wherever it is feasible to do so.

Two changes have been made—the data processing services have been withdrawn from vote 305, although the section continues to work within the administrative services branch, and there is an appropriate cross entry reducing vote 305. Personnel research is removed from the main office vote 301 and is established in vote 310. There is provision for an addition of two staff members in research to study such matters as staff turnover and the need for more supervisory training programmes, test validation and similar studies. These help the commission to develop personnel policies appropriate to the needs of the service.

The Department of Civil Service administers The Public Service Act and the regulations, under the direction of the civil service commission. In examining the estimates you will note that there are three significant programme increases in (1) training and development; (2) personnel research; and (3) publications. The work of the department must be considered, together with the personnel functions performed by the various other departments of government, in order to appreciate all the programmes conducted to improve civil service administration. Policies in regard to terms of employment, classification and pay administration are being consolidated. The emphasis is now on training, development and research.

Recruitment continues to be a pressing problem in some areas with the needs of the government departments constantly changing both in regard to calibre of staff and specializations required. The work of this department expands in proportion to the increased activity of the civil service. In addition, collective bargaining has placed an increased emphasis on good pay research and a sound classification plan. Typical of the increased demands on the staff of the department is the activity of the recruitment and testing branch. The advertising of vacancies caused over 18,000 applications to be received last year, an increase of 2,000 over the previous year.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to report that the staff of The Department of Civil Service is composed of trained and experienced personnel administrators, who are serving this province with distinction. They have been drawn from other employers, the universities and recently the armed services. Outstanding vacancies at the end of each week averaged 198—a decrease of 8.8 per cent compared to the previous calendar year. This means that the recruitment programme meets the demands of the departments more promptly than was the case a year ago. The appointment of a recruitment director will improve on the service to the departments. One of

the advantages of improved salaries is that we can attract good administrative and professional personnel in competition with other Ontario employers. We are now awaiting the award of the arbitration board in regard to manual, technical and clerical classes. The result will be increased salaries to those on staff and where vacancies exist. We will, of course, as a result of this, accelerate our recruitment activity. The report is expected probably next week.

Much of the work of this department involves internal services to other government agencies. The classification and pay plan, the training and development of staff, and personnel research concentrate their activities almost entirely within the service. These services are appreciated by other government departments, but would not normally come to the attention of the outside public.

Most of the public activities are concentrated on the posting and advertising of vacancies, the issue of *Topic* magazine and the posting of *Topic* bulletin. The effectiveness of the department must be judged in regard to the obvious improvements in civil service administration. Better and more efficient staff require higher salaries and better equipment.

Last year the average annual salary in the civil service increased to $4,978 from $4,575 or $403, which is 8.8 per cent over the previous year. This is the largest salary increase in any year since the records have been kept. This average salary does not take into consideration the increases which will be occasioned as a result of the arbitration award presently under consideration by the civil service arbitration board. This will involve 22,000 civil servants and result in an increase retroactive to January 1, last, for such personnel. The average salary, accordingly, will be increased over the $5,000 figure.

The province leads in supporting and implementing progressive personnel policies such as educational leave programmes, rights in regard to political activity under the Act, and grievance procedures with outside arbitration. Perhaps the most important feature which has a direct effect on administration is the arrangement for collective bargaining under the statute. In the last two years all matters respecting working conditions and terms of employment for persons in the bargaining unit have been negotiated. On only three occasions has there been resort to arbitration and one which pertained to a small group.

I believe I can state, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members of this House, without fear of contradiction, that the stature of the civil service is the highest ever achieved in this province, and indeed, has placed Ontario in the forefront of other jurisdictions. The fact that other agencies are establishing parallel policies to those which have been in effect in Ontario in the past five years demonstrates the rapid advances made in this province under this government. We are interested in the welfare of those who work for us and feel that Ontario must establish the best possible working conditions to keep services at the high level demanded by the people of Ontario.

From time to time in the estimates before this House the members have expressed interest and concern about salaries and terms of employment of civil servants engaged in the particular department under consideration.

Every government is faced with the problem of establishing a proper level of salary with good working conditions for its employees but still must keep in mind the costs involved which must be borne by the taxpayers. It is, of course, good business to employ good people. Work productivity is higher, respect for the service is improved and the policies established in this Legislature by statute and by the government through executive decisions are carried into practice more effectively. On behalf of the people of Ontario, however, we carry a heavy responsibility in controlling costs.

It occurred to us more than three years ago that collective negotiations leading to bargaining agreements was the only course of action to be followed to protect the interests of the civil servant and the public as well. The fact that there is a decision from an impartial, outside arbitration board which is put into effect by the government, continues the test of the general public interest in regard to such collective agreements. The employees of the province, therefore, while represented by the civil service association—and in regard to the police, the Ontario provincial police association—have strong spokesmen to look after their interests. Our rates of pay are all settled by collective bargaining agreements insofar as the bargaining unit is concerned.

The questions, therefore, put by the hon. members of the House in regard to rates of pay really require some understanding of the bargaining process since there is no longer the unilateral action by the government that establishes rates of pay. It is the employees themselves who either settle for a rate or,

if they cannot agree upon a rate, at the various stages of negotiation there is final recourse to arbitration. It should be of great interest that the only request for salary arbitration, with one exception relating to a small group of teachers, involves the present reference respecting the January 1, 1966, increases. These cover maintenance, technical and clerical classes. While the details of the award are not yet available, it is known that there will be some substantial increases to some of the categories.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. members of this House may be assured that there has been a very careful consideration of the matter by the members of the arbitration board. The board presently constituted under Judge J. C. Anderson, the continuing chairman, includes Professor J. Stefan Dupre, University of Toronto, representing the staff side, and Mr. Alan Page, personnel director, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, representing the official side. These three distinguished men deserve our appreciation for serving on this board and thereby participating in significant government activity as citizens.

In the past I have been asked about the policies of the government in regard to bargaining procedures for outside boards and commissions. It is our intention to bring in legislation to provide for such procedures wherever a majority of employees are represented by the civil service association of Ontario. I know that the hon. members of the House will wish to give full support to such amendment of The Public Service Act. This will demonstrate the government's willingness to deal with its employees directly and be represented at the bargaining table.

The problems of turnover are still reflected in the numbers of separations reported in the civil service commission report for the year ending 1965.

In these separations, of course, are reflected the serious difficulties which were occasioned prior to the settlement of the institutional salaries last July retroactive to April 1, 1965. As a result of that settlement it was noted that a considerable number of employees returned to the civil service and resumed their careers.

Approximately 33 per cent of the civil service are female—single and married—and because most of these—75 per cent—leave because of change of community, continuing education or taking up home responsibilities, this type of turnover will always continue. Most of the turnover occurs at the beginning salary levels and involve the younger staff. Thirty-three per cent of those leaving are under 25 years of age. This is a result, as well, of full employment.

It would be wrong to suppose that increasing the salary rates alone would offset this turnover. In some cases the employee is dissatisfied with the type of work or does not qualify for the performance levels required of him in the service. There are many other reasons for leaving the service but we would hope to establish greater stability among the lower salary and younger age groups once the award of the arbitration board is made known in the maintenance and clerical categories particularly.

When we receive the award of the arbitration board and adjust our salaries accordingly, we expect a significant improvement in our turnover of staff in the clerical and maintenance classes. In addition, it will assist us in recruiting staff since many entry level positions are involved in the 22,000 jobs now under consideration by the board.

A problem area in maintaining good staff for all employers is in the industrial and commercial complex of the Hamilton, Toronto and Oshawa area. There are a great many alternative positions available for anyone with the skills and knowledge to take advantage of them. Outside this area our turnover rates are considerably lower. To date the association representatives have preferred to continue the practice of paying a common wage scale across the province rather than establishing any geographic wage differentials.

The total staff of the civil service as of December 31, 1965, stood at 43,141 which is 1,726 above last year, an increase of 4.2 per cent. When transfers of casual employees to the civil service are taken into consideration, however, the percentage is correspondingly decreased. Last year, 1,118 were taken into civil service. These were casual employees. Some of these were appointed during the calendar year of 1965 and, therefore, the total number of casuals transferred cannot be deducted from the increase in civil service staff. It will be noted that the size of the civil service is growing at a modest rate when we consider the new policies which require increased staff.

New conditions for casual staff have been established. The regulations have been amended throughout to establish the working conditions and terms of employment of unclassified service employees under groups 2 and 3 in regulation 4a. These are casual employees who are employed for project or continuing positions. Contract employees or group 1 are established under terms of em-

ployment at the time that they are hired by the department concerned.

This represents a great step forward for unclassified staff who now have most of the protections of the civil service in group 2 and all of them in group 3. It is the government's intention to bring all group 3 casual employees into the civil service which will extend superannuation benefits to them. No more group 3 unclassified staff will then be appointed without the approval of the Treasury board through the granting of such a complement.

Because the regulations had to be completely revamped to apply to the unclassified staff, they have been consolidated and republished in a recently printed booklet

Coming now to the votes, the main office vote 301 requests $100,000 for the operation of the main office of the department. This figure is less than two-thirds of the previous year's figure as a result of establishing the personnel research branch under a separate vote, as referred to in my earlier comments.

Accordingly, the complement has been reduced by eight and vote 301 now covers the chairman and secretary of the civil service commission, the executive directors of personnel management and recruitment and research together with supporting clerical staff. The ever-increasing requirement for effective personnel management in the Ontario civil service demands the highest calibre of top level management available.

In 1965 The Department of Civil Service was reorganized into two main divisions each under the supervision of an executive director reporting to the chairman of the civil service commission. The sharing of top-level administrative responsibility is proving effective in coping with the demands for procedures and standards for personnel administration in the government service. New programmes can be pursued rigorously and experimentation is more feasible.

On April 1 of this year, classification responsibilities in part were delegated by the civil service commission to operating departments covering 74 per cent of the civil service. While this delegation is still in the trial stages, I am assured that this carefully prepared step appears to be proving successful.

The work of the main office, too, calls for constant review of policy matters and often involves protracted and detailed discussions with the civil service association. New regulations to establish equal conditions of employment for the unclassified service have been passed. The present regulations carry amendments which expand their application to the public service rather than the civil service. This, of course, includes the unclassified staff as well as the classified staff. In most cases the regulations apply to group 2 and group 3 of the unclassified staff and, as I mentioned, the members of the group 3 category will be brought into the civil service as quickly as possible and this group will disappear.

Position administration, vote 302, requests $250,000 to carry on the work of the position administration branch. This represents an increase of $33,000 for salaries over last year and an additional $500 for travel expenses. The only increase in staff requested is for one clerical stenographer.

The number of officers has not been increased, but in the next year there will be a change in emphasis of the work undertaken by this branch. It is expected that the delegation of classification to departments will require greater emphasis on standards and audit by the civil service commission.

As I reported to the hon. members last year, most of the principles, techniques and procedures recommended by the consultants under the reclassification programme now form the basis for the continuing administration of position evaluation and classification. We are conscious that there is no standing still in this field. The classification system must provide a logical framework within which our collective bargaining procedures may be conducted efficiently. The evaluation system is the responsibility of the commission under section 4 of The Public Service Act and there must be a defensible identity between the classes to which a pay plan applies and the group for which the bargaining process is being conducted.

Our classification plan must be flexible in relation to the market for particular occupations, and it must be consistent. The basic plan must encompass and respond to both the labour market and be internally consistent. Our classification structure is broad rather than specific, concentrating on providing career patterns with promotional opportunities from entry level to the top. The possibility of applying incentive programmes is being investigated, as well as criteria for performance appraisals.

These then are the developments and challenging problems this branch is facing. Our staff are aware of other developments in these fields in public service jurisdictions and information is exchanged with them on a regular basis.

This vote also provides for the planning

and audit group which carries into practice modern concepts of internal auditing as a management service. The auditors look for situations which require corrective action. They examine the cause of any such discovered difficulties and if possible will help management by suggesting certain corrective measures. This activity is supplemented through technical training courses for departmental staff where required.

One of the results is that the demands by departments for all the services of the planning and audit officers at present exceed their facilities. As this section builds up in experience and meets the backlog of demands presently available it is expected we will meet the requests as they arise.

During 1965 the classification rating committee heard 23 grievances; 19 decisions confirmed the accuracy of the classification rating. Since the audit and classification officers guarantee a proper review of an employee's complaint about his classification, resort to arbitration has decreased.

Vote 303, recruitment and examination: $269,500 is the amount requested this year. This represents an increase of $45,000 over last year. The increase is accounted for by a request for an additional $38,000 for salaries and $7,000 for publications and advertising. The complement has been increased by two to provide additional clerical and stenographic assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. members on both sides of the House are aware of the impact of full employment which makes civil service recruitment directly competitive with recruitment of other major employers. That the recruitment branch of The Department of Civil Service has, in the main, been successful in providing operating departments with a constant flow of qualified candidates to supply their needs is a high tribute to the staff of the branch. Of course, we recognize that there are specific areas where officially qualified people simply are not available to satisfy the demands. Hon. members are aware that this is not just a provincial problem. It is also a national problem.

The branch has maintained high standards in the selecting of candidates from both the point of view of experience, as well as personal suitability for a public service career. Recognizing the problems of scarcity in certain occupations we have worked with those listing the vacancies to develop new methods of recruitment, including the training of existing staff to meet the demands. This is more and more necessary to fulfil the needs of the various departments.

In addition the branch has intensified its search for suitable candidates while maintaining reasonable cost limits in advertising in daily newspapers and in trade journals. In order to attract good applicants to civil service positions which we cannot obtain in the immediate locality of the job, the province has decided to pay 80 per cent of the cost of travelling and moving expenses of new recruits. At the present time, this policy will extend to persons living at a distance of over 100 miles from the job site and it is expected that discretion will be given to the Deputy Minister to pay support in accordance with a formula to be developed by the Treasury board secretariat and The Department of Civil Service. This will be announced when it is completed in the next week. Other employers have also established similar financial assistance for new employees. This policy will, of course, assist our recruitment of scarce talent here in Canada and in the United States, as well as overseas.

A new director of recruitment, Mrs. Ethel McLellan, selected by competition within the service, will continue the developments in the recruitment branch of the department and assist the province to exhaust every source for the type of talent we demand. Working for the Ontario public service today are very fine men and women indeed, and it is our hope to continue the high standards of achievement by attracting similarly qualified administrative personnel to the service.

On training and development, vote 304: In this era of automation and technological change, if any evidence were required of the crucial importance of this branch, it would be found in the increasing demand for the services provided by the branch. Reflecting this demand is the intention to enlarge existing programmes and, where possible, provide new programmes where evidence exists that they are required. To accomplish this work, and to carry the administrative trainee programme, an increase is requested. The total for this vote of $184,500 compares with last year's total of $97,000. The increase of $87,500 is made up of the following:

1. One additional training officer for a total complement of nine together with normal salary increases and revisions, accounts for $14,500;

2. $1,000 for additional travel required for liaison with universities on training courses;

3. $1,000 for office equipment and furniture;

4. $11,000 for additional training costs relative to additional supervisory training programmes;

5. And a further $60,000 to provide a total for the administrative trainee programme of $75,000 against $24,000 last year.

Last year we carried only $15,000 of this cost; the balance was carried by participating departments. The administrative trainee programme involves ten carefully recruited trainees of executive calibre at a salary of $6,900 to $7,500 based on educational level and experience. Our policy is to select trainees from the top graduates in such courses as political science, economics and business and public administration, and I am pleased to report that the recruitment programme has been successful.

The increase in general training costs reflecting the increased demand for new skills and knowledge requires lecturers of outstanding ability, many of whom are outside the service. It will become necessary to provide for the rental of more outside facilities in which to hold special courses and seminars. Training courses which the branch proposes to institute this year for the first time are: Supervisory training courses for The Departments of Lands and Forests, Health and Highways, and a general management development course for all departments. The enrolment for these courses will be over 4,000.

On administrative services, vote 305: Last year the department requested $324,500. This year's vote of $210,500 does not include data processing. This reflects the decision to request $131,000 for data processing services as a separate programme. There is therefore a net increase of $17,000. There is no increase in staff in the administrative services branch as I anticipated in my speech last year. There is, however, a much greater emphasis on post-audit, and less on the day-to-day checking and control of personnel transactions initiated by operating departments.

The supervision of credits and perquisites administration is the responsibility of this branch, and during 1965, as will be seen from the perusal of the annual report, a total of over $2.6 million was paid out to eligible employees in attendance credit gratuities. This figure included gratuity payments made to 630 employees transferred from the federated colleges at Guelph to the University of Guelph. The average payment was $1,137 to employees separating with over five years' service.

On the data processing services, vote 306: The request for $131,000, as has already been indicated, includes a $17,000 increase to provide us with an additional two programmers. In today's age of automation when computers are being installed at the rate of one per day in Canada, it is fitting to note the commission's approach to this matter. For a number of years personnel transactions and information has been stored on punched cards and processed by unit record equipment in its data processing branch. As the civil service has grown, the necessity to process routine transactions has increased. The result has been that it has become increasingly difficult to utilize the information stored on several card decks for management and research purposes. It is imperative that we simplify the processes.

The electronic computing branch of the department of highways provides the commission with invaluable service by making available to The Department of Civil Service its systems, programming and equipment facilities. This is following the organization and methods data processing report whereby departments make maximum utilization, where possible, of existing facilities prior to finalizing any new or additional equipment requirements. Further studies are going on to develop an integrated approach to the whole matter of data processing requirements for complete personnel and pension records for the Ontario civil service.

The sum of $101,500 is requested under the pay research vote and shows an increase of $11,500 over last year. The complement is the same. This increase covers normal salary increases and promotions for the present staff. It is essential to study carefully and report fully upon rates of pay of other employers in order that the government may be aware of the salary situation in the community. These studies are detailed and complicated. I would like to express my gratitude for the excellent co-operation which we receive from other employers, who provide us with this information.

During 1965, surveys were conducted for hospital and reformatory classes, professional classes, maintenance, trades and service classes, office classes and technical classes. Over 1,000 classes were revised and 34,000 employee received increases costing approximately $15.5 million. A continuous review of economic and employment conditions is made.

These increases in salaries, which have not been provided for in the estimates, account for a substantial part of the Treasury board orders.

The branch effectively co-operates with departmental management and the recruitment

and position administration branches to provide the central reference point for staffing and promotional classification standards planning. Indeed, with the development of those concepts which I outlined to hon. members under vote 302 for position administration, it has been decided that position administration and pay administration are so closely allied that the two functions should operate under one director.

As from April 1, last, therefore, Mrs. Elsie Etchen will direct the activities in both these areas.

Vote 308—the Ontario joint council—the civil service arbitration board, the public service grievance board, and the classification rating committee operate under the moneys provided under this vote. This year the request is for a total of $37,500. This is $4,000 higher than last year—the bulk of this representing normal increases and revisions to salaried staff.

I have already referred to the civil service arbitration board chaired by Judge Anderson. The effectiveness of the joint council has been subjected to considerable testing during the past few months, and the system has operated fairly well. Some simplification on the basis of experience will be sought through amendments to the Act.

Professor Ralph Presgrave has continued as an outstanding chairman of the public service grievance board. I would like to pay special tribute to Professor Jack Sarjeant, who was chairman of the classification rating committee. Professor Sarjeant has reluctantly resigned this post to assume greater responsibilities in the academic field. The matter of Professor Sarjeant's successor is under consideration at this time, and a candidate has been approached suitable to the association.

Other members of these boards who have continued to serve with distinction are Mr. Frank E. Wood, Mr. D. A. Crosby, Mr. J. A. Bridges, Mrs. Elizabeth Smith and Mr. W. C. Alcombrack. Mr. Alcombrack, who is associate legislative counsel in The Department of the Attorney General, was appointed during the year.

Many members were personally acquainted with the secretary to these various boards, Mr. J. P. Culliton, who retired at the end of February, 1966. Jay gave distinguished service to the province both in The Department of Lands and Forests as a pilot, and later as superintendent of the air service's western district. Prime Minister Leslie Frost chose him as the first executive secretary to the joint advisory council when he was vice-president of the civil service association. His service dates back to 1931 and we were sorry to see Jay leave after a colourful and successful career with the province. He has been replaced by Mr. Norman Phelps, who has served on the staff of the Attorney General's department for many years.

On vote 309—publications: This is the first time we are requesting money specifically for publications as a separate programme. The complement of five transferred from main office and the vote of $79,000 is required to maintain the publication of *Topic* magazine, the employee handbook and other informational material. *Topic* is the official journal of the Ontario public service. Its purpose is to keep civil servants informed about what is "going on" in various government departments.

Five issues are planned over a twelve-month period. The distribution list now totals 46,000 copies per issue. *Topic* magazine is also circulated to public service jurisdictions throughout Canada and even some sections of the United States.

We also publish twice monthly a *Topic* bulletin, 4,000 copies of which are delivered to the Ontario departments of government for distribution to employees.

On vote 310—personnel research: As I told the hon. members earlier, this vote has been separated from the main office and we are asking for $87,500 to further the work of this branch. Of this total, $79,000 will be paid out in salaries for a complement of ten and the balance covers travel and maintenance.

The activities of this branch will be further developed in the areas of validating tests and training programmes. Studies of employee motivation are being planned and a survey of available skills and experiences made to prepare the way for manpower planning.

The value of this branch to the government will be of long-term application.

It is increasingly apparent that many programmes in business and government require objective examination of trained researchers. Industrial psychologists in particular are effectively questioning some former ideas and policies. Employers often rate other factors ahead of salary for job satisfaction. It is our policy to increase morale and thereby work productivity. Studies by this branch are extremely valuable in guiding the administration in developing better programmes and policies.

The work of the branch has been described in some detail in the annual report of the commission. Dr. S. D. Saleh, the director, has

published many articles on attitudes, motivation, test validation and allied fields. This branch assisted in developing the survey questionnaire used by the bilingualism and biculturalism commission in the Ontario service.

This department more than any other works on our behalf to establish and maintain an effective administrative arm of the government. It it natural for attention to be centred on its policies. In sharing responsibility for many of its programmes with departmental management it avoids much of the criticism levelled at central agency control by such studies as the Glassco commission. Good administration requires responsible leadership both in central agencies and operating departments. The fact that new programmes such as the Ontario housing corporation and the Ontario medical services insurance division have been established within operating departments effectively shows the advantage of this policy.

This is in keeping with the findings of the select committee studying administrative and executive problems of the government of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, we intend to continue this development to maintain the standards of service to the people of the province on the highest level possible.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering, at the lateness of the hour and whether the hon. Provincial Treasurer wants to continue the debate?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I think we should continue for a while.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): What is a while?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, half an hour.

Mr. Nixon: It is now a quarter-to-eleven.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is all right.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East) Mr. Chairman, many times the members of the government have misinterpreted the remarks of the party critic in the study of the estimates. I am convinced that much of the legislation introduced in the House this year, and many of the changes appearing in this estimate, come from suggestions made in previous years by Opposition critics. I am sure many of the changes taking place in the department under review at this time come from many of the suggestions that have come along during the last few years' estimates.

If I am not too presumptuous, I would suggest to the government members, and especially to the backbenchers, that their criticism of the estimates on the floor of the House as is done in many other jurisdictions, might speed up the work of the Legislature, and possibly at the same time relieve the workload of the Opposition members.

Mr. Chairman, in my introductory remarks on the civil service department last year, I spoke at some length about The Public Service Act and for a joint council for collective negotiation procedures between employee association representatives and management representatives. I referred to a brief presented at that time by the civil service association of Ontario to the hon. Prime Minister. I do not intend to read this brief in full at this time, but I would like to quote the introduction, because I feel conditions at this time do not differ from conditions then. I quote:

> Civil service association of Ontario with regret finds it necessary to focus attention on the unsatisfactory conditions prevailing in the relationship between the Ontario government and the association in the field of negotiations in the Ontario public service. The distress of the many members, and the low salary bracket aggravated by extreme slowness in the adjustment of their pay rate, the universal concern of all employees with the apparent apathy of the government and its agents to employee matters and the continual retreat of official side personnel behind sovereign rights have all combined to force the association into a position not of its making or liking.

With your kind permission, Mr. Chairman, and because conditions in 1966 have apparently not improved considerably over those of 1964 and 1965, I would like to quote one or two paragraphs of the brief.

> In a nutshell, it became obvious very early that the negotiation procedure restrictions applied only to the association and to items presented by the association. The employer reserved unto himself the same old rights of unilateral decisions. Class specifications were revised without reference to the joint council or the association. Pay rates were published without prior negotiation, changes in working conditions were made without negotiation. Experience was contrary to expectation.

Referring to the joint council, the following remarks were made:

> Joint council: The first big disappointment to the association was the arbitrary exclusion from joint council of the Ontario

provincial police. While the Act provides for exclusion by regulation, the association removed groups from the bargaining provision, particularly since any cross-service item negotiated must apply to such groups. The fact remains that the association was allowed a say in the matter, even though a significant number of police officers are members of the association.

As I have already said, conditions have not changed too much in the past year, although there have been some improvements in the relations between the association and the joint council. I trust that by the time this Legislature meets again, a very real improvement will be noticeable in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, last year I referred to the low scale of salaries paid by the civil service, more especially for applicants holding university degrees. I referred at that time to graduates holding Ph.D. master degrees and honours degrees, with salaries ranging from $5,250 to $7,200 per year. When I presented these facts, the hon. Provincial Treasurer advised the House that there were many applicants for these positions at those salaries. I still think that no matter how many applicants there were for the positions, the salary range should be increased considerably in order to obtain the best possible applicants to fill those positions.

I believe also that many of these civil servants may be among the 15.1 per cent of civil servants who have resigned from their positions in the past year.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to say a few words at this time about the turnover in the Ontario civil service. During the past year, this has been a rather alarming situation, and the increase in turnover in the province has been considerable.

While in 1962 the rate for the entire civil service staff was only 10.5 per cent, it has increased steadily since to 11 per cent in 1963, 13.9 per cent in 1964 and 15.1 per cent in 1965. In view of the fact that the government must continually be building up an expertise to conduct intelligently this nearly $2,000,000 a year enterprise, it is particularly alarming to note that about seven-eighths of the separation from the civil service are voluntary resignations, and that the rate of resignations has risen four per cent in two years. About a third of them are in the upper, or supervisory salary positions.

It would appear that civil servants are leaving the government service like men jumping off a sinking ship, and contrary to some of the remarks made by the hon. Provincial Treasurer a little while ago, more males than females are leaving the civil service, and two-thirds of the turnover is among men and women who are over the age of 25.

I would refer the hon. members of the Legislature to page 43 of the annual report of the civil service commission.

It is interesting to note that many other jurisdictions in Canada have a far lower percentage of turnover than Ontario. New Brunswick, for instance has a turnover rate of 13.3 per cent, two per cent lower than the rate of Ontario; and the federal civil service which, because of its size offers a better comparison, has a turnover rate of less than 13 per cent.

In the civil service annual report for 1965, there is a ridiculous comparison between the Ontario civil service separation rate, and the rates of separations in industry. I think it is clear to anyone in this chamber that the Ontario government service covers such a broad range of types of jobs that its operations could be said to cut across literally hundreds of industries. Thus, when a man is transferred from one type of job to another in the civil service, he would not become a separation statistic. Whereas, in such a move in industry, he would.

So when the department draws attention to the favourable separation comparison with industry, it is merely attempting to throw up a smoke screen to hide the startlingly high turnover rate. Many employers would accept as a measurement of morale the rate of absence from work due to illness, since illness is used frequently as an excuse to get away from the office, particularly if there is an arrangement with an employer for sick leave credits. Thus, it can be said then on the basis of per capita yearly absence and days with pay due to illness, morale in the civil service is the highest it has been in five years, and perhaps even longer.

Further, morale would appear to be the lowest in the following departments: the civil service commission itself; the Highways department; the Provincial Secretary's office; Public Welfare; Public Works: Reform Institutions; Treasury and University Affairs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 43 of the annual report of The Department of Civil Service regarding turnover rate, it is interesting to note that 51.1 per cent of these separations during the past year have had a salary of $3,500 a year or less. It is possible that these would include labourers and cleaners, but neverthless, working for a salary that would enable them to support a family, and

as a matter of fact would render them eligible for free medical care. No wonder there is such a large turnover, which will no doubt continue until such time as there is a substantial increase in these salaries.

I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that a family receiving public welfare may receive as much as $3,600 per year, which is $100 more than the salary received by 50 per cent of the people who left the civil service during the past year. I will mention just one case to prove my point.

A building cleaner, working for The Department of Health, married, 25 years of age, with two children, is at the maximum of his salary of $3,240. The hon. members on the other side of the House who are always trying to criticize the government at Ottawa, might be interested to know that the salary scale in the civil service in Ottawa for an identical position has a maximum of $4,040, or $800 per year higher than in Ontario.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, it would be quite appropriate to say a few words about civil servants making announcements which should properly be made by the hon. Minister himself.

Members of this House will no doubt remember the unfortunate remarks of one of the officials of the Ontario hospital services commission regarding the Ottawa hospital situation. I have already said that such statements should be made by the hon. Minister. It is interesting to note, however, that when a statement has to be made which might benefit the party, then the hon. Minister himself makes the statement.

I would like to read into the record a commentary made by Herman Neiland, commentator at radio station CJSS, Cornwall, on Monday, May 30, 1966, and I quote:

> David S. Caverley, general manager of the Ontario water resources commission, in his zeal to help his boss, Dr. Vance, in whitewashing Ontario's limping antipollution efforts, has made a very improper remark about the critics of the provincial programme. Last week he said, in effect, that Johnnies-come-lately have stirred up the public to the point of hysteria without paying attention to facts and figures.
>
> Mr. Caverley should weigh his words a bit better and contain his temper when among the most prominent critics of the Ontario water resources commission one finds a man such as Professor Langford of Toronto University who, as president of the Great Lakes institute, has all the facts first hand, facts, moreover, which have been collected scientifically without the restraints put upon the OWRC by politicians and industrial lobbies. Mr. Caverley boasts of great progress made in municipal sewage treatment. Yes, OWRC and municipal board have forced this improvement on the municipalities, and rightly so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall read just the last paragraph of this interesting commentary:

> Mr. Caverley speaks about Johnnies-come-lately and hysteria. This name-calling by a man who knows the score perfectly well, but still feels compelled to distort the truth to please his political masters certainly does not fool anybody.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a problem that should require a very thorough study by the Cabinet. I am not blaming the civil servants, because they are just doing some of the things that have been done over the years. I am sure most civil servants would much prefer not having to make policy statements, and some of the hon. Ministers would lose a very convenient way of letting somebody else fly kites for them. Most of the remarks—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not think the hon. member is being fair talking about a civil servant when he is not here to defend himself, and I might say to the hon. member that the speaker was on a panel. He was asked to appear on this panel and he was asked certain questions and he gave the answers as they are. Regardless of what this announcer says in Cornwall, he was not at the panel. I talked to many people that were at this meeting, and they thought Mr. Caverley conducted himself in a manner befitting any gentleman in the civil service.

Mr. Thompson: It seems to me that it came just after debate in the Legislature about water pollution.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, it was a panel in the King Edward hotel.

Mr. Thompson: And it came after a debate in the Legislature and I feel there would be an obligation to identify who these unknown people are.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Get the facts before you start.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, that is just what we are asking for, the facts. Who the unknown people are that he mentioned.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Get the facts!

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Who are the people?

Mr. Thompson: But he did not give the facts. He was asked who were the people he was referring to, and he could not give it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, I think the leader of the Opposition has made his point.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I want to add too much to the remarks made by the previous speaker. I think my point is that any statements of policy should be made by the hon. Minister, rather than by the civil servant.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is not policy. It was answering straight and direct questions.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Caverley has entirely too much to say.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He was on a panel and was asked questions.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this time that the suggestions I made last year in the study of those estimates are still applicable. I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he read some of those recommendations as they appear on page 3104 of last year's debates.

It is interesting to note that there is a substantial increase in the estimates for recruitment and examination and for training and development. I believe that in this day and age, when a position may become obsolete very quickly, a much greater emphasis should be placed on retraining employees before it is too late. If this were done, we could perhaps reduce considerably the percentage of dropouts from our very fine civil service.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to suggest that the hon. Provincial Treasurer and other members of the Cabinet, possibly, should study in depth the Glassco report. Although the Glassco report is not a study of this civil service, I think a very large number of their recommendations would be quite applicable.

I would like to read just one sentence here of an article pubished in *Le Droit* of Ottawa and the translation of which reads: Humanize the civil service.

Unfortunately I have not got the French copy here. At least one Royal commission has not worked in vain—the Glassco commission. Two successive governments have so far adopted 100 of its recommendations of which 27 were adopted lately. Of the 27 one needs to be studied more particularly, inasmuch as it humanizes, may we say, the civil service. On page 314 of the first volume the commission recommended that in the future, concerning at least the intermediate and superior positions, the remuneration inside the accepted salary scale be determined by the volume and qualify of work and function of other pertinent factors.

After months of study, Cabinet has approved this recommendation, adopting a recognized practice in free enterprise which really makes sense, and I would suggest that the hon. Provincial Treasurer think of these recommendations when he is preparing his estimates for next year.

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we shall continue with these estimates and then The Department of Municipal Affairs, if we complete these estimates.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I did not quite hear the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Did he say The Department of Municipal Affairs after these estimates?

What about the provincial auditor?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, the provincial auditor comes after the civil service and then Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock, p.m.

No. 129

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, June 3, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 3, 1966

Public Utilities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading 4245

Village of Beachville, bill respecting, Mr. Spooner, first reading 4245

Racing Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Oliver, first reading 4245

Questions of Mr. Stewart re milk prices, Mr. Whicher 4245

Questions of Mr. Haskett re driver record search, Mr. Young 4248

Statement by Mr. Stewart re enlargement and consolidation of uneconomically sized farms 4248

Estimates, Department of Civil Service, Mr. Allan, continued 4249

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Spooner, agreed to 4270

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE, 3, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Tranquillity public school, Brantford; and in the west gallery Seymour public school, Campbellford.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves that Bill 121, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act be discharged from the list for committee of the whole House and be referred to the committee on highways and tourism.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to permit the discontinuing of municipal water service when sewer rates or sewer service rates, which are based on water charges, are in default of payment.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The hon. Minister is going to get into trouble for that.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes. It is an important piece of legislation. Here is a rather important one, too:

THE VILLAGE OF BEACHVILLE

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the village of Beachville.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the village of Beachville to pass a bylaw to provide for the issue of debentures for the purpose of paying the balance required for the construction and equipping of a three-room addition to a public school.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I have a bill and it is important, too:

THE RACING COMMISSION ACT

Mr. Oliver moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Racing Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have three questions to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart).

1. Is the hon. Minister aware that the milk commission has issued a notice of intention to the dairies of the province that food milk producers are to get a substantial increase in price as of July 1, 1966, which will necessitate a 2 cents per quart increase to the consumers of the province?

2. Is the hon. Minister aware that this action by the commission has been taken without approval of the fluid milk producers of the province, many of whom are now satisfied with the price they are receiving?

3. Inasmuch as the dairies have stated that they are unable to pay this increase, would not the hon. Minister agree that, for the good of all parties concerned, and particularly for the consumer, that this matter should go before a board of arbitration where all the financial facts of the parties concerned are laid out on the table?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the notice for these questions just arrived at my office before I left to come over here, and I can only say in reply to these questions that I can only assume that the Liberal Party are opposed to increased producer prices for fluid milk.

Mr. Whicher: No such thing!

An hon. member: Get down off it!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the Minister not to debate the questions, but just to answer them, please.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. Minister has impugned—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have made a ruling, now.

Mr. Whicher: I will pay producers a whole lot more—

Mr. Speaker: I ask the Minister to answer the questions.

Mr. Whicher: —than the hon. Minister will, I will tell the House, any day in the week. If the hon. Minister wants to get dirty—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand what all the furore is about. I am only answering the questions in the tone in which they were asked me.

I would say as well, Mr. Speaker, that, for all too long, purchasers and processors and distributors of farm products have felt that the last person to get an increase in price is the farmer.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have a feeling that this assumption has been the generating factor in the questions that have been asked me this morning from the Opposition.

Mr. Whicher: Tell the hon. Minister to answer the questions, Mr. Speaker—instead of giving a speech.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will answer the questions.

Mr. Oliver: On a point of order, my friend the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not answering the questions. He is being argumentative; he is giving a speech that has nothing to do with the questions at all. Now, the rule is specific; the hon. Minister must answer the questions 1, 2, 3; and he is not doing that at all.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): He does not have to answer at all—if he does not want to.

Mr. Oliver: I know he can do that, but if he undertakes to answer them, he cannot have a preamble, as the hon. Minister is doing.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would like to draw to your attention that the hon. Minister has now defied your ruling. He should answer the questions and not deliver a speech.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the points of order and I have asked the Minister to answer the questions as given by the member.

Mr. MacDonald: Particularly the second one!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will be glad to. I think that any series of questions that are as important as these to the people of the province of Ontario deserve some explanation as to why they are asked in the first place.

Mr. Whicher: If the hon. Minister will sit down, I will give it to him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will be quite prepared—

Mr. Whicher: Do not try to give it to me; the hon. Minister has not been around here that long!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am prepared to answer the questions—

Mr. Whicher: Well, go ahead; the hon. Minister is getting paid for it!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The first question refers to the milk commission. The milk commission has not issued any instructions to anyone, and if the hon. member knew this he would not have asked the question in the first place.

Mr. Whicher: They have issued a notice of intent, and that is how the question reads.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The commission has not issued any intent; the milk commission has not—

Mr. Whicher: All right then—the milk board.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why did the hon. member not say the milk board?

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister is really in good form, eh? Is he speaking as a Tory, or as a representative of the farmers? He is overpaid for either work.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I have asked for order two or three times.

I do not want the question period to develop into a debate, I would ask the member for Bruce to remain quiet and allow the Minister to answer the questions 1, 2, 3; if he will, please.

Mr. Whicher: If he knows the answers!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I must say that I know the answers as well as my hon. friend knows how to ask the questions.

In reply to question 2, the commission has taken no action whatever, and I am a little concerned as to why the hon. member has suggested that the producers of the province of Ontario are satisfied with the price of milk that they are now getting.

Mr. Whicher: It does not matter if the hon. Minister is concerned about my thoughts or not; let him answer the question. I am concerned, too; they need more money and they should get it—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Has the Minister finished?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the producers have indicated to me—and I am sure they must have indicated to their friends in the Opposition—that they are not satisfied with the price they are receiving.

Now, in question 3, the hon. member makes a statement that the dairies are unable to pay this increase.

Mr. Whicher: I made no such statement at all. The question reads: "Inasmuch as the dairies have stated." I did not say they could not pay; inasmuch as they have stated that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I am not sure what the hon. member really meant. All I am reading is the question.

Mr. Whicher: Well, the hon. Minister should learn how to read.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Inasmuch as the dairies have stated they are unable to pay the increase, that is all I have referred to here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Whicher: But I did not say it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, the hon. member did not say it?

Mr. Whicher: No, the dairies—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member is a dairyman and—

Mr. Whicher: And a mighty small one, too; a mighty small one! But I am not as small as the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I trust future questions do not generate as much heat, and a little more light.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not had a chance to answer it yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Minister was finished; I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In regard to the third question, there is a statement made here that to my knowledge has not been proven. However, I called by telephone to the chairman of the milk commission and he has advised me that both the distributors and the milk marketing board have been asked to review their present positions in the dispute prior to further meetings which will be held early next week.

Mr. Oliver: That is exactly what he asked the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General is not in the House this morning, but he left word that he would take the member's questions as notice if he would read them.

Mr. MacDonald: I understand the Attorney General has the answer but it is in his head. Unfortunately, his head is now with him on a plane.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What does the hon. member mean, unfortunately?

Mr. MacDonald: It is not here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps, like the Minister of Agriculture, I should explain that my use of the term was unfortunate, that if his head is not here, therefore, he cannot reply to the question.

It is a four-part question:

1. Is the Attorney General aware that 28 1966 model Ford cars of the Windsor police force have been partially immobilized for the past two months by a directive to all uniformed staff to the effect that the cars must not be driven over 50 miles per hour until further orders?

2. Can the Minister inform the House of the nature of the defect in the cars which led to this directive?

3. Is this matter under review by the police commission and, if so, for what purpose?

4. Have any other municipalities in Ontario experienced the same problem with 1966 Ford models?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put several questions on notice for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), who is not in his seat.

1. Is the Minister aware that there are at least 31 disturbed and neglected children presently known to the Metro Toronto children's aid society, but for whom nothing can be done because no appropriate resource is available?

2. Would the Minister agree that this destroys the intent of The Child Welfare Act?

3. Is the Minister aware that there are at least nine severely disturbed children presently in the care of the Metro CAS who are in need of institutional placement which is nowhere available?

4. Would the Minister agree that this destroys the intent of the recent amendments to The Child Welfare Act?

5. In view of the foregoing, what action is the Minister prepared to take, emergency or otherwise, to correct the situation?

6. In view of the numbers involved—namely, 40 cases—would the Minister consider special funds for expansion of various treatment centres in Metro operating under The Children's Institutions Act?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a three-part question of the hon. Minister of Transport, notice of which has been given.

1. How many drivers' records were issued during 1965 on the form entitled, "Application for driver record search"?

2. How much is charged for each one?

3. What did it cost the department during 1965 to provide this service?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answers are:

1. 562,629.

2. $1 each, except those provided to enforcement agencies where no charge is made.

3. Since the operation is part of the input and output of all driver records, it is not practical to separate that portion of cost which relates specifically to the application for driver record searches.

Mr. Young: May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister? Has the department made any assessment of the basis upon which these questions are asked? Is it in the case of driver records, or is it indiscriminate?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think I am clear enough on the point the member is raising to give him a good answer. If he will rephrase it or let me have another question I would be glad to give him the information.

Mr. Young: All right, I will do that later.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to inform the members of the House that, in co-operation with the federal government, a plan to provide for the enlargement and consolidation of uneconomically sized farms in Ontario has been approved under the federal-provincial rural development agreement.

I may say this is a joint announcement, for Maurice Sauve, Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, is also announcing this ARDA programme in Ottawa this morning.

In brief, the programme is designed to make possible the enlargement of uneconomic farm units to a size that will provide a satisfactory income to the operator. The feasibility and advisability of the plan is determined following an economic study in eastern Ontario carried out by the farm economics branch of the department during 1964 and 1965, to determine the minimum requirement for a viable farm unit.

The study showed that three out of four of those farms, with sales of produce of $10,000 per year or more, had added land during the tenure of the present farm operator. In contrast, only one out of three of all the farms, with gross incomes less than $10,000 per year, had added extra land during the tenure of the operator.

The need for a long-range land rationalization programme in eastern Ontario is recognized. Studies have revealed that any significant increase in gross income will depend on farm enlargement. Trends in size of farms indicate that the normal rate of increase which has been taking place in Ontario is extremely slow. Thus, normal changes will not result in any basic solution to the problems of uneconomic farm size in Ontario.

Our studies have shown that, generally, the need for an enlargement and consolidation programme is greater in central, eastern and northern Ontario. Under this programme,

uneconomic farm units will be acquired by ARDA as they come on the market for sale and would be consolidated with another farm unit where there is an operator who requires this additional land to improve his farm income.

It is proposed that the land be leased to the farm operator on a long-term basis, giving him the first right to purchase the land. The terms of the federal-provincial rural development agreement restrict this programme to land costing less than $100 per acre, with the development costs not exceding $50 per acre.

I wish to emphasize that farms will be bought by ARDA only where these farms are on the market for sale. Farms will not be bought through expropriation proceedings.

In order to ensure that the resident owners of farms that are offered for sale to ARDA are not put to any disadvantage, this programme provides that, where the owner wishes to continue to reside in the farm house, he will be given a lifetime lease for the residence at a nominal rental. Provision was also made that any person selling his farm can receive training in some other skill under the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreement.

Any vendor who has confirmed employment available to him will be assisted if the employment opportunity involves his moving to a new location. This will be entirely financed under the federal manpower mobility programme. In the case of purchase of farms from owner-residents between the ages of 55 and 65 who are not able to take advantage of the above option, the purchase will be governed by the following principles:

1. That the rural development officer or equivalent agent of provincial ARDA is satisfied that the vendor will have an adequate income until aged 65 from employment or the proceeds from the sale or other income sources, then the purchase and sale of the property can take place.

2. If, in the opinion of the provincial officer, the vendor will not have an adequate source of income after the disposal of his property to the government, then no purchase and sale will take place.

3. When the proceeds from a sale to a vendor who is unable to work, certified by a medical doctor, are insufficient to provide an annual income of $1,200 a year, then special assistance of an annual amount necessary to make up this figure will be provided until age 65. The costs involved in providing this assistance will be shared equally by the province and Canada as per section 33, subsection 4 of the Royal development agreement.

The estimated cost of this programme until 1970 is $7,200,000, with the provincial and federal governments contributing $3,600,000 on a dollar per dollar basis. It is anticipated that $1,200,000 will be required for the programme in 1966-67, and $2,000,000 for each of the succeeding three years.

I am sure the hon. members of the House will appreciate the magnitude of this programme and the effect it will have on our rural economy. I feel that, in implementing this plan in co-operation with the federal government, we will have done much to enable farmers to make adjustments to improve economic units, and will have strengthened the competitive position of the agricultural industry in meeting the growing needs for food production.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The nineteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. F. Lawrence in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

(continued)

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, after the hectic battles of the last few years in the field of the civil service, it was rather a pleasure last evening to come out into more or less relatively calm and clear waters, as one listened to the report of the hon. Minister (Mr. Allan). He presented this report of some, I think, real progress in the whole field of collective bargaining and the field of relationship between the government and the civil service. We, on this side of the House, would congratulate the hon. Minister on some achievements in this field, even though we are still going to keep pushing him a bit for further progress here.

I was very interested in many parts of this report and it does reflect, I think, a genuine change in approach, a general change in thinking, and a willingness at least, now, to accept the fact of collective bargaining. I was very fascinated by a statement on page 5, by the Minister, when he said:

> It occurred to us more than three years ago that collective negotiations leading to bargaining agreements was the only course of action to be followed to protect the interest of the civil servant and the public as well.

I remember a young chap who was riding a motorcycle and had a crash—he hit a fence. He picked himself up, with his head bruised and his arms rather in pain and his leg lacerated, and he looked around and he said, "Well, it has just occurred to me that I had better take lessons in driving."

If the hon. Minister will look back a few years, he will remember that time when there was almost a complete paternalism—and he mentioned this a bit obliquely in his statement here—in the attitude of the government to the civil service. One year the civil service came to the place where it was so frustrated and so completely irritated by the attitude of the government that it took a vote and that vote resulted in the mandate to the executive of the association to affiliate with the Canadian labour congress.

For a group of civil servants who, up to that point, had regarded trade unions with a jaundiced eye, this was something of a bombshell. Perhaps that was the time when, as the hon. Minister mentioned, "It occurred to us" that collective negotiations were perhaps called for, and it was following this that the more or less primitive method of bargaining called the joint council was set up. While I say it is primitive, at the same time it was a very great advance at that time, and an instrument which has been used both by staff side and by official side to move forward to understand each other, and to understand each other's problems and to come as far as they have come at the present time.

But in spite of this progress, Mr. Chairman, there are still some attitudes of mind which this government carries to the bargaining table that I want to comment upon briefly this morning. There seems to be still a bit of an unhealthy position in this department which goes back to the bad old days when jobs were held at a privilege everywhere, sir, and the employer made all the decisions unilaterally in a paternalistic society. In this situation, there was more security in a government job than there was in many others.

The appointees had a vote and so did their wives and, very often, their relatives and children. So the appointee had some power over his employer. As long as he could keep his own representative in office or the party to which he belonged he was fairly secure. No politician wanted to incur the wrath of a group of people by firing them, especially if they controlled large blocks of votes which might have turned the other way if the employees concerned were let out.

But those days are gone, at least in Ontario; they are gone in large measure. The trade union movement has won collective bargaining so that paternalism in jobs among most large employers is over, and it is disappearing too in most segments of the government service. The government of Ontario has fought this transition hard and is still fighting it in areas like the Niagara parks commission and the LCBO, although I understand from what the Minister said last night that there is some consideration given to this field too.

But the very magnitude of the government service in a province like Ontario makes the old personal relationship between employee and politicians impossible. Patronage to the extent that it once existed is certainly past, and I think all of us agree that this is a good thing and it makes for far more efficiency in the government service.

There is still one attitude of mind that it is difficult for this government, it seems, to shake. In the days I have mentioned, because of the relative security of a government job and because government jobs usually did not penalize one for sickness and there was generally some sort of arrangement for security in old age, the employee was usually willing to work for a lower wage than in a private sector where he was completely at the mercy of the employer, where seasonal work was all too often a rule and where the companies often went bankrupt or just went out of business for one reason or another. And this low pay position has persisted throughout the years.

The government has always taken the attitude that, since there was a greater degree of security in its employ than in the cold, cold world outside, the government employee should work for something less than in the private sector of the economy. And the employee by and large accepted this philosophy. Getting a government job meant breathing a sigh of relief because of its security, sometimes because of its lack of pressure. So the tradition of lower pay for public service was established, and this extended, of course, to the teaching profession and to municipal employees.

Then, when welfare services began to emerge, being supported by public subscriptions, they took on the character of a public service. They too were not supposed to compete with the private sector in the pay scale, and so people in these areas of public service took for granted, as everybody did, that their pay scale would naturally be a bit lower than others.

This is the attitude which is still somewhat apparent in this government. This is a mental quirk which it takes to the bargaining

table when it meets the civil servants. It seems to take for granted that the private sector of the economy should pay more for the same kind of service and that the civil service should be content with less.

The day is gone when civil servants have more security than those outside. I think all of us are recognizing that fact now. The mass market, the extension of construction through the cold weather, around-the-clock processes of industrial production, these and many other factors have brought job continuity and more or less steady employment. The trade unions have bargained higher wages and fringe benefits and these have had to be extended even to unorganized shops if they want to keep their labour force.

The world has changed, and in the process the civil servant has seen his position reversed. Without a trade union, and with the traditional passiveness rather than aggressive action, he has dropped behind as the more dynamically organized private sector of the work force secured a larger and larger slice of the new wealth pouring out from industrial machines. That is now changing somewhat in Ontario, and I think all of us appreciate that fact, but still there is a dragging of feet as we approach this change that has taken place.

Coupled with this factor, of course, was the idea that taxes were bad things and therefore they must be kept low. The one way to keep taxes down was by keeping the wages and the salaries of public servants as low as possible. Again on page 5, the hon. Minister points out to us that every government is faced with the problem of establishing a proper level of salary, with good working conditions for its employees. He recognizes that fact, whether his confreres do or not, but he must still keep in mind the costs involved which must be borne by the taxpayers. He says, on behalf of the people of Ontario, we carry heavy responsibility in controlling costs, and he is speaking here of the matter of wages and fringe benefits. I agree with the hon. Minister that that responsibility is there. I do not think any Cabinet of any political stripe can ever escape that responsibility.

However, the fact emerges, I think, pretty clearly that we take for granted that in the private sector taxes can be raised to meet payrolls. For example, if an oil company raises its price a cent a gallon on gasoline, it is just as much a tax as if a government put a provincial tax of a cent on the same gallon. It has to be paid by the people who are driving the motorcars.

In the case, of course, of the oil company, our people have been conditioned to accept the tax, the one cent a gallon increase, put on by the company as inevitable, and when the company says, well higher wage rates make it inevitable that we raise the tax or the price—in this case, sir, on the gallon of gasoline—we shrug our shoulders and we say, well what can we do about it, and we take it in our stride.

But if a government wants the extra cent to pay the rising cost of its workers, we are conditioned to raise an outcry and to accuse the government of extravagance and worse. We are almost ready to storm the bastions of the provincial Parliament, or the municipal hall, when this kind of an increase occurs.

So it is that these hangovers from a not-too-distant past are there and as we saw in the House not so long ago, some of the government members indicated that they wanted to get back to those good old days. It is because of this hangover that we offer an MA graduate in social service, $5,250 as a starting salary. That is why you expect attendants at the Hamilton hospital, which has been so much in the news, to work for $3,360, rising after two years of training, to $4,050, in a city where the average wage is over $5,000. That is why we find it hard to get professional people to fill the many chronic vacancies on our staff. That is why custodial staff in our institutions is hard to get and difficult to hold.

It is this attitude, which this government has not been able to shake off, which accounts for its insistence that salary scales in the public service should be geared to the lower echelons of the private sector, or to the voluntary agencies—those agencies which first established their lower levels of pay by following government policy in this field.

The civil service association of Ontario has estimated that it will take $100 million a year to bring the pay scale of civil servants up to an acceptable standard, acceptable to them, and they use certain basic criteria to establish that standard, and I will have a word to say about that.

This means that all these years the public service has really been subsidizing the taxpayers of the province by something like this amount. If the civil service wages had been on a par with industry, then we would have been paying that much more through our taxation arrangements.

They arrive at this figure through a logical process. It was during the bargaining beginning in 1962—or about that time—in the

field of fringe benefits that the government used the fringe benefits of 33 typical companies in Ontario as examples to demonstrate that the civil servants were doing all right.

Now, the civil service association is saying, all right, let us use your own list to look at wages for the labour group in the service. It is that group which is up now for arbitration, along with a couple of others. They find that the average wage of the industrial group is exactly $1,065 higher per year than the wages of the corresponding group of Ontario provincial employees. This brings the labour rate asked by the civil service to $4,305, which is the average of the labour pay in the 33 typical industries used by the government in its negotiations for fringe benefits.

I note that the hon. Minister says that the average wage after this arbitration award will likely be over the $5,000 figure. That is all to the good. But when one realizes the number of people who are below that amount, one still is very much concerned over what is happening in this province in the civil service area. The association is asking now for $4,305, or about $82 a week, as a basic wage for its labouring people and for people in that kind of category, and they are asking that other classifications be raised accordingly.

During the past year, bargaining in the province has run its usual course. The government, through its side of the joint council, approached the process in the usual archaic frame of mind, refusing to face the fact that employees of the province have a right to a pay scale similar to that of industry. On the other side—that is the staff side—these people were determined to change the mores of the government and get new standards recognized. Along with the archaic government attitude the bargaining process was hampered by the inefficient vehicle of the joint council, and I am hoping, too, from what the hon. Minister said, that there is hope of some changes in the bargaining process that is now under way, and I think this is all to the good.

But inevitably I think the process bogged down. It was almost impossible under the circumstances—in using the vehicle, the joint council—and so the whole dispute went to arbitration. There again the situation is almost hopeless; the board has to deal with 570 classifications and sort them all out, and deal with about 23,000 employees who are involved in the dispute.

Now, to make it more difficult, the government often acts unilaterally, even though progress has been made. I give the government full credit for its general attitude and general approach. Still, it seems to take for granted that it can change classifications in mid-stream, or alter job descriptions, without consultation with the civil service association. It seems to me they are so vitally affected in this field that this kind of change, particularly when it comes in the middle of negotiations, should be discussed by the government with the association and no unilateral action should be taken in this field. Perhaps the Minister has some hope for us in this field too.

Then, I noticed that the Minister has on the order paper a bill to revise The Public Services Act. This may affect the civil servants in a variety of ways. I doubt if that was discussed with the civil servants before it was introduced. Again in changing the ground rules, which this may involve, we do not know how serious this may be. It may involve certain changes in the ground rules, and it seems to me that this is not the kind of thing that should be introduced without discussion during the kind of bargaining that is going on today.

I think another bit of progress ought to take place—and I give the Minister this advice free of charge. Both in the field of legislative changes in this area of the public service and changes of job classification and job description—these kind of things ought to undergo certain discussions before they are completed. I know that the job classification does call for certain procedures of appeal and discussion at that point, but I doubt if this is sufficient to solve the problem that is facing us.

As long as the present situation exists, even though it is improved, no matter how dedicated the civil servants are, we are going to get a poorer quality of work than if the pay were a bit higher and if we demanded better qualifications of our staff. We can only demand those better qualifications if and when the pay rate is higher. We generally get what we pay for, and while I take off my hat to the dedicated work that is being carried on by our civil service today, many of them are not equipped for the kind of task we ask them to do, and while training is now under way, and again I compliment the Minister for this programme, and while that training is under way this must be speeded up and the present employees given every opportunity to qualify for better paying jobs, at which time those matters of pay must be faced up to realistically.

I think what is happening in the department of my hon. friend, the Minister of Re-

form Institutions, where people on the custodial staff are difficult to get and hard to keep—he may maintain there is no greater turnover there than in many other areas today, but in that field we do need far more qualified people, particularly in the higher echelons, in the professional field, and he recognizes that and has said so. Again we have to face the fact of training, of pay and of long-term planning.

In the hospitals—the mental hospitals, particularly, which have been in the news lately in a very great way—the problem is terrific. Again I pay tribute to the people who are holding those jobs, who are doing their best with an overload of work, shortage of staff and without the proper pay and qualifications. Yet they are carrying on as best they can. But here again we have to face the problem of low pay and of staff shortage, which we just have not been able to overcome.

And in the field of the professional, of course, this is something that has been recognized by the Minister and, I think, by almost every Minister during the estimates this year. There is the absolute necessity of getting in at the university level or before that, thinking in long terms, and this is now under way.

But the very fact that the government is now facing up to this does not excuse them from the long years of sheer neglect when they kept hoping that something would happen to bail them out of this difficulty. Something did not happen, a miracle was not performed, and today this government is up against the results of its own lack of long-term planning in the professional training field, and its own long-term lack of planning in the salary field to attract these people and to build the kind of staff necessary.

And so, because of that neglect, human values in this province are suffering and our own staffs are paying the price as well.

There are many matters in the report which might be mentioned but those can come during the estimates. We in this party are very concerned about what is going on. We again compliment the Minister in facing up to some of the problems.

His statement on page 5 is sound: "It is good business to employ good people, work productivity is higher, respect for the service is improved, and the policies established in this Legislature by statute and by the government through executive decisions are carried into practice more effectively." This is good common sense and we hope that common sense is going to rub off on the Treasury board, so that the Minister and the Cabinet Ministers who do need this kind of lift with staffs are going to get the money that they need to do the job, and that the money is going to be available to do the training now under way, do it more rapidly and more effectively. We hope that, going right back to the university and high school level, the recruitment job is going to be carried on with vigour and with a real sense of urgency on the part of not only this Minister but of all the Ministers in the Cabinet.

That is about what I want to say at this point. We feel there is still a problem here which is recognized, I think, on all sides of the House, a problem which cannot be sloughed off by saying that this is a problem right around the world.

It is more intense in certain fields here than it is in other jurisdictions and we are trying to solve it by robbing jurisdictions that have been able to train and have been able to make a greater success of things. I hope we will face our own responsibility, that we will do the job we have to do in raising pay rates, in training and in recruitment in the days ahead.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to express my appreciation for the thoughtful way in which the hon. member for Yorkview has presented his remarks. I would like to assure him and members of the House that opinions on this side of the House and the opinions he has expressed on the other side of the House are as nearly parallel as one could expect them to be.

I think the views he has expressed are very sound, as were some of the views expressed by the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine) last evening. We quite agree that the salaries of civil servants should be comparable with salaries for like responsibilities outside the civil service.

Mr. Young: Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer's Cabinet colleagues admit that?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am quite sure they would.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): They might agree with it but they do not do it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There was mention of the rates for social workers. Those rates are presently under negotiation and will no doubt be increased when the award is made. The line of argument with respect to the rights of the civil servants that have been expressed by the hon. member this morning are very

similar to those expressed by the civil service association before the arbitration board, and I would expect that the board would give them due consideration.

In the matter of job classification, there is a good deal of discussion with the civil servants association regarding this, although the responsibility is taken by management.

Mr. Bryden: Arbitrarily.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not arbitrarily at all.

Mr. Bryden: What does the hon. Provincial Treasurer mean, not arbitrarily? You made a unilateral decision; that is not arbitrary?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform you, and through you the members of the House, that anyone who is not satisfied with his classification has the privilege of appearing before a classification committee, which is an independent, neutral body, and is recognized as being fair and just.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question on that point?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will be finished in just a moment.

I would like to point out, too, to the member that the changes in The Public Service Act have been discussed with representatives of the civil service association. Very good relations exist, and we feel it is desirable that they should be acquainted with our thinking, and I think it works out well.

On vote 301:

Mr. Bryden: For guidance in dealing with the estimates now before us, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer a number of questions as to where different matters could appropriately be raised.

I would assume that matters relating to classification would come under vote 302.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That would be right.

Mr. Bryden: Then what about superannuation?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Superannuation, I am wondering what you—

Mr. Bryden: The public service superannuation—I have a number of questions to ask on that—and also the policy the government adopted in integrating its own superannuation plan with the Canada pension plan. I raised this with the hon. Minister in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer the other night, and he told me it would be more appropriate to deal with it under the estimates of The Department of Civil Service.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to fence off the consideration of this. I should think that really the best place to discuss it would be in an Act that is coming in, that is an amendment to the superannuation Act.

Mr. Bryden: I do not regard that as satisfactory. We do not know anything about the Act that is coming in, but we do know that there are certain matters on which we want information. I understood from what the hon. Minister told me the other night that this was the place to raise it. I tried to raise it under Treasury and he said under civil service.

Hon. Mr. Allan: My understanding of your question the other night was that you were asking about superannuation benefits for casual employees.

Mr. Bryden: I asked that question and I had a great many others I wanted to ask. I mentioned I wanted to get into the question of the method the government has used in integrating with the Canada pension plan. I think perhaps the specific question I asked at the time was one of a series of questions, and at this point the hon. Minister intervened.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This was the reason for the answer that I gave you, based on—

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am interested in much more. I am interested in the business of superannuation generally.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There will be ample opportunity when the Act is presented to the House to discuss superannuation.

Mr. Bryden: But this is the place, Mr. Chairman, and it is in the estimates that we get information. I sought certain information the other night and the hon. Minister told me that the staff he had before him was not in a position to provide the information, and, therefore, I should raise it under the civil service. Now, I want to raise it. I followed the suggestion of the hon. Minister, instead of pushing the matter at that time. I am not going to have the rug pulled out from under me now.

I would suggest the hon. Provincial Treasurer should have a consultation with the hon. Minister in charge of The Department of Civil Service and get this thing settled. I

missed the chance under Treasury, so I want to deal with it somewhere under these estimates. I am just asking where.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, as I view this situation, you are discussing legislation.

Mr. Bryden: I am discussing policies that have been implemented by this government.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, the policies are to be determined by the legislation.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this matter of integration has been a matter of lengthy dispute and a certain amount of negotiation between the government and the civil service association. It is certainly an important public issue and of great importance to civil servants. The hon. Minister may push the civil service association aside and say he will make the final decision, but he is not going to push me aside. I am going to raise this, and I am going to try and have it out with him. I want information before I can make any final judgment as to the merits of the government's position.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder, could we deal with this matter under vote 301 in a general way then?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, if he would care to ask the questions, Mr. Chairman, the situation is this. The present legislation exists until other legislation is passed. Legislation is being prepared and will be brought into the House amending the superannuation Act and it seems reasonable to me that this is when that should be discussed.

Mr. Bryden: There is no legislation before this House on this point, Mr. Chairman, absolutely none. The hon. Minister says that some will be brought in, and I do not question that he makes that statement in good faith, but sometimes plans change.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I assure you—

Mr. Bryden: As long as the legislation is not before the House, then it does not in any way affect what we are doing now. It is not before the House.

The acting Chairman suggested we might as well go ahead with it now, and I wish to go ahead with it, but on the point of your legislation.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to say to the member that this matter has been under discussion, and I know it has been the practice to bring it under the main office. The closest vote seems to be vote 308, dealing with the Ontario joint council, civil service arbitration board and grievance board. It seems to be the only vote that would be closely allied to the subject of your discussion.

Mr. Bryden: I do not want to leave the impression, Mr. Chairman, that I am dragging something in that does not really belong in this department. I was told by the hon. Minister the other night that the civil service commission deals with these matters, and I am willing to accept your direction as to that phase of the estimates which is relevant.

It may be, in other words, that the matter is dealt with at the top level, I do not know, but if you wish me to leave it to vote 308, I am willing to do that.

Mr. Chairman: I think under the circumstances discussion would be more desirable under vote 308. Number one vote this year has been reduced, and the personnel research branch has been established separately. I think it would be better if we did leave it until vote 308.

Mr. Bryden: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that subject to correction by the Minister, there are a number of other matters—quite large matters—which would also, I think, come under vote 308, namely collective bargaining and wage rates and related working conditions. Do all those come under vote 308?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I would be inclined to say so.

Mr. Bryden: Just before I surrender the floor to my friend from Kent East, Mr. Chairman, I have a question on the order paper, number 13 on page 8. It has been there for quite some time, and I am wondering if the hon. Minister could answer it for me. It reads as follows:

> How many (a) public servants and (b) civil servants, as defined in The Public Service Act, are there in the service of the province?
>
> 2. How many civil servants are there on: (a) probationary staff, and (b) regular staff?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have that information and would be glad to give it to the hon. member.

There are 55,941 total public servants. There are 43,141 civil servants. Of those, 7,913 are on the probationary staff and 35,228 is the total number of the regular civil service.

Mr. Young: I have a question I want to ask the hon. Minister, in connection with his

report, and I think it would come under the main vote; it is just a question of information.

The hon. Minister stated that the report is expected next week—that is the arbitration report—yet when we asked in this House that these estimates might be delayed for a week or so, so that we might have the information with which to discuss these estimates with more clarity, the House leader at that time said there is no way of knowing, and he insisted that the estimates come on at this time. It seems to me that, if the Minister did have information that the report was expected next week, it might have been well to delay the discussion of the estimates until that report was in. We are working in the dark to some extent here.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have no way of knowing when the report will be in. Since these remarks were written, I have been informed that it will probably not be in next week. Now, this is a matter for the judge to decide, and I have not been in touch with him.

Mr. Young: I thought perhaps the hon. Minister had some inside information, that the House leader did not have.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I have not.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Under this main office vote, I do not know whether it is correct to ask this question in regard to the highway and maintenance employees of Essex, Kent and Lambton. During January and February they were protesting their rates of pay. Of course the negotiations broke down with—

Mr. Chairman: I would think that the member from Kent East would be better advised, if it is anything at all to do with casual workers on the highways, to bring it under vote 308.

Vote 301 agreed to.

On vote 302:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who is in charge of this department, has indicated that the methods of classification used in public service, or the procedures for establishing classifications, are perfectly fair and reasonable and quite satisfactory. I think it would be closer to the truth to say that they are quite satisfactory to him. They are not necessarily satisfactory to others, nor are they necessarily satisfactory procedures.

I sense the procedures are inherently arbitrary. As set forth in section 4 of The Public Service Act the procedure is that the government or its representative unilaterally determines the classification system. Now it is true, as the hon. Minister says, that an individual employee may dispute the classification applying to him. I am not saying that is not a valuable right for an employee to have, but it does not take the whole procedure out of its essentially arbitrary character.

After all, there are thousands of employees, there are 43,000 in the civil service of the province. I do not know how many classes are involved but certainly there are a great many, a great many classes and a great many individuals. If the civil service association, or the employees as a body, were dissatisfied with the classification system and the relationship of one class as determined by The Department of Civil Service, their only remedy would be to process a long series of individual grievances.

Is that not correct, Mr. Chairman, that this is their only remedy? They have no voice in the thing in any other sense, other than that they could, if they wished, process many individual grievances. That does not really take the procedure out of its essentially arbitrary, unilateral character.

The government in its wisdom has decided, I would perhaps say in its lack of wisdom, that its experts know all about classification and its employees really do not know anything about it at all except that they are on the receiving end of it. There is no consultation, or no significant consultation, that I know of with the representatives of the employees as a body.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that there ought to be. In fact, I believe that one of the difficulties, in the numerous difficulties that the arbitration board has to face, is the lack of communication between the parties on the matter of classifications. You cannot take classification out of the collective bargaining process and claim that you have collective bargaining. After all, classifications and the inter-relationship among the classifications are vital to the whole question of salaries.

If a certain group of people is given a certain classification with a certain rating in the overall picture, then this can have a vital effect on their salaries; so that you cannot say, really, that you are negotiating with representatives of your employees as long as you reserve for unilateral determination a major area that affects their interests. I do

not think that you are going to develop a satisfactory relationship with your employees as long as you continue to insist on reservations of this kind. You will discuss certain things with them for a certain time, but then you just make an arbitrary decision.

Now that is essentially your position. It shines through almost every clause of The Public Service Act. I realize that on the matter of disputes over wages generally you have provided for an arbitration procedure. You have not, of course, committed yourselves to accepting the results of arbitration but I have no doubt that you will. But you still reserve a great deal that never goes to any sort of procedure in which the viewpoint of the representatives of the employees can be adequately considered.

I am not suggesting the problem is a simple one. In an operation the size of this government there is really a most complicated problem of classification. It is not only the number of employees that are involved, it is also the tremendous variety of types of work. I do not imagine there is any private employment anywhere in the world that has anything comparable to government service in terms of range of classifications that have to be considered, so I am not suggesting that the problem is simple.

I know it has to be under continuous review and no doubt always will be, but I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that there should be some sort of consultative machinery other than merely a grievance procedure for individual employees in which these classifications and the relationship among them can be discussed.

Hydro did that sort of thing a few years ago and I understand with considerable success. They undertook a joint approach to classifications. If this can happen in private industry—and it is happening indeed to an increasing degree as private employers become more enlightened and realize that the views of their employees are important to them—I do not see why in the government of Ontario it is not possible to have a sort of a standing committee representing the civil service department on the one side and the civil service association on the other which will at least keep looking at these classifications, reviewing them, reopening those that seem to be out of line and looking at them in a spirit of partnership rather than on the present basis, which is based on the assumption that in the last analysis the government knows everything and the employees know nothing. That is the basic assumption involved.

I was not exaggerating when I said that the procedure now is essentially arbitrary. I am not hopeful that I will persuade the hon. Provincial Treasurer to change his mind today, but I am putting this proposition before him today and I hope that perhaps he might think about it. We over here have put propositions before him in the past. They were repudiated when they were put before him, but some of them he has come around to accepting and I admire him for that.

Wherever an idea appeared to him to be good, after consideration, I admire him for accepting it. I suggest that he just think about this question of classification and of the procedures used in determining classifications in the civil service.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that I will think about his suggestions. I do not agree, however, with his remarks today. We, in the administration of the civil service, have studied carefully the methods of dealing with the civil service in Britain where it is recognized that their bargaining procedure is as good as any jurisdiction. We are following their example in this particular, although I do assure the hon. member that I listened to what he said and I shall think about it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said that they have studied the system in Britain, but I would say they only studied it to a limited degree. Of course, the system in Britain is an extremely complicated one. Like all British institutions it just "growed," and it has many different accretions. But if you take the total system of staff relations in Great Britain and compare it with this province the differences are very marked, and they are all differences that are to the detriment of the employees.

Now it may be that the government is moving more in the direction of the British pattern. It certainly does not have anything like it right now, but the hon. Minister has said that he is bringing in a bill to amend The Public Service Act. We will wait and see it, but I wish the hon. Minister would not use Britain or any other jurisdiction as his authority for a single point only. I think we should look at the system in effect in any jurisdiction in its totality, because that is the only thing that makes it an organic and effective system. I am trying to look at the Ontario system in its totality and what I find is a high degree of authoritarianism and paternalism, and I have called attention to one area where it exists.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for Woodbine that it is very difficult to deal

with vote 302 without encroaching on some of the other votes; I realize that he is on items 307 and 308, but we are dealing now with the standards for recruitment.

The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I am now puzzled as to whether or not—I had to go out for a moment—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 302.

Mr. MacDonald: Everything seems to be under 308? Well, we may have to leave it there for now.

Vote 302 agreed to.

On vote 303:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister about recruitment, as to whether or not a dynamic programme is going forward in this field. I have suggested in other estimates in this House that we ought to be doing a real job right at the high school level where we have today the whole postwar generation coming up into the high school area, and where there should be a lot of idealism and a fertile ground for recruitment.

We should be making these people think in terms of public service and of the job that ought to be done there, particularly in the professional field in the public service. They should be faced with the need, and challenged with the proposition of serving the public in that area. Thinking in terms of it at that level, I wonder if the hon. Minister has any advice to offer us regarding what is happening there.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I can advise the hon. member that I thoroughly agree with what he has said. We have a programme to inform high school students of the opportunities in the public service in the province of Ontario. I think we should do more of it and I hope as we progress that this will come about.

Mr. Young: I wonder what the hon. Minister means by "begun"? What specific thing can he tell us has happened at this stage? I have not yet seen any great evidence of it. Time is passing and the urgency is upon us, because even there we cannot expect results for some years to come.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have a publication that has been sent to the high schools, a brochure entitled, "Careers for High School Graduates." This was distributed earlier this year and the hon. member will find this in the report.

The high school liaison officer visited and addressed high school groups—that is, an officer of the civil service commission. The career aspect of the public service and the increasing need for civil servants to continue educating themselves while they are working was also emphasized at these meetings.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell me whether the recruitment for the civil service is through the national employment service? Is the national employment service kept advised of the needs of the government service?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We work with them, but not through them.

Mr. Renwick: But not through them. As I understand it, we were told during the estimates of The Department of Labour that this whole question of an employment service was not one in which the government was going to be interested. It was going to be left to the national employment service. I would suggest that if the national employment service is ever going to become an effective body it must have the active co-operation and support of this government when recruiting for the civil service.

We all know that up to this time the national employment service is not fulfilling the function which many of us think it can fulfil in the area of fulfilling the needs of the province.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The national employment service refers persons to our recruiting section, from our listings, but from what I have been able to observe I think we must be responsible for our own recruitment. I do not think that we can ask the national employment service to do it for us.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I know that we must be responsible in the final analysis, but are the vacancies or the positions that you are recruiting for made known to the national employment service and are they listed with the national employment service office in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think that all of the positions are; most are, but not all of them.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister a question with regard to recruitment in the Ontario Hospitals. How many employees have been taken on in the past two years? I do not insist on that precise period — whatever period of that approximate length would be conveni-

ent. How many have been taken on and how many of the people taken on in the last two years are still there? Could that information be dug up, if not between now and 1 o'clock, then between now and Monday?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We can endeavour to do it, but it is quite a little task; we do not have the information at the present time.

Mr. Renwick: To what extent are examinations used in the recruiting for the civil service? Is it almost universal throughout the service that there is examination, or are some other tests applied other than examinations?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Nearly all of the positions here require an examination.

Vote 303 agreed to.

On vote 304:

Mr. Young: On vote 304, item 4, general training costs, $32,000. I wonder if the hon. Minister would enlighten us as to what this covers? Certainly, it must cover a very limited field in this area because it just is not sufficient to do a real training job.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the costs of the training programme do not appear in that figure of $32,000 because a great deal of the training programme is carried on by the staff of the commission, and this would be more likely to be money for special lecturers, rentals for a building or something of that sort. They intend, as you will have noticed in the statement I made, to give 4,000 civil servants some training in this coming year. You could hardly do it for $32,000.

Mr. Young: It surprised me, and I wondered at the low amount.

Votes 304 to 306, inclusive, agreed to.

On vote 307:

Mr. Young: On vote 307, Mr. Chairman, I wonder what basis the government uses in regards to pay research? What are the criteria that they establish, what has their pay research staff arrived at as a basis for their negotiations? I suppose this is the vote on which we ask this question.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the basis for the study is to research in the areas that are comparable to the positions that we wish to compare salaries. This research section has reciprocity, I guess you would call it, with a great many companies, many of them large companies, some of them medium-sized companies, some companies in areas where a great many of a particular class of our civil servants would be working; by getting this information from the various companies and coming up with a salary level which would make us competitive in the field of employing labour.

Mr. Young: And this is the basis of your negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Young: I raised the question in my introductory statement which puzzles me a bit in view of the answer the Minister has now given—or perhaps his answer puzzles me—that in the negotiations on fringe benefits his pay research people came up with 33 companies which had certain fringe benefits and listed them. And over the years the negotiations were carried on on the basis of those fringe benefits of those 33 companies. That was for fringe benefits. Now, that issue was pretty well resolved last year, we had a major debate in the House—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That was done by a special committee, not by our own salary research branch.

Mr. Young: By a special committee?

Hon. Mr. Allan: By a special body.

Mr. Young: All right! That special committee, I take it you had some confidence in it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Young: You used their findings as a basis for negotiations in fringe benefits?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, we were more generous than their findings.

Mr. Young: Yes, you were forced into that situation, if I remember, Mr. Chairman. But now, when the civil service association uses that same list as a basis for pay research on their side, you scrap that list and say that is not a logical thing to do. In regard to rates of pay for labour in those industries, we come up with a figure, and I think the association came up with a figure that is $1,065 above the basic wage which is being paid in this province.

Now, what is good on the one set of negotiations ought be good on the other side of negotiations; the companies that the government throws into the teeth of the association in the one case, ought to be accepted in the other case. But this does not seem likely, and I wonder if the hon. Minister

would comment on his reason for discarding these companies as a basis for negotiations in wages when he insisted that they were valid when it came to fringe benefits?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to decide anything as a result of these studies and representations. I think the matter is before the board of arbitration now, as you know. We feel that the list of companies that we used in this instance were comparable to the types of employment that were up for arbitration. I have no doubt that the arbitration board will decide whether or not our representations were reasonable. I think that justice will be done in the end, which is what the hon. member is interested in.

Mr. Young: We are interested in justice, but why did the government say in one case that this set of companies was valid as a basis of negotiation and in another case it was not? After all, the total pay package of the workers include wages and the fringe benefits. In one case, the Minister said the fringe benefits were the ones that you wanted, and in the other case he says that their wages have no relationship to the problem we are facing now.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out before, this work was done by two different groups and although—

Mr. Bryden: This shows how scientific it is.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, you will agree with me, I think, when I say that when some responsibility is placed with a committee or a salary research branch, they conduct that and carry it out. I do not know which companies they go to, but I have confidence in those people and as a result of their judgment the companies were selected. I did not pick any companies.

Mr. Bryden: I think this brings out a point that is worth bringing out. I am not going to suggest in any way that pay research is not a necessary function in the civil service commission or in any personnel department of any employer. Obviously you have to try to acquaint yourself as far as you can with the wage rates that are being paid for comparable work elsewhere in the community. One of the difficulties that has arisen in the past, however, is that it is suggested that pay research is some kind of an exact science. In fact, the Minister has frequently in the past given the impression in the House that his pay research people have found out such and such a thing, and really that would be the reasonable way of settling it. However, his attitude may be modified a little bit because he has found that two different teams of pay researchers have come up with quite different results.

Hon. Mr. Allan: One was pay research and the other was the matter of fringe benefits.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, of course. But then another group of pay researchers used the first group of companies and came up with some results on comparable wage rates that were quite different from what your people came up with. I think we might as well face the fact that to a very important degree the purpose of pay research is to justify the position that you have already decided you are going to take.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, no!

Mr. Bryden: Certainly, you take a certain group of companies which support your predetermined position.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The member might do that.

Mr. Bryden: But the hon. Provincial Treasurer has done it. He took a certain group of companies that support his position in one area, then when they did not support his position in another area, he got another group of companies. He said he thought the companies were comparable. They were comparable only as long as they supported his position. They ceased to be comparable afterwards.

It is like the old history of the railways where for years the railway companies held that it was a revelation of God that the proper comparison for railway workers was the durable goods industry, so-called. They held to that as an absolute principle until the durable goods industry's wages went above railway wages. Ever since then they have been proclaiming that the durable goods industry is quite unrelated and not comparable at all with the railway industry.

This is what frequently happens in pay research. You get support for the position that you have decided you are going to take. The civil service association took your group of companies which you had used for another purpose and found that to bring the basic labour rate in the public service up to the comparable rate in those industries would require an increase of $1,065 a year. However, the government made an offer of 31 cents an hour, which is a good deal less than that; I am not sure how that works out in terms of annual wages.

Mr. Young: $2.07 per hour, I think.

Mr. Bryden: $2.07 was what would be required to come up to the rate in the industries that the government had previously used. The government offered to bring it up to $1.87.

So I suggest to the hon. Minister, if he is going to use these types of comparisons, then he should not keep switching standards just to suit his position.

Hon. Mr. Allan: If the hon. member would like to listen to me read three pages of the companies that we did take I could, but I will read half a dozen.

Abitibi Power and Paper Company; Air Canada; Algoma Steel Corporation; Aluminum Company of Canada; Atlas Steel; Bell Telephone; Campbell Soups; Canada Packers; Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; Canadian Canners; Canadian Carborundum; Canadian General Electric; Canadian Industries.

That is the run of the companies that were used, and I am told that the chairman of the arbitration board remarked that it was a very rich sample that we had chosen.

Mr. Bryden: Well then, what did you come up with as an acceptable rate for labourers on the basis of the comparison with these companies? Those companies pay an awful lot more for labour than you do.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I was replying to the remarks.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 307 carried?

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman! To take labour as a case in point. The industries you are talking about pay the labourer a great deal more than what you pay. Is that not so?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The question was, as I understand it, that we had chosen—

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am now asking another question.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not familiar with what went on in the negotiations, as I told you before, but you will know very soon.

Mr. Bryden: Well then, let us get it on the record.

As far as I can see the 33 companies that the government used in relation to fringe benefits showed an average for labour of $2.07 an hour, and for the third quartile it showed $2.15 an hour. I think what the government was offering was $1.87 an hour.

What it is actually paying now, I have not got it in terms of hourly rate, but the top rate the government is now paying is $3,240, which is a lot less than that. It is about, I would say, it is probably about $1.50 or $1.60 an hour. Are those not all facts?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not have that information here, I could not say.

Mr. Bryden: Well, either you do what I said, use samples that suit your purposes, or—

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do not use such samples here.

Mr. Bryden: —you do not pay any attention to the samples you do use. Obviously the selection of 33 companies, which as the hon. Minister said was a very rich sample, shows wages—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That was not the sample, it was the group used that was the rich sample.

Mr. Bryden: Well, okay; so the one you used for fringe benefits is not a rich sample then! Well, at any rate, it certainly demonstrates the point, Mr. Chairman. The science of pay research is a kind of justification of the kind of case you are trying to put forward.

Vote 307 agreed to.

One vote 308:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent West asked about casual workers. The Ontario joint council may have some system for negotiation eventually, and I suggest that he put his question now and see if the Minister can answer it.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister no doubt is quite well aware that last January and February, when the workers on the highway in the vicinity of Essex, Kent and Lambton were asking for an increase in wages, negotiations with the civil service broke down and it went to arbitration.

Could the hon. Minister inform us: Has the arbitration board given its decision, handed down its decision? If they did, what increase did the employees get?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, I understand that the meetings have been completed; they have finished the hearings. I said in my report that we expected the award next week. This morning I was told that probably it would not be next week, it would be the next week, but it will be very soon, I should think.

I think it is a matter of writing the report. As the hon. members will understand, when 22,000 employees in many categories are concerned, it is quite a task for an arbitration board. I would be confident that they were endeavouring to bring the award forward as quickly as they can. There is no doubt that there will be an increase in the wages, which will be retroactive to January 1 last year, as I indicated in the House when you brought this matter up last month.

Mr. Spence: I am glad to hear that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Allan: January 1, 1966.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, under this vote we discussed the whole matter of bargaining by the joint council and the machinery of bargaining. I bring to the hon. Minister's attention an article written by Peter Thurling on March 11, 1966, in the Toronto *Telegram* in which he assesses what the situation is. I think it is a disturbing article in view of the fact that the government has refused to bargain to the place where all these 22,000 cases have to be taken to arbitration.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We did not refuse to bargain.

Mr. Young: Well, all right, you bargained; but you dragged your feet to the point that finally arbitration proceedings had to take place.

Now, Peter Thurling says this, and I quote him, he still counts several thousand employees earning less than $3,600 a year —several thousand—and notes that the Conservatives rush to pay parity only when they are forced to it by the labour market. And that has happened in the last few years. Continuing to quote:

> Some of the worst paid are just over the $1 an hour requirement by Ontario's own minimum wage law. Women cleaners at Queen's Park are paid $2,160 for 2,080 hours of work a year.

A year ago the Minister said that he was going to do something about this and I hope he has.

> Mail clerks and messengers start at $2,400 and general clerks at $2,640. Until a short time ago the top rate for psychologists was $9,000 a year, now it is $11,500 after five years' service. Rehabilitation officers in The Department of Reform Institutions start at $4,200 a year which just happens to be $300 a year less than the civil service association thinks anyone in the service should be paid.

That is the end of that quote.

In other words, the rehabilitation officers who carry the responsibility in the reform institutions start at $4,200 a year. This is $300 less than the wages paid, the third quartile of wages paid, in the industries which the hon. Minister quoted in the fringe benefit negotiations a year ago, and more than a year ago. It seems to us on this side of the House at least that these wage scales should have been such that the hon. Minister would have been quite willing to negotiate up rather a fair distance, a distance which should have prevented the arbitration proceedings this year.

The fact is that I suppose the hon. Minister takes some pride in the progress that has been made. Well, of course, bad is better than very bad, and we started years ago at the very bad, or even worse than that, level for civil servants. Because of the fuss that has been made, because of the pressure that has been exercised, both by the Opposition and by the union itself and by economic conditions, the hon. Minister has had to move in this regard. But he is moving too slowly, and even though it may take a good deal of money to bring the level up to where it ought to be, it seemed to me there should have been far more intensive and far more willingness on the part of the government to bargain to a little higher level before the whole matter went to arbitration. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member for Yorkview would be one of these to say that we should not prejudge people before we come to conclusions. I would suggest that before you paint us as the big, bad boys you wait until the arbitration award has been determined and then you will have a better idea as to whether we were, or not.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, that was the very request we made of the House leader on two occasions, that we wait until then so we would know and be able to deal with these estimates logically and reasonably, in fairness to the hon. Minister. But the House leader chose to make that decision that we were going ahead now before the arbitration report was in so that we are in effect, as the hon. Minister says, groping in the dark just a bit. But that is not our fault, that is the fault of the House leader who has made this choice.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not going to accept the proposition that we will be inhibited in our discussions here by the fact that the arbitration award is not down.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No one is trying to intimidate you.

Mr. Bryden: I said inhibited, I did not say intimidated. But you are suggesting that we should now defer judgment on this until we see what the—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, I think that is reasonable.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I do not think it is one bit reasonable for the government—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, I do not care what you think.

Mr. Bryden: —to push ahead with these estimates when an arbitration award is pending. We put this before both the Prime Minister and the House leader, and both of them just brushed the idea aside. Then the House leader had the gall to suggest that we should use reasonable circumspection in discussing the matter in view of the fact that it is before an arbitration board.

All the government is trying to do here is to prevent a reasonable discussion of the matter. There is no reason on earth why these estimates could not have been deferred for two or three weeks. We will certainly be in session in this House until the end of June, at least, and I think that there is a good chance that the arbitration award will be down before the end of June. However, the government bulls ahead anyway without any reasonable cause at all, so we will deal with the matter as best as we can.

All that we can go on is what we know of the history up to now. We do not know what the arbitration board will find; we do not know what the government will do with its findings; we do not even know, in anything but general terms, precisely what the arguments and discussions were before the arbitration board.

I am not suggesting that we should know. These were, in many cases, matters that would be better dealt with privately.

But we will go on the basis of what we know. What we know is that this government continues to be among the leading payers of starvation wages in the province. The situation has improved in the last year or so, there is no doubt about that. We have been having some big battles and the civil service association has been having some big battles with the government, and those two factors have no doubt helped to improve the situation. Also, I have no doubt that the market situation has forced the government to change its position.

What has happened, essentially, if you take the past few years, has been that the government has increased the wages or salaries of the top-rated employees. Why, because it just could not get people on the market, with the wages it was paying. It simply could not get people, so it increased the wages. It still held down the wages of the low-rated employees who did not have any great individual bargaining power. It held them down to the lowest possible level for the longest possible time. Finally, the combination of pressure within this House and the civil service and the pressure of the market have moved the government a bit, not too much, but a bit. But even now, just look at the situation as it was in 1965 on the basis of the annual report of the civil service commission.

These figures do not apply to the whole of the public service, but just to the civil service. The total number in the civil service in 1965 was 43,316. Of that number, 23 per cent, or just about 10,000 people, were getting less than $3,500 per year; 17,654, or 41 per cent of the total, got less than $4,000 a year in 1965. That 41 per cent was a significant improvement over 1964, I am willing to concede that. The developing shortage of labour no doubt brought about that improvement, but it still is a pretty lamentable situation.

Even more lamentable are the figures shown in the civil service department's report with regard to salaries on appointment. Of the people that you recruited to the service, 2,195 or 27 per cent of all your recruitment was at wage rates of less than $3,000 per year; 39 per cent, no I am sorry, exactly two-thirds of your recruitment—5,386 people or just about exactly two-thirds of the people you hired during that year were taken on at rates of less than $3,500. I am suggesting that a lot of the people you hired probably lost very quickly; you probably had a substantial turnover in employees who had been hired, came into the civil service and as soon as they could find anything better got out of it again. Then we wonder why people like the hon. Minister of Health and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions have difficulty staffing their institutions with the type of people they want! The reason is obvious, it

is the amount of wages you pay. You are one of the worst employers in the province, I would say, as far as the lower rated employees are concerned. Since you had to meet the competition of the market in the professionally-trained people you could not get them for the wages you pay so you jack up salaries. That is true except in relation to social work. The social workers are in a profession which has always been underpaid, so it is possible to get them pretty cheaply. The government still is in the market for them pretty cheaply.

What is happening, of course, is that now our whole community is suffering from an acute shortage of social workers because of the cheapskate attitude that has been taken over the years by the government and by other agencies. The profession grew out of a sort of charitable approach to human problems. The professional social worker replaced the do-gooder, but there was still the attitude that he should provide his services at much less than they were worth, he should still be a sort of charity worker.

Now, we are suffering in the community for this shortsighted approach. The whole community is suffering from the shortage of social workers.

So, wherever you had a situation where there was not an immediate pressure from the market on you, you did very little in terms of improving wages in the service.

The civil service association has had to fight and fight and fight with you, and the two of you could not even get on to the same street in your negotiations. This was the problem in your arbitration. You were not even talking the same language; you were not even on the same wavelength.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We will find out who was on the wrong street.

Mr. Bryden: Well you know, no arbitrator ever produced distilled undiluted truth. All an arbitrator can do is to make a guess too and—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The only person who could would be yourself, would it not?

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Allan: You would be the only one.

Mr. Bryden: I see we have got the hon. Provincial Treasurer rather irritated.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, you have not.

Mr. Bryden: You see, one of the problems is that you will not accept criticism when it starts to hit at the weaknesses of your department.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will accept it.

Mr. Bryden: I have been suggesting to you all along that there are no final and absolute truths in these matters. This is one of the difficulties of arbitrators, they will not come down with final and absolute truths. I do not know if the hon. Provincial Treasurer has any inside information on what the arbitrators are going to hold. If not I do not know why he threw out that childish challenge a minute ago.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, we appointed an arbitrator. I have been listening to the hon. member for Woodbine for the last 15 minutes talking about the wages we pay, the salaries we pay—this is all empty talk for the reason that we are willing to let the board of arbitration decide the salaries we will pay. The board of arbitration will be coming out with salaries in a few days. Now, all this talk about the government and what we will pay and what we will not pay, this is just like so much empty talk.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about what the hon. Minister has been doing; I am not trying to—

Hon. Mr. Allan: If the hon. member wants to give me a lecture, then I will sit and take it.

Mr. Bryden: But you cannot dispute the facts that I have been putting to you.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I thought you were discussing the estimates.

Mr. Bryden: I am; I am discussing your performance. We are being asked to vote money to you, and before we vote it to you we are going to discuss your performance. I know you fellows object to that—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, we do not.

Mr. Bryden: You would like just a bunch of pat little questions that you could stand up and answer in a nice suave way. But we are interested in finding out exactly what you have been doing with the money that we have voted you in the past. One of the things that you have been doing is holding down the wage rates of your employees. You cannot dispute any of the facts that I have been presenting to you, because I have

been taking them right out of your own report.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): How would you decide? Other than in negotiations; how would you decide on wages?

Mr. Bryden: As a matter of fact, I would like to see the matter decided by negotiation. I have always held that, and of course, the government has never been willing to really negotiate. This has been our difficulty and it still is not willing to negotiate.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is what you say. I say we are. I have just as much right to say that we are willing to negotiate as you have to say that we are not.

Mr. Bryden: I am not disputing your right to say it; I am just saying that your record indicates that you do not understand what is involved in negotiation. Your attitude has always been—every time we discussed the matter in this House—that you made a reasonable offer, they would not accept it, and they were, therefore, very unreasonable people. That is your idea of negotiating, that the other fellow accept what you say. You think it is very reasonable in regard to a system of classification that you determine it precisely. Then you allow individual employees to file grievances on your determination. This, you say, is reasonable.

The trouble with the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, is that he does not understand what is involved in negotiation, that there is a lot more give and take to it than he is ever willing to accept. He makes an offer and that is it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is an absolute untruth! How does the hon. member know what went on at the negotiations?

Mr. Bryden: You tell us what went on.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know.

Mr. Bryden: How can you say it is untrue?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I know perfectly well that there were negotiations.

Mr. Bryden: The official side offered 31 cents an hour—that much I know about it—and that was the end of their offer, notwithstanding what else could be put forward as to the very low wages they had been paying. And I did not go over these low wages just for the purpose of lecturing the Provincial Treasurer—he always accepts the lectures in such a genial mood; he never gets irritated—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will just listen until you run down.

Mr. Bryden: I know that; that is the attitude of the Minister. That is the attitude that causes your troubles.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do not have any troubles.

Mr. Bryden: You do not have troubles? Not much! I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer genuinely believes this; this is another problem. He does not know when people are discontented. He just smiles and pats them on the back and he thinks that everybody is smiling just as he is, but it is not true.

However, I was calling attention to the disgracefully low wages that the government was paying even as late as 1965. I was doing that for the purpose of showing the difficult position from which one starts any genuine negotiations, and the vitiating effect that this will have on any arbitration.

I do not care what the arbitrators do; they are in a difficult position when they start with such disgracefully low wages, and negotiations are vitiated when they start with such disgracefully low wages. It is very difficult to get them up to a fair level, except over a long period of time.

I have sat as an arbitrator myself on occasion, or as a member of an arbitration board, and I can tell you what arbitrators usually do—they saw the thing down the middle. That is the way they find the revealed truth and distilled justice of the universe. There are really no fundamental principles of justice which one can apply to these things. It is really a matter of sawing the thing off as best you can.

The problem in the current arbitration is that there is really no basis for making a saw, because the parties are so completely far apart. I hope the government will not look on this arbitration award—whatever it may be—as the final answer to the problem.

The government has got to be prepared to recognize this as only the beginning in establishing a proper system of bargaining within the civil service and a proper system of wages. I know that the Provincial Treasurer now is very mad and is going to—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not mad; not the slightest, not the slightest.

Mr. Bryden: One thing I would like to ask the Provincial Treasurer, why was it found necessary in his recent advertisements

for clerks and typists to advertise not at his class 1 rate, but at his class 2 rate?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am informed, and I know that this happens all the time, that if we are in a market where the number of applications are likely to be smaller when there is not a surplus of labour in that area, that we recruit at lower than the starting rate—

Mr. Bryden: You mean higher.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Or higher, rather, than the starting rate and this would likely be the reason.

I would point out to the hon. member that in 1965—he says that we do not negotiate, but for how many employees were the wages agreed upon by negotiation at that time? I think around 20,000. At least 20,000 where there was negotiation and agreement. You are quite unfair to say that we are not anxious to negotiate, because we are anxious to negotiate, so that really your opinion and ours is not the same in that respect.

Mr. Bryden: No, I know it is not. Of course, you are also dealing with an association that is acquiring experience in negotiating, but some of your settlements were not very desirable settlements—even the agreed-to settlement rate of $3,200 a year, and that—

Hon. Mr. Allan: It is very difficult to please you, is it not? If we negotiate with the civil servants and come to an agreement, we settle—

Mr. Bryden: You have not settled this time—

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do this and at this time you say, "Well, but your settlement was poor."

Mr. Bryden: As long as the civil service association was in the position in which they were ready to accept substandard wages in settlements, then you got along with them all right on your wage negotiations. You did not get along with them very well on a lot of other things, and now that they have started pushing you to pay living wages instead of substandard wages, you have trouble.

I am told that in your pay research leading up to the current cyclical review which finally ended up in arbitration, actually you and the civil service association pay researchers came to similar results, using the third quartile. But then you made an arbitrary reduction of 25 per cent. Now is that correct? You arrived at a much higher figure than you actually offered on the basis of your own principles of pay research.

You arrived at it; you used the third quartile and then you cut it 25 per cent. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, I am not familiar with any of the details of the negotiations prior to the board.

Mr. Bryden: Why is the hon. Provincial Treasurer not familiar with it? Is that not his responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I had confidence in those who were carrying it out.

Mr. Bryden: That is all right and I am glad he has confidence, but we want to know what went on. Those who carry the responsibility should be here to advise the Provincial Treasurer, to tell him what went on. If any of the information is genuinely considered as classified, as information that could not be revealed in the public interest, okay, you always have that way out, but the Provincial Treasurer does not have the escape that he simply does not know and cannot be bothered trying to find out.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 308?

Mr. Bryden: No, Mr. Chairman, apparently the Minister does not want to follow up the wage situation any further. I would like to turn now to another matter that I have given notice of before, and that is the question of superannuation.

First of all, the Minister was good enough to provide me with an answer to my question on the number of public servants and civil servants in the employ of the province. The figure he gave me, as I got it down, was that there are 55,941 public servants; that is the whole group in the service of the province. I would like to know how many of those are not covered by The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The ones covered are the civil servants including the probationary staff.

Mr. Bryden: There are 43,141 civil servants; how many of them are covered?

Hon. Mr. Allan: They are all covered.

Mr. Bryden: Well then, there are almost 13,000 people who are public servants, none of them covered, I take it, by The Public Service Superannuation Act. I had thought some were, but apparently not. Thirteen thousand! Why is that number so large? That is about a quarter of the total, I would think.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Chairman, those figures can convey very little, as a matter of fact—

Mr. Bryden: Well, the hon. Provincial Treasurer should make them so they can convey—

Hon. Mr. Allan: —because they include all our summer help, those people who are having short-time employment, seasonal help. There is a small group of casuals who have been steadily employed and which I referred to in my report last night.

Mr. Bryden: Let us get down to specifics. There is a figure of 55,941—well, let us take the difference—there is a figure of close to 13,000—12,800 people—who are public servants, but not civil servants, and this is the group I am mainly interested in. May I ask, first of all, did the figures he gave me refer to a specific date, or were they the average for a year, or just how were these figures arrived at?

Hon. Mr. Allan: They were the figures at the end of December.

Mr. Bryden: At the end of December of 1965? Well, then, we can take everything on that date. As of that date, there were 12,800 public servants who were not civil servants. How many of these people were the seasonal type of employees which the government takes on in great quantities?

Hon. Mr. Allan: At least 8,000. Some figure above 8,000.

Mr. Bryden: At the end of December?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: Where were these people employed?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know whether the hon. member knows, but this type of employee is employed by the departments not through the civil service. I do not have a record of the departments in which they were.

Mr. Bryden: I would like the figure of how many actually were in this—the hon. Minister named a number of different categories, seasonal, casual, and so on—I would like these various categories, and I would like the figure broken down by categories.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do not have those figures.

Mr. Bryden: Why not? Surely somebody has them.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I just got through telling the member that these people are not engaged through the civil service. They are engaged by various departments.

Mr. Bryden: Where was the total obtained from?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We got it from the departments.

Mr. Bryden: All right, you had the breakdown by departments when you were accumulating the total. I get tired of Ministers over there, the Provincial Treasurer, telling me he has the total, but he does not have the components that went into the total; which he used to arrive at the total. The only way you could have arrived at the total was by adding up the components. Now, I want the components.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not have the information here of where they are.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not have the information as to where they were, or what they were doing.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it is rather difficult when the Minister will not give that kind of information. Incidentally, how does the Minister define casual—what is a casual employee?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Just what I have told the hon. member. A casual is an employee who is engaged by a department on the authority of the Minister of that department.

Mr. Bryden: How long can he continue to be employed and still be called casual?

Hon. Mr. Allan: He can continue to be employed for any period of time if the work is such that it might be a type of employment that could end at any time. This includes the group of tradesmen who are employed by the departments on contracts really, who do not receive fringe benefits of any kind.

Mr. Bryden: Well, could a casual employee be employed for as much as three years?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes. Some tradesmen have been here for 15 years.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Provincial Treasurer is now talking about tradesmen.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They are part of the group.

Mr. Bryden: Are they still provided with fringe benefits, notwithstanding the fact that in their trades now in private employment they are getting substantial fringe benefits? They are still left with none at all? No protection of any kind against any of the contingencies of life?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not well enough informed to give the member the information on this because these persons are employed on the authority of the Ministers of the various departments. Some of them are on contract. I am not familiar with it. This is really the civil service estimates.

Mr. Bryden: When we try to deal with these under other departments, then we are told it should be raised under civil service. I really think that there should be a central personnel registry at least in the government where information relating to all forms of government employment should be accumulated on a centralized basis. It is a very difficult thing to get information by going to every single department. Even though I can see that in regard to seasonal workers for example, on highways it would be ridiculous for the civil service department to be involved in their hiring. But, I think it should at the same time have the basic information as to the terms on which these people are hired, and also the numbers that are hired from year to year.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn now to the civil servants. According to the answer given to me by the Minister, on December 31 there were 43,141 civil servants of whom 7,913, or it would appear about 15 per cent, were on the probationary staff. What constitutes being on probationary staff?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Principally less than one year in employment, that is, everyone is taken on probationary staff when they are employed. If they are not Canadian citizens they stay on the probationary staff until they become naturalized Canadians.

Mr. Bryden: You will not take non-citizens on permanent staff under any circumstances, I take it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: They get all the benefits. They can transfer their benefits when they go on the permanent staff.

Mr. Bryden: Are they covered by superannuation?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: Now, apart from this group then, are there any people on probationary staff who have been employed with you for more than one year?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Those persons who are retained in the service after age 65, even if they have been civil servants, they go back on probationary staff.

Mr. Bryden: How many of them are there? The reason I am asking these questions is it seems to me that your probationary staff is quite large. It represents a turnover of employment, or there is some other—

Hon. Mr. Allan: There are 621 over 65.

Mr. Bryden: So there are more than 7,000 then, who are not in that category. I do not imagine there would be very many who are not citizens, so that apparently it would follow from this, that you have more than 7,000 employees out of the 43,000 who have less than one year's service. Would that follow?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am sorry, I do not believe I got your question.

Mr. Bryden: I was suggesting that you take out the past-65 group and those who are not citizens, and you still have 7,000 people with less than one year's service. Would that follow from what you have been saying?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, I am informed that included as well in this group are nurse aides and attendants in the training courses at the hospitals. It is really not any disadvantage to be on the probationary staff. They have the same rights and privileges as the civil servants. If you had some concern about that, your mind could be put at rest.

Mr. Bryden: There clearly must be some difference, or else I do not think there would be a difference in their status. If their status is the same, then I do not see why the distinction is made. I would presume there will be at least a difference in the security of tenure of employment, would there not be?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, they can be dismissed and they do not have the privilege of grieving within one year of service. But after they have been there the second year, they have the same rights on the probationary staff as they would have if they had been civil servants.

Mr. Bryden: Does the Minister consider that is a reasonable length of time to permit an employee to be dismissed without really any cause being shown, because that is what the lack of grievance procedure indicates?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think it is generally accepted as a reasonable time.

Mr. Bryden: What do you mean by generally accepted?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think it is the practice.

Mr. Bryden: It is the practice in the Ontario government. It is not the practice in very many other places. Under most union contracts, three months is considered to be the time, even less than that in some cases. 30 days. A lot depends on the—

Hon. Mr. Allan: There are two sides to every coin. If you were going to limit the possibility of discontinuing employment at three months, many persons who are given a chance to try out for a particular job would not be given a chance. I think the year is a very satisfactory and reasonable length of time.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest to the Minister that it may be necessary for some types of employment, but for employment requiring very little skill or qualification it is quite a long time. However, I will not pursue that any further.

I want now to consider the question of the integration of your civil service superannuation plan with the Canada pension plan. This is not an easy subject to discuss, naturally, and perhaps the best way to start into it would be to ask the hon. Minister how much the government will be paying into the superannuation fund under the integration plan that is now apparently decided upon, and how much it would have—let me rephrase my question.

How much will it be paying both into the superannuation fund and into the Canada pension fund, on the one hand, and how much would it have paid into the superannuation fund, if the Canada pension plan had not come into effect? Do you follow me?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, but I do not have that information.

Mr. Bryden: Could the Minister get it for us?

Mr. Chairman: Would that come under this vote?

Mr. Bryden: I am going on the basis of the assurance the Provincial Treasurer himself gave me that this is where it comes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The discussion I had with —the answer I gave was given with the thought that I explained this morning, that to discuss the casual staff that we have been discussing—I would point out again that a bill is coming into the House covering this whole situation. I do not have the information at my fingertips to give any details, and would not, anyway, give any details in connection with that bill that is coming into the House, I suggest it is a pure waste of time to discuss this matter, in view of there being another opportunity to discuss it. However, I do not have that information.

Mr. Bryden: Just let us get the facts. I am getting tired of this runaround.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine said that you would give him the figures.

Mr. Bryden: It is always that the place to raise these matters is someplace other than the one we are at.

One thing that surely should be self-evident, even to the hon. Minister, is that in discussion of a bill on second reading, we cannot ask for information of the type for which I am now asking. I am not going to discuss this bill. I do not even know what is in his bill, but there is certain information I want, and I suspect that information will be necesary for an intelligent discussion of his bill. He may or may not give it to us, but I can foresee right now if we get up and try to ask for it, the Speaker will have us in our chairs, quite properly, in no time flat. That is one piece of information I would like.

Somewhere in this government there is somebody who is responsible for The Public Service Superannuation Act and I am going to keep looking until I can find him. I understood from what the Minister said the basic responsibility other than for pure administrative details is in the civil service commission. This is the civil service commission's vote, and I want to get the information that we require.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would ask you if it is reasonable to expect The Department of Civil Service, which does not have any of these figures; has nothing whatever to do with it—

Mr. Bryden: Who has them?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The Treasury has the figures as to the amount of money that we

have paid out and this was in the Treasury estimates. Under civil service estimates, I am asking you if this is a reasonable request?

Mr. Bryden: That is absolutely no good at all. I raised this precise matter under Treasury, and the hon. Minister said, bring it up under civil service. Now, I am not going to take a runaround like that. The precise matter I raised, and you said, bring it up under civil service.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, you raised it on casuals.

Mr. Bryden: Now you are telling me I should have taken it up under Treasury. I am asking you to get the information. I think it is a reasonable request and you ought to get it, and I think it is a disgrace that a Minister would give any member a runaround like this.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I did not give you the runaround.

Mr. Bryden: You certainly did. You told me under Treasury to raise it here.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not without the means of discussing it, because the whole matter is—one time you stand up on your feet and say: "Why do you want to discuss this before the award is out, wait until we get the information." The next moment, you say, "Give it to us now before we get the information." Which time; which is the correct approach?

Mr. Bryden: This is a very good insight, Mr. Chairman, into the method of operation of this government. They refused a reasonable request to defer these estimates until information was available. They went ahead, and now when we ask for the information they tell us we are being unreasonable in asking for it. They do not want us to get the information until we have no opportunity to discuss it. This is what this Minister considers to be the ideal time to provide information, after every opportunity has passed to discuss it.

I have put forward, I think, a perfectly reasonable request. I realize that the hon. Minister can arbitrarily refuse to provide information if he wants. I think he should be prepared to justify his refusal. I have given him a question with regard to the superannuation programme. It is a question on which it should be possible to provide information. I would ask that he provide it. I may say that there is certain other information I want, too, but I would certainly want that. I think it is fair to ask that this be provided on Monday. Even if it has not been accumulated between this afternoon and Monday morning, you can get it.

Mr. Chairman: Dealing with that one particular point, I remember the Provincial Treasurer did indicate that the amount of money would be paid through the Treasury. He was asked at that time where we could discuss it and it was suggested that perhaps it could be discussed under this department. The Minister has indicated that there is a bill coming before the House and you have said that it is difficult for you to get that information on the second reading. Would it not be convenient for you to get that information when we are in committee of the whole House?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, our decision as to whether or not we will support the principle of the bill often depends on information. At any rate, I think the bill is a red herring; it has nothing to do with the matter we are dealing with.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Before putting the Minister's motion, I have been asked to inform the House that at 1.30 p.m., Monday, which is the 75th anniversary of the death of Sir John A. MacDonald, a wreath will be placed at the foot of his monument at Queen's Park crescent, directly south of the buildings. Rev. A. W. Downer will give the invocation.

Also present will be city of Toronto and Metro officials. All members are cordially invited.

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 130



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 6, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 6, 1966

Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading 4273

Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966, bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, first reading 4273

Homes for the Aged Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading 4273

Statement re Sir John A. Macdonald commemoration service, Mr. Yaremko 4273

Statement re award to Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope 4274

Questions of Mr. Cecile re severely disturbed children, Mr. S. Lewis 4275

Questions of Mr. Wishart re Ford cars in the Windsor police force, Mr. MacDonald 4276

Estimates, Department of Civil Service, Mr. Allan, concluded 4277

Estimates, Office of the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Allan 4287

Estimates, Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Robarts 4301

Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Spooner 4301

Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported 4307

Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 4307

Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, reported 4307

Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, reported 4307

Recess, 6 o'clock 4313

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as visitors to the Legislature today in the east gallery, students from Maywood public school, St. Catharines, and Woodland public school, St. Catharines.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT 1962-1963

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the amendment relates to the sharing of operating costs with benevolent organizations which sponsor private homes for the aged and other charitable institutions.

The new Act provides for increasing the sharing arrangements in favour of these private organizations. Provision is made for an 80 per cent provincial sharing of the operating costs, a raise from the previous 75.

THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, this new Act relates to our rehabilitation services programme, which is presently shared between my department and the federal department concerned.

This legislation replaces the previous Rehabilitation Services Act. It provides for an extension of facilities and services in the field of sheltered workshops for the handicapped. Provision is also made for sharing in the capital costs of these workshops and for lending support to their operating costs.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister, before he proceeds to the next bill that he is going to introduce, does he plan to refer the bill he has just introduced to the standing committee on health and welfare?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, I can do this.

THE HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the amendment to this Act is related to the specialized care required by handicapped persons who cannot be appropriately cared for in their own homes or in existing homes for the aged, hospitals or other institutions. The type of facility I want to describe would be known as rest home accommodation. It is a grey area because the emphasis is not on treatment nor on the kind of care usually available in homes for the aged or required in hospitals. Persons who would benefit from rest home accommodation would be those whose physical condition is stabilized and who require continuing concentrated care. Persons accepted would be adults of any age and they would have to qualify for admission in the opinion of two medical practitioners. One such opinion would be required from a regular physician of a public home for the aged and the other would probably come from an independent doctor in the community.

I would suggest that rest homes of from 30 to 40 beds would provide a suitable balance in staffing which would involve professional nursing services around the clock. These public homes would be operated by

counties, cities or separated towns. Provision is also made for a local municipality to build a rest home. In this event the county in which the municipality is located would have to give the necessary approval. This requirement is considered essential because it is related to the overall planning on the part of the counties in providing domiciliary care and the working out of local financing arrangements.

We believe that the building of this needed type of accommodation will be particularly appropriate for the small centres in the province. We consider it possible that such homes can be standardized with a choice of plans that will provide the ultimate in properly designed interior arrangements.

I would add that there is at the present time accommodation in public homes for the aged, to take care of some 12,000 persons. The average age of these residents is about 80 years.

The homes for the aged today are serving a high percentage of cases who require bed or semi-bed care. These homes are not entirely designed or intended to provide concentrated nursing services. I prefer to look on our homes as an individual's own home because they make available all the comforts and care needed by the residents. Nursing service, however, is sometimes necessary, which falls just short perhaps of that available in a hospital-type setting. In other words, homes for the aged are not meant to serve as hospitals or nursing home facilities.

We feel that where municipalities proceed in establishing rest homes, the proper accommodation will be assured to serve the type of case that requires nursing care. In this manner, we believe that there will be a relief of some of the pressure on hospitals in caring for persons who do not require active bed treatment.

We have reasonable assurance also that a proper programme would be developed in the rest homes to provide a wholesome social life through worthwhile activities for the persons accommodated. Provisions of this nature will be made through the boards of management concerned and auxiliary community services.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a question? Will the capital grants and per diem grants under the present Homes for the Aged Act simply be extended to the rest homes?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The same sharing basis, yes.

COMMEMORATION SERVICE

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I shall ask permission of this House to have noted for the journals and records of this House the following:

That in the front of the Parliament Buildings at Queen's Park, Toronto, at the foot of his statue, there took place ceremonies commemorating the 75th anniversary of the death of Sir John A. Macdonald.

The commemorative ceremonies began with a procession to the monument by the members of the government and the members of the Legislature of all parties, led by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Legislature, the Clerk and the staff of the Assembly. The Speaker of the Legislature, the Hon. D. H. Morrow, called for order and asked the hon. member of the Legislature for Dufferin-Simcoe, Mr. Downer, to offer the invocation which followed. There then followed addresses by the hon. John Yaremko (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship) representing the Prime Minister and government of Ontario, the hon. John Robarts, also leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario; Mr. Elmer W. Sopha, QC, member of the Legislature for Sudbury, representing the leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, Mr. Andrew Thompson, leader of the Liberal Party; and Donald C. MacDonald, the leader of the New Democratic Party and member of the Legislature for York South.

There also participated Mr. William D. Dennison, president of the council of the city of Toronto, who spoke on behalf of the citizens of Toronto, the council and specifically the members of the Sir John A. Macdonald chapter of the IODE.

Wreaths on behalf of the foregoing were laid at the foot of the monument and a moment of silence was observed. There followed a benediction and then the Speaker concluded the ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, let it be noted that we all met as Canadians to pay tribute to the greatest of all Canadians.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to draw the attention of this House to an award which last week was made to The Department of Mines by the Canadian public relations society at its annual meeting in Ottawa.

The certificate for the best specimen of its class of public relations in print went to the department for the production of the map

folder, "All that Glisters," which was designed specifically for the purpose of bringing an understanding of mining and geology within reach of the average intelligent layman. That it has succeeded in its purpose would appear to be evidenced by the fact that since its production late last year, about 150,000 copies have already been distributed and a further printing is now on order.

I believe that great credit is due the members of the cartographic unit of The Department of Mines and their conception of such an artistic and informative production.

The award reads as follows:

> Awards of excellence to The Ontario Department of Mines for the best education brochure produced by industry or associations. This entry produced under the direction of W. Treadwell has been selected by the awards committee for outstanding merit in design and conduct.
>
> *Signed,* The Canadian Public Relations Society Incorporated,
> J. H. Yocum, *National Pres.*

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, I would like to endeavour to answer questions which were put to me last Friday by my friend, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

In answer to question 1: Is the Minister aware that there are at least 31 disturbed and neglected children presently known to the Metropolitan Toronto children's aid society, but for whom nothing can be done because no appropriate resource is available?

The whole matter of severely disturbed children is one of which my department is very much aware. It is not a simple but a complex matter, involving a rapidly increasing juvenile population, a greater mobility of people, greater use of existing facilities and much more awareness of the need to identify and treat disturbed children earlier than in the past.

Both The Training Schools Act and The Child Welfare Act have been recently amended and this, combined with the factors I have mentioned, has resulted in a successively greater volume of cases coming to the attention of the two children's aid societies in Metropolitan Toronto during 1966.

We have consulted with the two societies concerned and find that the 31 children mentioned in the question are not wards of the societies but referred to them by the juvenile and family court for various reasons, such as being out of the control of their parents, being expelled from school, and acting in a variety of ways not acceptable to the community. These children are often very ill mentally and in need of confinement and treatment. Just as it takes time to secure an appointment with your doctor and further time to have necessary tests made, so it takes time to examine and evaluate fully the needs of such children.

We are assured, sir, that such evaluation and assessments are proceeding and that the matter is being dealt with as quickly and as thoroughly as possible.

Question 2: Would the Minister agree that this destroys the intent of The Child Welfare Act?

My answer is that we would by no means agree that the intent of The Child Welfare Act is being destroyed. Rather we would submit that the emphasis on preventive and protective work that the new Act spells out is, in fact, being recognized in the increase in referrals, and in the larger number of younger children being referred.

The two societies concerned, which together care for approximately one-third of all the children in the care of the 53 children's aid societies of this province, are endeavouring to meet these increases in a variety of ways, such as expanded reception home facilities and additional group homes.

Question 3: Is the Minister aware that there are at least nine severely disturbed children presently in the care of the Metropolitan CAS who are in need of institutional placement which is nowhere available?

This question refers to nine severely disturbed children for whom the Metropolitan Toronto children's aid society is allegedly looking for institutional placement. This morning I received a wire from one of our children's institutions offering 12 beds and I have passed this information on to the society.

In the past some of our children's institutions have admitted children from outside Ontario as there were not sufficient requests from inside the province, but this situation now seems to be changing.

Question 4: Would the Minister agree that this destroys the intent of the recent amendments to The Child Welfare Act; and question 5: In view of the foregoing what action is the Minister prepared to take, emergency or otherwise, to correct the situation?

I would think that these questions might have been answered in reply to question 2.

Question 6: In view of the number involved, namely, 40 cases, would the Minister

consider special funds for the expansion of various treatment centres in Metropolitan Toronto under The Children's Institutions Act?

The answer is, Mr. Speaker, that funds are readily available, and there is no lack of them, at the rate of $5,000 per bed for any corporation that wishes to expand or to build new facilities that would appear to meet a proven need.

We also make similar grants available to the children's aid societies for the building of group hospitals so that youngster can be dealt with in their own communities, closer to their families. At present there are at least 15 societies planning or building group homes. In addition there are approximately 35 group homes already in existence. We have several corporations or groups interested in becoming incorporated which are making plans to develop institutional care for the mentally retarded or the mentally ill.

Mr. S. Lewis: With the Minister's permission, I would like to put a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The hon. member can ask and if I can possibly answer it now I will; otherwise I shall take it as notice.

Mr. S. Lewis: It is a general question, because I appreciate it will not be easy to give a precise answer.

In view of the facts which emerged on the weekend that there are 240 children requiring institutional placement presently in the care of children's aid societies across Ontario, and a ratio of three more for every one of those requiring care, namely, 1,000 children across the province; does the hon. Minister not think that in bulk this does have an effect of undermining The Child Welfare Act in that neglect under that Act can be emotional deprivation as well as physical deprivation?

The second and ancillary question I wanted to ask, Mr. Speaker, is: Does the hon. Minister not recognize that the daily denial of these facilities to the children mentioned is just systematically destroying them—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I am sorry; the member does not really give his question properly. He intermingles with his questions a lot of statement of fact or opinion, and instead of waiting for the one supplementary question to be answered he reels off two or three or four.

The other day, the hon. member may recall, that he gave to the hon. Minister of Health five questions without stopping, all of a supplementary nature mixed with some statement of fact. It is most difficult for the Minister and it is really against the rules of procedure.

I would ask the hon. member, if he requests a supplementary question to simply ask if the Minister would answer the question, and then ask it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have asked my questions, Mr. Speaker, I remind you that the hon. Minister of Health answered all five systematically and ably; I did not think that two would be too many for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

Could he answer the questions I asked?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As far as theorizing is concerned, I will not get into an argument with the hon. member. I do not agree with his thinking in this matter. However, I will take his questions as notice and will find out the exact situation. We are already looking into this picture to find out what the number is across the province, but as far as the theory of undermining the Act is concerned, I do not agree with my friend, I can answer that right now.

Mr. Speaker: Now, if the member would ask his second question, then the Minister could answer it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well all right, Mr. Speaker, I will in fact ask it again.

If the hon. Minister disagrees with me, then what happens to these children described by the Minister as severely disturbed for whom no facilities are available? Are we not in effect destroying them in the same sense that one physically does?

I have repeated the question as Mr. Speaker asked me to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I believe I have answered that.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, a question was submitted by the hon. member for York South when I was not in the House on Friday:

> Is the hon. Attorney General aware that 28 Ford cars, 1966 model, in the Windsor police force have been partially immobilized for the past three months by a directive to all uniformed staff to the effect the cars must not be driven over 50 miles an hour until further orders?

I was able to get in touch with the chief of police of Windsor on Friday and inquire regarding the matter. He sent me by Telex a report which I would read:

> Because of an accident to a police vehicle in which the officer had alleged accident due to poor braking at high speed of a new Ford, a directive was issued on April 7, 1966, by the deputy chief of the uniformed division restricting speed to 50 miles per hour.
>
> The claim of poor braking power was never substantiated. However, the order was not officially cancelled, pending clearance from the public works central garage. We now have 28 new 1966 Fords in our police fleet.
>
> A report has now been received from the commissioner of works advising that:
>
> Pursuant to the report alleging defective brakes causing an accident, we met certain representatives of the Ford Motor Company, including the national supervisor of fleet service and the service manager from the local dealership. In company with three of our supervisors extreme test conditions were applied to several of the units. The results indicated that normal braking was attained, that no design or other defects were apparent in the system and that brake fade was not excessive. The only recommendation we received was to replace the standard self-adjusting brake with manually adjusting brakes to enable greater precision in adjusting. This changeover is now being effected.

The Telex goes on:

> From a mechanical point of view it would appear to be unnecessary to retain the 50-mile-per-hour speed restriction.

That is from the board of works to the chief of police.

The second part of the question—can the hon. Minister inform the House the nature of the defect in the cars which led to this directive?

I think I should perhaps be a little critical of that question. It was not, as I understand it, a defect in the car which led to the directive, but the allegation by the police officer who had the accident, that it was his brakes that caused it, which led to the directive, and the matter was then investigated.

The matter, as was indicated—the third part of the question, the matter under review by the police commission—is under review by the Windsor police commission. Although I have not spoken to them or to any member of that commission directly, I understand the order is in process of being removed, but I have no official word on that.

We have no knowledge of any other municipality having such trouble.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney General if changes were made in the braking arrangements of these cars in order to meet the requirements of the police force? Have similar changes been made more broadly for the protection of the general public?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I cannot answer at the moment, Mr. Speaker, because although I have tried to reach the Windsor police commission, I do not know what their action has been with respect to this. I should like to get that further information before I make further inquiries.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 21st order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. H. Cowling in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

On vote 308:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, at adjournment time on Friday, I was in the process of trying to elicit certain information from the hon. Provincial Treasurer with regard to the integration of the civil service superannuation plan with the Canada pension plan.

I put a specific question to him in the hope that he might be able to get the information for me between noon on Friday and 2 o'clock today, and perhaps I could put the question to him again, to see if he has been able to get the information.

I asked him how much the government will contribute to both the superannuation plan and the Canada pension plan under the integrated programme that has now been approved by the government; and, on the other hand, how much would it have contributed to the superannuation plan only, if the Canada pension plan had not come into force.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, with the distinct understanding this is not in these estimates, I am happy to give the hon. member the information, because it does come from the Treasury estimates.

There is no difference whatever in the amount that is contributed on behalf of the public servants. The amount is exactly the same. We are contributing more, but that would be because of higher salaries and some increase in the number of civil servants.

Last year, that is the period April 1, 1965, to March 31, 1966, the amount contributed was $17,852,252. The period from April 1, 1966, to March 31, 1967, the amount contributed—and this is estimated, because it could not be definite at this time, but this is our best estimate—will be $20,345,800.

Of that amount, approximately $700,000 will be contributed on the salaries of casual employees.

In addition—and this will be pointed out, it may come up in discussion of the bill—this year, the government's contribution to employee insurance plans, and this was given weight in the development of the whole fringe benefit plan, the amount contributed, April 1, 1966, to March 31, 1967, is estimated to be $3,850,000.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I wish to pursue this matter a little further, but before I do so, perhaps I should clear up this point that the hon. Provincial Treasurer keeps raising: that I am asking these questions at the wrong time. He is now suggesting that I should have asked them when we were under the estimates of the Treasury.

When we were under the estimates of the Treasury, I raised the matter with him and he told me that the proper time to raise such matters would be under the estimates of the civil service department. In case there is any doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer back to the debates of the day in question, to page 2398-1 of the typed transcript, where the following is recorded:

> *Mr. Bryden:* So would this then be the best place to ask about such matters, for example, as the integration of the plan with the Canada pension plan?
>
> *Hon. Mr. Allan:* Mr. Chairman, I think the division between The Department of Civil Service and Treasury is that The Department of Civil Service decides who are eligible for payment, the Treasury simply then—
>
> *Mr. Bryden:* Makes the payment?
>
> *Hon. Mr. Allan:* Makes the payment.
>
> *Mr. Bryden:* So that the question that I mentioned as to the method of integration of your plan with the Canada pension plan would be better asked under the estimates of the civil service?
>
> *Hon. Mr. Allan:* Yes.

Now, it is on the strength of that, Mr. Chairman, that I did not pursue the matter under the estimates of the Treasury and that I want to pursue it now. I appreciate the trouble the hon. Provincial Treasurer went to in getting certain figures, but unfortunately they do not answer the question I asked. I would assume that payments for superannuation made by the government—incidentally, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should just clear one thing up quite definitely. Were the figures that the Provincial Treasurer gave me a couple of minutes ago, were those for the contributions of the government only to the superannuation plan and Canada pension plan?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, government contributions only.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, these figures that the hon. Minister gave me were figures for the government contributions only. Now, one would expect that there would be an increase between two successive years. Salaries are up and probably the total staff is up, so that would produce an increase, but what I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, and what my question was designed to elicit, was how much would the government have contributed this year if there had not been the integration? In other words, what I want to know is, is it contributing more or less?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Exactly the same.

Mr. Bryden: Exactly the same. There is no difference in what you would have contributed? Well, how is the integration with the Canada pension plan affecting the benefits of the employees, then, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Chairman, until the bill is introduced, we are talking about something that has not come into effect. I am not trying to throw curves or do anything unreasonable in this matter, and I think that certainly I would expect that there would be a further opportunity to discuss this matter. There is a new public service superannuation bill coming into the House, at which time you will have an opportunity to discuss it in as much length, I should think, as you would like. You can understand that it is not my intention to discuss now what is in that bill. I think that is only reasonable, I do not think I am being unreasonable in this because I would want to be reasonable.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the integration with the Canada pension plan not yet in effect?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The plan as outlined in a circular to the employees is in effect, but it is operating really without the authority of The Public Service Act which will be brought in in a very few days.

Mr. Bryden: I am not complaining about that, Mr. Chairman, I understand that it was necessary to—at least that the government considered it desirable to make the adjustment as of January 1.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I might explain to the hon. member that it was desirable on behalf of the employees to make sure that they began and got the benefits of the Canada pension plan from January 1 this year, and this was the reason for our having handled it in the way we are.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, well, I am not, as I say, complaining about that. Because the Canada pension plan came into effect on January 1; the government made the changes that it considered appropriate effective on that date and it will now be shortly coming in with validating legislation to have it—shall we say, legalized? That I can understand. I really think the bill could have been brought in a bit sooner than early June because of the fact that the change had been made effective January 1. However, I am not going to quibble about that either. All I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that there really is no necessity for the Provincial Treasurer to be so coy about this matter. The change is already in operation.

Why then should he be telling us in effect that it is not appropriate to discuss it until he brings in the bill which he says he is going to bring in in the near future? He knows what the conditions are, they are already in effect. I am seeking further information about the new conditions as they apply to the plan. The hon. Minister has just said that contributions of the government are unaffected by the integration, that the total of its contributions to the superannuation plan and the Canada pension plan are exactly what the contributions would have been to the superannuation plan if there had been no integration. I want to get information about the other two possible variables. Are the total contributions of the employees affected, or are they just the same as they would have been if there had been no integration?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, they are just the same.

Mr. Bryden: Well, then, are the benefits of the employee affected: Are they just the same as they would have been if there had been no integration, are they larger or are they smaller?

Hon. Mr. Allan: None will be smaller, and many will be larger.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, was the civil service association consulted with regard to the integration of this plan and did it agree, if it was consulted, to the terms that the government finally made operative?

Hon. Mr. Allan: They were consulted and I have a memorandum of understanding. I have a commitment to make the civil service association aware of what I intend to bring into the House in the bill as soon as it is ready, to show to them; and I would like to show it to them to indicate what is in the bill before I bring it in.

Mr. Bryden: That is fine, Mr. Chairman. In that case I will leave the matter where it now stands until the bill comes before us. While we are on this subject of consultation with the civil service association, did the government consult with the civil service association or does it plan to do so with regard to the changes in The Public Service Act that the hon. Minister plans to introduce later this session?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: You have consulted?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have consulted and we intend to consult with them further—their representatives.

Mr. Bryden: Is the situation with regard to that bill much the same as with regard to the superannuation bill, as far as consultation is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: Now, Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer another question on Friday. I do not know if he remembers or not, but at the time he indicated that this staff was trying to get the information I sought. I asked him how many employees were taken on to the staff of Ontario Hospitals during the past two years approximately—I should state that I did not insist on precisely two years—and also how many of those employees taken on in that period are still there.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I may inform the hon. member that we are endeavouring to do this. I am informed that at this time it will be one more day before the information will be available but that we are working on it.

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps, then, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister will give me the information when he gets it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will give you the information.

Mr. Bryden: Now, I am told, Mr. Chairman—and it is very hard for an outsider to be completely satisfied with this information —but I am told that there is a shortage of hospital attendants in the various Ontario Hospitals. I think it is possible that there has been quite a large inflow and outgo in that category of hospital attendant over the last couple of years. However, the Minister does not have the information at the moment and I will not pursue that point.

But I am told there is a shortage of attendants in many of the hospitals. For example, in the Ontario Hospital at Hamilton I have been told that the shortage of attendants is somewhat in the vicinity of 35 or 40. When I say shortage, I mean the amount by which the actual staff falls short of the establishment or normal complement, whatever you want to call it. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, before I pursue that any further, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer is in a position to confirm or deny that statement?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to give the hon. member any definite information, but if he will remember, I did point out in the remarks that I made before my estimates that this particular problem presently applies in this area; that is the Hamilton-Toronto-Oshawa area. Of course, this brings up a matter which I do not propose to discuss now, but there is this matter of zoning where you find that salaries in this area do not compare with those in other institutions, on as favourable a basis as outside this area.

However, if it is serious—I have heard nothing directly from the civil service or from The Department of Health people—but I will be glad to get the hon. member the information.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister reminds me that he did deal with this point in his introductory remarks and I think what he said in his introductory remarks may point to the crux of the problem. I would take it from those remarks that difficulties in maintaining staff at an adequate level in Ontario Hospitals are occurring in areas where there is some mobility of labour. In other words, if an employee, in Penetanguishene shall we say, has a house and various roots in the community, it is very hard for him to escape from his employment no matter how dissatisfied he may be with it. If, however, he lives in the golden horseshoe or other similar areas where there are many different employment opportunities, it is quite easy for him to find other employment. He does not have to sell his house for one thing, and if he does decide to sell his house there is a market for it, which may not be true in some smaller centres of the province, especially in centres of low economic growth.

I have no doubt at all that important staffing problems are arising in these hospitals. I suspect they are probably also arising in the reform institutions. I am not now talking about staff with specialist qualifications—professional qualifications. We all know the desperate shortage existing in that field but I am now talking about what in many ways is the backbone of the staff of the institutions; the attendants, people in that category.

It is quite clear, I think, that a problem is arising of staffing and I do not think we have to look very far for the reason. The reason is that the wages are too low. Under the new rates that were established by virtue of the cyclical review last year, the starting rate for the hospital attendant is still at the abominably low figure of $3,360 per year.

If an employee takes two years of in-service training and at the end of that time he passes an examination—in other words, if he becomes a skilled employee—he will receive a bottom rate of $4,050. The rate of $4,050 is for a trained, skilled employee in an area where considerable qualifications are required if the job is to be done properly. This is, shall we say, less than the common labourer makes in many establishments in the Oshawa-Toronto-Hamilton-Niagara complex. It is no wonder the government is having trouble staffing its institutions with attendants. It simply does not pay them enough money.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer, when I talked to him about this on Friday, said that the current rates were established under the cyclical review of last year and that they were agreed to by the civil service association. I took it from that, that his position was that —that is, until the next—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Mr. Bryden: Okay!

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not it necessarily. As a matter of fact, we have made changes. We have come to the conclusion that our recruiting rates for attendants in this area were too low and we are raising those to $3,750–$3,900. There is no reason why the government would want to be a poor employer. The government wants to be a good employer. Certainly we look at these things, and we are anxious as well that these institutions are properly staffed. I think the hon. member will find that this will finally be so.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Treasurer says that the recruiting rate has now been raised to $3,700–

Hon. Mr. Allan: $3,750.

Mr. Bryden: $3,750. Has any change been made in the wage scales or is it merely that you have given up on this starvation wage of $3,360? Having found that you cannot possibly hire anybody at that rate, you are now simply going two jumps up the scale in order to find–

Hon. Mr. Allan: It is not unusual for us to recruit above the minimum if it is necessary to do so.

Mr. Bryden: The Provincial Treasurer says it is not unusual. I can believe it is not unusual in view of the low wages you pay to many categories. The plain fact is you cannot get people at your basic scale. That is why it is not unusual. We found that you are doing the same thing with clerks and stenos, you cannot recruit them in your class 1 category, you have to start them off in the class 2 category, so that the class 1 category has become meaningless.

In regard to hospital attendants, apparently you find that you have to go up almost to the top of your recruiting scale in order to get anyone. I would suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that that should indicate to him his whole structure is out of date. It simply is not meeting the need. What he is doing now, I take it, is in order to get anybody to come into the hospitals at all as attendants, instead of taking the rate of $3,360, which is what was established last year, he has gone up the scale within that classification to $3,750. He is using that for a recruiting rate, but he still has not altered any of the other rates applicable to these people. Has the Provincial Treasurer changed the rates for the qualified people, people who take two years of in-service training and then pass an exam in order to get into the fully experienced category? Have those rates been changed? Has the starting level of $4,050–

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, those rates are competitive.

Mr. Bryden: They are competitive with what? You mean the people have now got–

Hon. Mr. Allan: People doing similar work.

Mr. Bryden: What does the hon. Provincial Treasurer classify as similar work and where does he find the rates are competitive?

Hon. Mr. Allan: You find them in municipal institutions, any similar types of institution.

Mr. Bryden: Well, this is one of the difficulties we are always up against, Mr. Chairman, in this area. We follow the pay research principle of comparing these people with similar work elsewhere; and, of course, the similar work elsewhere is similarly underpaid. People working in hospitals are underpaid, it does not matter where you go.

Now, of course, what the hon. Minister has found is that they are now just going out of hospital employment altogether into other types of employment.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, perhaps.

Mr. Bryden: The only reason you had to increase your starting rate was because you simply could not attract anybody. They went into other types of employment instead. But we are faced with a situation, and have been for years, where hospital employees, it does not matter who employs them, are underpaid; everybody underpays them. On the principle of pay research, it then becomes an edict from on high that these people must forever be underpaid.

I am putting forward to the hon. Minister the proposition that the rates of pay for these people are too low, that $4,050 is not an adequate starting rate for a person who has had two years training and has passed an examination.

I suggest to him that if he wants to really live up to what he suggested a few minutes ago was the principle of the government, namely that the government wants to be a good employer, it should not leave itself in the position where it responds only when the market conditions force it to respond. It increased the starting rate because it had no option, because of market conditions. It is still trying to cling to an unduly low rate for the experienced people in the classification.

No doubt this will come up for review next year, at least I think that would be the normal time for review.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that he should consider an interim increase for people in this category. I would also include people in the reform institutions, who in many respects have similar type of work to perform. The rate that was established last year, in my opinion, was too low, but that is a matter we could argue about till doomsday. The point is that it was quite low, and since then the cost of living has gone up quite significantly. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, since these people are in one of the lowest wage categories in the government, and since it is found impossible to recruit them at existing wage levels, I think that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should be prepared to reconsider the rates now paid to these people.

I am not suggesting for a moment that he should do it arbitrarily, I am suggesting that he should—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Is that not what you are suggesting? You are suggesting that I should do it arbitrarily, unilaterally. That is the thing that we do not want to do.

Mr. Bryden: So you just do nothing at all. Well, if—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Would you like it done unilaterally?

Mr. Bryden: I was just on the verge of suggesting to you that you should reopen this matter with the civil service association. Now, I will give a firm undertaking to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that if the civil service association objects to an upward revision of the wage scale of these people during this year, I will—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would advise the hon. member that we are quite capable of dealing with the civil service association ourselves.

Mr. Bryden: Well, will you then put a proposal before them that this particular category should be re-negotiated for this year?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We will deal with the civil service association.

Mr. Bryden: If the civil service association brought in such a proposal to you, would you be prepared to consider it, or would you simply stand on the technicality that these classes cannot be reopened until next year?

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is the responsibility of this government and we will live up to our commitments.

Mr. Bryden: I see, you consider yourself so superior to the House that you will not bother advising the House what your position would be in relation to these matters.

I am asking you, would you be prepared to talk this over—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have given you the answer.

Mr. Bryden: —with the civil service association or would you stand on the legal position that cyclical review does not occur to this group of people until 1967? The hon. Minister is apparently unwilling to answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have given you your answer.

Mr. Bryden: I would point out to him that I am not suggesting any arbitrary, unilateral action.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It sounded to me like that.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it may have sounded like that to you because you would not listen to what I had to say. What I was trying to tell you was that you should put this matter before the civil service association, take it up with them, or alternatively, indicate your willingness to discuss it with them. You see, as the matter stands now, the legal situation is that it cannot be reopened, it is settled for another year. If the government is willing to reconsider it, then I think it should be prepared to give an indication that it is prepared to reconsider it.

I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that if he took this up with the civil service association and if the civil service association should tell him they did not think there should be an increase, I would be quite prepared to withdraw any criticism that I have made of him.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Do not withdraw, it is not that important.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: But until that happens I suggest that he should look at the realities of the situation, that the rates here are too low—and I would think the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions would support me on this. I realize that, in his position, he could not support me openly, but I would think that

in his mind he should support me and, therefore, refrain from his interjections when I am trying to make an argument which I think would benefit his department, as well as The Department of Health.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will permit. Entirely apart from my views on this thing—and I think everybody would know what an individual Minister would feel in respect of increases for his staff—the fact remains that my interjection was that I thought it was quite stupid to suggest to the hon. Minister that in advance of some negotiations he permit his position to be known, that he is prepared to open up negotiations and give an increase in advance.

I mean, the hon. member knows perfectly well, having served, as he said, I think, as a conciliation officer, that you do not go into negotiations that way. The hon. Provincial Treasurer is responsible for the taxpayers' money and I think it is prejudicing the position of the taxpayer for any hon. member to suggest in this Legislature that he go into negotiations in advance, exposing his position that he is prepared to give a certain increase in advance of these negotiations.

I know that if I were going to negotiate salaries on behalf of the taxpayers of this province, I would not want to have my side prejudiced in that way. The hon. member knows perfectly well, if it is going to be done by negotiation, which is the only democratic way to do, that you do not expose your position in advance that way.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, that was a noble effort to becloud the issue. I will now try to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suppose that was a red herring.

Mr. Bryden: That is your expression, but it is a very appropriate one.

I will now try to clarify the issue. I think the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions knows as well as I do that there are no negotiations pending with regard to these employees. The regular cyclical review comes up approximately one year from now.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Much less than that.

Mr. Bryden: This is the point I am trying to make. In the normal procedure within the civil service, there is no basis for re-opening the wages of these people. I have tried to make the argument, and I do not think anybody could seriously attempt to contradict me, that the wages as established in the last cyclical review are clearly too low, that we are not able to recruit people we need at the wages we agreed upon a year ago—or that the government and the civil service association agreed upon. Therefore it is in the interests of the government, as well I presume as in the interests of the civil service association to renegotiate these rates.

The only trouble is that under the procedure that now exists, there is no basis for re-opening. I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that under the circumstances he should indicate a willingness to renegotiate these rates. I did not suggest, I do not plan to suggest, notwithstanding what the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions said, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should indicate how much he is willing to give. All I am suggesting is that he should indicate a willingness to re-open this question, in view of the desperate need, not only in terms of the employees themselves, but also in terms of the government.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that this is by no means an unprecedented procedure. It happens from time to time that contracts are re-opened during their currency. It does not happen often, but it happens sometimes, especially when a contract—and this essentially is what it is—is for a two-year period without any automatic increase during the two-year period. Most collective agreements, when they are for a term of longer than a year, provide for a succession of increases during their term.

We do not do that here yet; I hope we will get that in time. But where there is no provision for automatic increases, it is by no means unparalleled or unprecedented for an employer and a union or an association of employees to re-open a contract in mid-term and make adjustments that appear appropriate. And I would call to the attention of the hon. Minister and to the House, Mr. Chairman, that the federal government did precisely that just recently with regard to all technical classes in the federal civil service. They are also on a two-year cyclical review. The last review was last year and in the normal course of events there would not be a review again until next year, but the government recently—according to an announcement in the *Globe and Mail* of May 27—agreed to increase the wages of those people by 3 per cent. All it was doing was recognizing economic realities, that—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Reached an agreement? This was just a unilateral—

Mr. Bryden: All right. So it is unilaterally decided. No employees are going to object to your making a decision to increase wages. I would suggest, however, that even when you have an increase in mind, it is better to talk to the association about it. At any rate, under the normal procedure at Ottawa, these people were not due for any further consideration until next year but the government, in recognition of plain economic realities, increased their wages by 3 per cent.

I think the government here should recognize fully the economic realities relating to attendants in hospitals and also to the comparable classification in reform institutions and indicate its willingness to negotiate an increase.

Obviously it has already partly recognized economic reality by increasing its recruiting rate. My only proposal is that it should recognize economic reality right across the board by making it an interim increase for the whole category from top to bottom.

There is one other matter I would like to inquire about. Perhaps the hon. Minister may not be able to give me much information, but I understand that the civil service commission is now under the gun from the human rights commission, allegedly because of discrimination in the rates paid to male and female employees in Ontario Hospitals. My understanding of the situation is that male employees in hospitals are called "attendants" and female employees are called "aids." They do essentially the same work, in all significant respects—or so it is claimed—but the aids, the females, are paid less than the attendants. Is this the matter that is now being determined by a board appointed on the recommendation of the human rights commission?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, there is discussion before a board mutually agreed to by the human rights commission and by the civil service commission and that board is now sitting. I do not know what has happened at the board.

Mr. Bryden: Is the issue essentially as I have tried to define it in this case?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, I would say that it was essentially that.

Mr. Bryden: Since the board is still sitting I will not say anything further about it, Mr. Chairman.

There is one last matter on which I would like to ask the hon. Minister one or two questions.

To what extent is the civil service commission involved in determining wages and other conditions for employees in such agencies as the Ontario water resources commission, the Ontario hospital services commission, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, they are not directly involved, but those agencies do make use of the facilities of the civil service commission. They ask them to do research for them; they get advice from them as to appropriate rates, but of course, the civil service commission are not definitely involved as they are with the public service.

Mr. Bryden: Is there any valid reason, Mr. Chairman, why such agencies should not be brought directly under the civil service commission?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, it has never been government policy to do this. Treasury board have considered the rates for them as well as they do for the civil servants and really the result of what is being done now is that the salaries are practically parallel. This was accomplished with the effort on the part of the civil service commission and of the various boards.

Mr. Bryden: That was my understanding of what is now happening. As a matter of fact, representatives of the Ontario hospital services commission were before the public accounts committee a few days ago. At that time they said that when the commission was first set up there was sort of a dual classification. Some employees had been shifted from the civil service while some who had been brought in from outside, and there was a problem of integrating that staff. Now, however, they are pretty well integrated and they pretty well operate under civil service conditions.

They also said that they—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not under their jurisdiction.

Mr. Bryden: Yes. They also said that they have a unit of the civil service association—or perhaps more than one unit, I am not sure—in their establishment and that they operated very much in the same way as other units of the civil service association except that—and this is a rather important exception, Mr. Chairman—the grievance procedure available within the civil service is not available to the employees of the hospital services commission.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Some of the commissions have chosen to have it available. In the

Ontario water resources commission, for instance, it is available.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad—

Hon. Mr. Allan: And it would be available for any of the commissions.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad to hear that. I can remember that a few years ago there was quite a bit of trouble persuading the Ontario water resources commission even to recognize the civil service association. For whatever reason, their position is now exactly the opposite of what it was a few years ago. The association is fully recognized and for all practical purposes the employees of that commission are now civil servants.

I think that is a good trend, but I do not see why it should be left to the discretion of a commission. My impression—I certainly would not want to speak for the representatives of the Ontario hospital services commission—but my impression from talking to them is that they would have no objection at all and would not see their work adversely affected in any sense, if they were brought under all the conditions applying to civil servants including the grievance and arbitration procedure.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They can be brought under the grievance at any time they request.

Mr. Bryden: I wish the government would make this a matter of government policy, rather than leaving it to the individual commission. You see one of our troubles with some of these commissions—this is not true of the hospital services commission, but it is true of some of them—is that we have no way of getting at them in this House, and some of them are petty little despots. The outstanding example is the Niagara parks commission, a little empire, an empire by itself, a state within a state, even with its own police force. It is flatly refusing to recognize the civil service association which represents the overwhelming majority of its employees and it is on the old tack of trying to establish a company union.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, just to save the hon. gentleman from making a long speech—when the new bill is presented to the House, he will find that the Niagara Falls parks commission will be included in those that the civil service association may negotiate for.

Mr. Bryden: I am sorry; I did not quite hear what the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Allan: They will be included in the new bill.

Mr. Bryden: Then they will come under The Civil Service Act?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not the civil service, but as Crown employees the civil service association will be able to represent them—

Mr. Bryden: I certainly am glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman, because the way that commission was carrying on and with a former Minister of Labour, no less, as the chairman, was a public disgrace. However, if the government has now taken the bull by the horns and settled the matter, I will certainly be very happy to see the bill and to concur in that much of it, at least.

Hon. Mr. Allan: At least that is something—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps part of the question has been answered. On page 7 of the hon. Minister's statement to the House, he said:

> In the past I have been asked about the policy of the government in regard to bargaining procedures for outside boards and commissions. It is our intention to bring in legislation to provide the correct procedure wherever a majority of employees are represented by the civil service association of Ontario.

I take it this is the legislation that the hon. Minister has mentioned.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is correct.

Mr. Young: I also take it that the way then is wide open for the civil service association to organize the employees of any of the commissions, and once they have 51 per cent of those employees signed up the way is wide open for them to become part of the association and to become part of the bargaining unit. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is correct.

Mr. Bryden: Would that apply to the liquor control board and the workmen's compensation board?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The workmen's compensation board is in a little different category. It receives no support, no government money support. It is really an independent board.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it is in a separate category in another way, too, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately. Under the law as it now stands it is impossible for those employees to be represented by anybody. They cannot be

represented by the civil service association because the board refuses to recognize the association, and they cannot get certification under The Labour Relations Act either because of the vicious Crown Agency Act that went through this House a few years ago. I hope the employees of the workmen's compensation board will not continue to be left in limbo. From what I have heard, and I have heard a good deal in the last few months, they are badly in need of representation by somebody. There is a seething mass of discontent among employees of the workmen's compensation board from what I have been able to determine, and these people have no remedy at all. They cannot get under the civil service association, they cannot get certified under The Labour Relations Act. This is a matter that we may have an opportunity to discuss on another occasion in this House, but I hope that if the hon. Minister is changing the law along the lines he has indicated he will make some provision one way or another for the workmen's compensation board: either they should be able to have a union certified under The Labour Relations Act if the majority of the employees so decide; or alternatively, they should be able to have the civil service association recognized as their representative in negotiations. The present situation should not be allowed to continue any longer, in my opinion.

Votes 308 and 309 agreed to.

On vote 310:

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I had some remarks on vote 310. Mr. Chairman, there is a very interesting item in the hon. Minister's report, on page 25, in which he says: "This branch assisted in developing the survey questionnaire used by the bilingualism and biculturalism commission in the Ontario service." This is a very interesting remark inasmuch as I think it is important at this time to know what is being done regarding some part of the civil service's offering some bilingual services.

First of all, in view of the many requests coming in from various departments of the government of Ontario, for information and service in the French language, has the hon. Minister given any thought to having at least a nucleus of a group of bilingual civil servants? Secondly, have any efforts been made in the past or are efforts being made now, to hire some bilingual employees in various departments more especially in areas like Ottawa, Sudbury, North Bay and Windsor where a large proportion of the population is French-speaking? How far has this department gone towards establishing a bureau of translation?

Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago, the hon. member for Stormont made a declaration to *Le Droit* of Ottawa saying that the government is thinking of establishing a translation bureau. How far has the Cabinet gone in the study of this problem? Would it not be more practical if all translations were centralized rather than having translators in several departments such as we have in The Department of Public Welfare, in The Department of Labour, perhaps in The Department of Health and in The Department of Lands and Forests? For instance, the latter department publishes a very interesting booklet in very very good French.

Now, I believe that a similar system appears to have worked quite well in Ottawa and would certainly speed up translation work here in Toronto. In view of all those problems, I would like to find out from the hon. Minister whether there is a possibility of having a central translation bureau rather than having translators in perhaps half a dozen or more departments. I wonder, could the hon. Minister enlarge upon this matter?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may answer the questions in a different order than they were presented. I would say, first of all, that we have a nucleus of a bureau of translation already established. I would advise him too that in certain areas, where such is desirable, we require employees to be bilingual. Also that we are already—the Prime Minister has written to each Minister of the Cabinet in a way of survey, to find out the needs of the various departments so far as this matter is concerned. We have also sent a questionnaire to a number of employees in each department. When this information is received, then the matter will be given attention.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, just one remark. There was a publication given to us the other day by the Ontario human rights commission. I wonder would the Minister of Labour recall this publication we had last week, last Thursday or Friday? There was one letter appearing in French in that publication, unfortunately there were three or four very serious grammatical errors. That I think would bring up the problem, that some central agency might be able to look into that. I think that it is very much appreciated in certain areas, particulraly when

some of those publications have to go to a school where the majority of the—

Hon. Mr. Allan: We will have to be a little more careful.

Mr. Racine: I think that perhaps, if there were some central point where those things should be checked, then things might be a little better.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Thank you for bringing that matter to our attention.

Vote 310 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Civil Service.

ESTIMATES, THE OFFICE OF THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): The estimates of the audits of the provincial auditor are now presented to you and I have before me Mr. George Spence who is the provincial auditor of this province. Mr. Spence is a fellow of the institute of chartered accountants in Ontario and has been in the service for 27 years. The provincial auditor—this is not news to you, this is well understood—occupies a unique position of independence and impartiality within the provincial administration. He is required by The Audit Act to audit and report upon the conduct of the business of government on behalf of this Legislature, with complete objectivity assured by statutory provisions protecting his tenure of office.

All expenditures from the consolidated revenue fund are examined on a continuous day-to-day basis, and the provincial auditor countersigns all cheques and certifies that there are funds available and legislative authority for each such payment. In addition, his staff is constantly engaged in audits of the revenue accounts and records of the consolidated revenue account. In conjunction with his responsibility for the audits of the government's financial transactions, the provincial auditor conducts audits for such boards, commissions and Crown corporations as may be required by various governing statutes as directed.

The public accounts are prepared under his direction, so as to show the results of the operation for each fiscal year, and are delivered by him to the Lieutenant-Governor for presentation to the Assembly within the first ten days of the first session held in the following calendar year. The provincial auditor's opinion upon the accounts is appended to the balance sheet in the public accounts and refers to his statutory report which appears as a separate publication entitled "The Provincial Auditor's Report."

In his report the provincial auditor provides statements and charts so that the government's operations may be readily understood and their full significance appreciated. While it is required that special mention be made of the scope of his examination—Treasury board orders, special warrants issued and other matters—he is free to comment on whatever topics he may desire, to bring them to the attention of the Assembly. This prerogative he has not hesitated to use, and this serves as an important function in the process of financial control and accountability.

The estimates of the provincial auditor for 1966-1967 show a small increase over those of the current fiscal year. As in past years, I have not hesitated to inform him that the funds necessary for the efficient functioning of his office will be made available. And I am sure that this assurance will receive the approval of this House. Because he is an officer of the Legislature who is charged with heavy responsibilities, it is vital that his functions should not be hindered by any financial stringency.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make concerning the office of the provincial auditor.

I am rather surprised that in the remarks of the hon. Provincial Treasurer just made to us, he made no mention of one of the statements that he made last year. In *Hansard* of 1965, page 505, the hon. Provincial Treasurer said the following:

> We are giving consideration, not only to the possibility of a system such as they have at Ottawa, but we have had a committee of Treasury study the Glassco report. We have condensed those recommendations. We are looking at those and—

And he finished up by saying:

> We realize this cannot be done overnight.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has not said anything about that this afternoon. He has completely forgotten that statement that he made last year.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That stalled you off last year.

Mr. Whicher: Yes, well it is not going to stall me off this afternoon.

May I remind the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he has had a little bit more time than overnight to consider these recommendations. Perhaps he could now tell the House, in a few minutes, when he answers my criticisms and those of the other party, perhaps he could then tell the House what action he has taken or intends to take on those recommendations. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully point out that not only did he say that "We are giving consideration," I further point out that he said there was a committee set up to investigate this situation. And not one word of it was mentioned this afternoon.

All of this, of course, leads us to the obvious fact that the provincial auditor does not function as an external auditor in accordance with the auditing standards of Canadian corporations and the federal government. The technique of pre-audit referred to on page 20 of the auditor's report would tend to make him an arm of the Treasury department and an integral part of the internal controls of that department.

This proposition is further strengthened by the fact that the provincial auditor signs all cheques. The auditor of any corporation, society, municipality or province must be completely independent of the business which he is auditing, and he must appear to be independent. The provincial auditor's daily involvement in the functions of the Treasury department could give rise to serious questions as to his ability to remain independent.

Now then, among the recommendations of the auditor mentioned in this year's report, in his report on page 20, and I quote from him:

> Few critical observations concerning the expenditures are made in the annual report of the provincial auditor for the reason that any accounts questioned in the course of the pre-audit are directed to the attention of the responsible department officers, with the result that transactions questioned are adjusted and corrected before the accounts are closed for the year.

This appears to be an ideal way for the government to conceal its errors of commission and omission and denies to the Legislature the right to know what types of errors are being made by government departments in the disbursement of public funds. If what the auditor reports as to the effectiveness of his pre-audit is true, it would appear impossible for this government to make any improper expenditures. Now surely, Mr. Chairman, past scandals over many years—and those of us who have been here for some time know that this government has had the odd scandal around—surely past scandals in departments of this government give a lie to this premise.

On page 19 the auditor comments on the failure of the corporation income tax branch to get assessments out to the taxpayers in time, and that the backlog of assessments seems to grow each year. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer what steps the government is undertaking to correct this situation, since the failure to assess promptly can deal hardships to Ontario corporations, particularly those who are claiming refunds due to losses and overpayments.

At no time in his recommendations does the provincial auditor mention such economies as belt-tightening or make any suggestions in respect of areas in which the government might properly cut back its expenditures. This would appear to be a legitimate area for the auditor to comment on and make recommendations, particularly when the provincial Budget is increasing so tremendously. There has to be excess baggage somewhere, and in his function as a servant of the Legislature he and his department, especially with the expanding staff indicated in his budget, should be in a position to bring these excesses to the attention of the Legislature.

May I respectfully ask, Mr. Chairman, is the provincial auditor not worried about the huge increases in expenditures of the various departments and commissions of government? If he is, he does not say so.

What about the tax situation? What about the amount of capital expenditure charged up to ordinary revenue? Is the percentage used by the government a good business practice? What about the sinking fund? What about borrowings of the province? Are we paying the cheapest possible interest rate?

People are worried about government spending. Governments have excuses, Oppositions have political inclinations to attempt to get into power, and consequently have a tendency to put things in the poorest possible light. But the auditor has no political motives, only good business motives, not to make policy but to see that policy after it is laid down by the government is carried out correctly and efficiently.

He is supposed to be the servant of this Legislature. As such, he is the servant of the people and his job is to point out, Mr. Chairman, mistakes in government spending. He has not done so because as an internal auditor he is a servant of this government and not of this Legislature and of the people.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think one could say that some improvement has been made in our auditing procedures in the past few years in one respect; namely, we now have an active public accounts committee. I think the proper review of the government's stewardship in spending the money voted to it by the Legislature depends both on having an indepedent auditor and a public accounts committee. I think this is very clearly brought out in Professor Norman Ward's book of a few years ago, *The Public Purse*, where he traced the history of the review of expenditure at the federal level from Confederation down to the present. There were periods when effective review was exercised by an active public accounts committee assisted by an energetic auditor.

There were also long periods in the history of Canada when practically nothing was done in reviewing public expenditures, but there have been periods when it has been done quite effectively. I think, after many years, we are moving in that direction in Ontario. In fact as far as I know, ever since Confederation the attitude has been that a public accounts committee was merely a scandals committee. In other words, it came into operation only if somebody made some allegation as to malfeasance on the part of some public official, Minister or member of the Legislature.

After many years in which that was the prevailing view and in which, therefore, the public accounts committee practically did not operate at all, this government was induced —and when I say this government I am talking about the present administration—the present administration was induced to attempt on an experimental basis to see what it would be like to have a proper public accounts committee.

I know the hon. Prime Minister at the time was a little worried that it might turn into a witch-hunting style of committee. He actually made a reference to that possibility at the time we set the committee up. I think he is probably assured, and everybody else should be now assured, that the public accounts committee as it was rejuvenated—or perhaps it was not so much rejuvenated as having breath breathed into it for the first time—at any rate as it now operates it has been far from a witch-hunting committee.

I have been on this committee ever since it was activated and I do not think we ever did any looking for scandals at all or any witch-hunting.

The committee, in my opinion, has done not a sensational job but a useful job. I think a committee of this kind is not likely to do a useful job if it is doing a sensational job. Occasionally it is reported in the press, but not in the sense that it gets big black headlines on the front page. It has a more modest role than that. It attempts to carry out on behalf of this Legislature the task of reviewing what the government has done with the money voted to it. In a democratic system that is surely as important a function as the voting of the money itself.

The committee has made a good many recommendations to the government. I will say for the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he always has the courtesy to appear at the first, or at any rate, at an early meeting of the committee in each year to report on the position of the Treasury and of the government in relation to the recommendations that the committee made the preceding year. The hon. Provincial Treasurer has been quite meticulous about that. He has always appeared. He has taken the committee's recommendations of the previous year one by one, and stated the government's position on them. I will say that in a substantial number of cases he has indicated that the government has accepted the recommendation concerned either in whole or in part, often in very essential part. I am not going to attempt to make a list of the recommendations that the committee has made and which the government has accepted. I refer, however, to the fact that it has accepted a number of recommendations to underline the point I had already tried to make: namely, that the committee has, in several ways, performed a useful role.

There are two recommendations which are still in the process of being considered by the government, which I would like to mention in a little greater detail. The government has not said "no," in fact, they appear to be giving very serious consideration to these recommendations. On the other hand it has not said "yes." Since I consider both of the recommendations to be quite important I would like to make a brief reference to them at this point, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, the committee has complained —I think "complained" is a fair word—it has objected to the way in which the estimates have been presented to the House. It objected that insufficient information has been given to inform the members properly when they approach the important responsibility of the committee of supply. There has been some improvement in the book as it has been presented to us. Greater information is now being provided than was provided two or three years ago, so I would not say that the

work of the committee has had no effect at all. In my opinion, however—and on the basis of what the committee has said in its reports —I think I can also say "in the opinion of the committee"—we still have not gone half far enough. For one thing, this item, "maintenance," which the committee specifically selected, still appears in its same vague, undefined form. "Maintenance," as far as the estimates of this province are concerned, apparently means everything other than salaries or travelling expenses. Salaries and travelling expenses are segregated; then we have "maintenance." Sometimes they might throw in "postage"; some departments call that "postage," some call it "maintenance," but it really belongs under "maintenance," just as much as all the other items that are there. Grants are always segregated, and sometimes advertising is, but far too much is included in that omnibus title, "maintenance." It can include the widest variety of things.

The committee has objected in the past that there should be a breakdown of this item that appears as "maintenance," that a whole lot of unrelated items should not be lumped together under one heading with only one item in the vote; it should be broken down. I am hoping that the government will give further consideration to this matter and further elaborate on the information now being given in the estimates and in particular to the breakdown of this item of maintenance.

The committee has also recommended on a number of occasions that comparative figures should be presented in the estimates to assist members in deciding exactly what it is they are being asked to vote. The committee has suggested that, as a bare minimum, there should be, in addition to the figure now shown—which is the figure of the money asked for the coming fiscal year—there should be a column showing the amount that was asked for the past fiscal year; and another column showing the amount that was actually spent in the last year for which figures are available.

Thus we would have some idea of what the trend of spending is with regard to the various items for which money is being asked. We would also be able to identify a new programme, or programmes that had been discontinued, without having to spend a lot of time asking questions of the hon. Minister.

If this were done certain basic information would be available to the hon. members in a readily accessible form. I know the hon. Provincial Treasurer will say that if you just take last year's estimate book and put it down beside this year's book, and then put beside that the public accounts for the last year, you will have all that in front of you, which is true. But, as these desks are relatively narrow and we usually want to have other papers on the desk, only a professional juggler could balance those three books side by side in the way the hon. Provincial Treasurer suggested.

It would be much simpler if he would accept a reasonable recommendation of the public accounts committee and would put the information right in the book where we can see it. If he has to make the book bigger, that is really a very small penalty. I am sure the hon. Provincial Treasurer can afford to spend a little more for paper than is now spent for this modest-looking book. I understand from a statement that he made not long ago—I think it was under the Treasury estimates—that this is actually under active consideration, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer now has a mock-up, I think he calls it, of a possible new format for the estimates. I hope that he will make that mock-up available to the public accounts committee. Let the committee take a look at it and make any comments before he makes a final decision. I am, however, pleased indeed to hear that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has proceeded that far. Any time that he has been before the public accounts committee he has always led us to believe that there was no merit in the proposal whatever, that we were just asking for the Treasury board to go to a lot of trouble for nothing, that we were really asking them to spoon-feed the members. And now, apparently, the Provincial Treasurer has softened in his position, he may even accept—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I was never hard.

Mr. Bryden: Well, you were never hard, but you sounded awfully stubborn to me, in your genial way. I can remember on two different occasions before the public accounts committee when we tried to put it to you in our normal, very—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Reasonable way.

Mr. Bryden: —reasonable and modest way that this would be a good idea, the hon. Provincial Treasurer in his very genial and reasonable way would say, "I do not really see why this is necessary at all," and that is as far as we could ever get.

However, I am not going to criticize the hon. Provincial Treasurer retrospectively. I was unhappy about his attitude of a year ago but I am very happy about his attitude

of today. I hope that he will continue along the line in which he is moving and that we will get this particular recommendation of the committee implemented, if not in the form in which the committee made it, at least in a form that is accepted as reasonable by both the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the committee, as well as other hon. members of the House.

There is another matter that the committee has placed before the government and that is the question of centralized purchasing. I had been under the impression that the government had simply brushed that recommendation aside. However, we asked Mr. Brannan of the Treasury board to appear before the committee to report on what had happened on that recommendation. I will not go into all the details of what Mr. Brannan told us. I will, however, say that the explanation he gave satisfied me as to why further progress has not been made up until this point. It also satisfied me that a full-scale investigation is likely to be made into this matter before the end of this calandar year and before another session of the Legislature.

I considered Mr. Brannan's explanation reasonable, and I also was happy to hear that his present plans call for an intensive study of the whole question of centralized purchasing to be completed between July 1 and December 31 of this year. Of course, if there should be another session of this Legislature, and I should therefore be back here again, I will be wanting to know what happened to that inquiry, but I understand—

Hon. Mr. Allan: And I will want to tell you.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will want to tell you.

Mr. Bryden: You will want to tell me if you have done anything, but if you have not done anything, you will probably not be so anxious. However, I will be the happiest man in the world if you are able to tell me a great deal.

One thing I would ask is this: I hope the government does not give Mr. Brannan another major assignment which will prevent him from carrying out his study of centralized purchasing. As I understand it, he had it all ready to go last fall, then an important matter of government policy arose which took the energies of all of his staff. I could not criticize him as a public servant for giving time and priority to a highly urgent matter of government policy. But I hope a similar thing does not happen again. I hope the government will now consider that a study of centralized purchasing is a top-priority item and it will make it possible for Mr. Brannan to carry out the plans he now has in accordance with the timetable that he now has in mind. At any rate, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows, I am always a reasonable man and I am ready to accept what I think was a reasonable explanation, for the present.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Will you take an affidavit on that?

Mr. Bryden: Obviously that is unnecessary; the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, there is one final recommendation that has been made by the public accounts committee, to which as far as I can see, the government has given no consideration at all. Perhaps it is unfair to say that it has given no consideration, but it is totally unwilling to give favourable consideration. This matter was raised by the hon. member for Bruce in his introductory remarks and I will try to make my remarks about it as brief as possible.

In every year in which the public accounts committee has presented its report, it has recommended that serious consideration should be given to changing our present audit system so that the provincial auditor will be responsible for post-audit only. I believe there should be pre-audit but that should be a function of the Treasury. In other words, what the provincial accounts committee was suggesting is that we in Ontario are big boys now; we are in the big leagues now and should get out of bush-league ways of operating. The system of auditing we now have is a bush-league system. The provincial auditor is used to doing pre-audit work and therefore does not in effect do post-audit. There is essentially no post-audit. This is done in small provinces—it would be highly appropriate in Prince Edward Island with a very small amount of accounts. To have a full-fledged, big-league audit system would be far too much machinery for a small province. It was far too much for our province 50 years ago when our budget was—I do not know what it was but it was probably a few million dollars—but when we are getting into the $2-billion class, I think we need big-league auditing procedures.

There obviously should be a pre-audit, but that is an executive function. The executive—that is the Cabinet, the Treasury board —are responsible for the spending of the money as it is spent and there should be

treasury officers in every department who check expenditures before they are made to make sure that they are authorized are in accordance with the votes granted to the government. I am not suggesting for one moment that that function should not be performed, but I do insist that it is purely an executive function and it should be carried out by the executive as it is in Ottawa. There should be a comptroller of the Treasury, or whatever you want to call him, who is responsible for pre-audit. He would be recognized as a Treasury official, responsible to Treasury board and to the Cabinet.

The trouble in Ontario is that this function is not being performed by an officer of the executive; it is being performed by an officer who is supposed to be an officer of the legislative assembly, namely the provincial auditor. The government has simply laid hold of this officer of the legislative assembly, spirited him off to the Treasury building and made him into an officer of the executive, so that the legislative assembly has no officer who audits the accounts on its behalf. Yet if we are to have true accountability to the legislative assembly, surely it is vital that the intent of The Audit Act—The Audit Act is very badly phrased in this way—but surely the clear intent is that the provincial auditor is an officer of the legislative assembly accountable only to the legislative assembly. He should conduct a post-audit on behalf of the legislative assembly. In other words, his function should be as it is at Ottawa, to audit the accounts after the money has been spent and then report to the legislative assembly, without fear or favour, his views as to how the money was spent. But he cannot do it if he is also acting as an officer of the Treasury in conducting the pre-audit. No man can wear two hats successfully—unless he has two heads and I do not know of anyone with two heads.

Therefore the one official can be one thing or the other, but he cannot be both. He can be an officer of the executive conducting a pre-audit, or he can be an officer of this legislative assembly conducting a post-audit.

When we have put this matter up to the Provincial Treasurer—including Conservative members of the committee he has always said that he thinks that the system is working fine as it is. Of course, it is working fine from his point of view, but the public accounts committee which in this connection represents the Legislature does not consider that it is operating satisfactorily from the Legislature's point of view. That is the whole problem. The provincial auditor sits over there in the Treasury building side by side with the Treasury officers on whom he is supposed to be checking; and his people are scattered through the building sitting side by side, day in and day out, with the departmental accountants on whom they are supposed to be checking. And they are not in a position to do the independent type of auditing that an auditor ought to do.

As I say, they are Treasury officials. I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that we rescued the hon. Provincial Auditor from the imprisonment in which he is now being held in the Treasury building, and brought him back here to this legislative building, to become what he ought to be, an officer of this assembly. I think his office ought to be right here in this building along with the Clerk's office and the office of the legislative counsel.

If it is necessary to move out the Attorney General's department, well why are they different from any other department? They should have been moved out of here long ago and this building should be turned over entirely to services to this legislative assembly. Surely the auditor is one of the servants of the assembly, just as the Clerk is. There is no reason why he should still be incarcerated over in that Treasury building, where the members of the legislative assembly cannot really get at him at all. He is over there as a servant of the Provincial Treasurer. A very efficient servant. I can understand that the hon. Provincial Treasurer does not want to let him go. Perhaps he could keep the present auditor as his executive officer, responsible for pre-audit. In that case let us get a similarly qualified man to be provincial auditor and to be the servant of this assembly.

He cannot possibly be the servant of this assembly under the present situation and, as I say, this is a matter that the public accounts committee, representing the Legislature, has recommended to the government in every report it has produced. I think it is time that the government paid some attention to this recommendation, not merely because the public accounts committee made it—although I think that is an important reason for paying attention to it—but because it is clearly logical and proper.

The provincial auditor is theoretically the servant of this assembly, he should be made the servant of this assembly in fact. He should be the key person in the inquiries of the public accounts committee. The public accounts committee is trying to get information, the auditor should be the person who steers them in the direction where they

are most likely to find the most interesting or most important information.

This is the function performed by the auditor-general in Ottawa. Anybody who reads Ward's book will see that this is a function that off and on has obtained in Ottawa ever since Confederation—with some long gaps when nothing was done, when there was no proper review of expenditure by the Legislature. But essentially this is the practice at Ottawa and I think it should become the practice in Ontario.

The government made a constructive step forward, admittedly under considerable pressure, when it agreed to have a proper public accounts committee. Now it should make the equally important step forward of having an auditor who is not a prisoner of the executive but is a genuine servant of this assembly, and more particularly of its public accounts committee. That is the next necessary step if the process we embarked upon two or three years ago is to be carried through to its logical conclusion.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not think this can be easily dismissed. The hon. Provincial Treasurer has not been willing to think about it up until now. I would suggest that he should read the last few chapters of Norman Ward's book. If I cannot get the idea across to him perhaps Professor Ward can.

I think it is a basic principle of democracy that there should be an independent review by the Legislature of the government's spending of the funds voted to it. This is possible only to a limited degree under the system of auditing that now exists.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to compliment the two hon. members who have commented upon the activities of the provincial auditor. I agree with them in many of the things they have said and I feel that the criticism has been given in a spirit of wishing to contribute something to good government; and certainly I would give consideration to the comments they have made on that basis.

With respect to the hon. member for Bruce and what he said, I think I should point out that the auditor is an independent servant of the Legislature. You might be surprised that although I am only one floor away from the office of the auditor I still have to make my first visit to the provincial auditor.

Mr. Sopha: Do you summon him to your office?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, he comes up sometimes, but not often.

Mr. Whicher: Your names are both on every cheque the province issues.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right; but the auditor to me is a very independent person and the fact that he does certain pre-auditing work does not in any way affect the possibility of his criticizing the actions of the government or the efficiency of the government.

The auditor and his staff occupy one floor in the Treasury building, the fifth floor.

You say to get him out; he is going to get us out!

Mr. Sopha: We suggested at public accounts that perhaps he could occupy the space here that is now occupied by the hon. Attorney General so that there would be a geographical separation between the auditor and the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Now, what is wrong with that suggestion of ours' to give the conception to all mankind, and us particularly, that he in fact is independent of you.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to it, nor do I see that such action would be beneficial in any way. I am sure that moving an office across the street is not going to make a man dependent or independent, or make an auditor dependent or independent. I think really this is—

Mr. Bryden: No, but get him out of the pre-audit job.

Mr. Whicher: When you both sign the same cheques there is bound to be a bit of suspicion, you know. It is just not done in business.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh no? May I point out to the hon. members that every province in Canada has the same system that we have.

Mr. Sopha: No, it would not be—

Hon. Mr. Allan: It was pointed out by the hon. member for Bruce that a year ago I said that this matter would be studied. It was, it was given attention. It was brought to the attention of the government as a whole and the conclusion was reached that the present system is operating well.

Mr. Bryden: For you fellows.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No. We are beginning to wonder if it is not operating too well to suit some of our Opposition friends.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, with regard to the hon. Provincial Treasurer's reference to his Opposition friends, this recommendation that we are talking about also comes from his government friends too on the public accounts committee. They have been unanimous for two years running on this matter.

I will not undertake to say what the accounts committee might recommend this year, but I suspect they will recommend the same thing. At least they will certainly have the matter before them and I will say as a member of the committee that the hon. Provincial Treasurer always assures us that he has studied the matter, but he never gives us one solid argument in support of his position. In fact he never gives us an indication that he understands the point we are trying to raise.

This is the frustrating thing about it. The hon. Provincial Treasurer does not even seem to understand the problem to which we are trying to call attention.

It is not only the Opposition, it is the public accounts committee, including also members of his own party.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, my great interest in this whole matter is that the finances of this province be handled in a way that is satisfactory; that is my interest. It is not whether someone is situated in a building on that side of the street or whether he is situated in a building on this side of the street.

Mr. Bryden: That is a side issue.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This is a matter of opinion. Certainly there is no unanimous opinion as to the way in which this auditing should be carried out. The matter was studied and the government came to the conclusion that they would continue the system that was in effect.

I recognize and listen to the arguments put forth by the public accounts committee and I want to say that I am thoroughly in accord and I want to compliment the public accounts committee on the work they have done. I think it has been an excellent public accounts committee and the members have worked a great deal. I think they have worked from the viewpoint of endeavouring to improve the operation of government. I appreciate that and I will listen to your representations. I do not say that this change will not be made but, as I point out to you, the conclusion was reached that it will not be made this year.

The hon. member for Bruce seemed to feel that it was the responsibility of the auditor to criticize expenditures. I am afraid I cannot agree with the member for Bruce.

I think a government must take responsibility for the expenditures they make, the amount of money that is spent on education, the amount of money that is spent on highways. I cannot feel that it is the auditor's responsibility to say we should have spent less money on roads, less money on education, that there should be fewer provincial police. I cannot think that is the responsibility of the auditor. It is his responsibility, it seems to me, to point out any action which would weaken the financial position of the province. I know he has had an interest in that, and if it were possible for him to speak in this Legislature that he would say we have handled the finances of the province in a satisfactory manner. The percentage of the capital costs that has been paid from ordinary revenue has been excellent.

Mr. Whicher: How do we know that?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Of course you know it.

Mr. Whicher: Has the auditor said so?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Why, certainly, the auditor audits the accounts for the province, of the revenue and the expenditures. And there is an auditor's statement with them in.

Mr. Whicher: He is just like a mouse whereas the auditor in Ottawa is a lion.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, well, the auditor here can be a lion just as well as the auditor in Ottawa. There is nothing to hinder the auditor from taking this government apart if he has justification for so doing. Nothing at all.

Now, the matter of corporation taxes: The situation was mentioned there and the question was asked as to what we were doing to improve the handling of the returns. I would point out to the hon. member that auditors have been in short supply; not only does the government find this situation to be so, but this extends throughout industry and commerce in the whole province. However, I am pleased to report that as our computer is becoming more useful, and as we are getting accounts on the computer, we are reducing the backlog and I think we are going to handle that situation to everyone's satisfaction in a very short time.

I agree with the hon. member for Woodbine that the public accounts committee should be interested in expenditures, that

they should be very interested in expenditures and should be, and are, free to criticize if they so desire. I would point out to the member for Woodbine also that if there are any more meetings of the public accounts committee I would be glad to let him have the mock-up of the proposed programme budgeting.

Mr. Bryden: We will be having several more, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I had only one copy but I will lend it to the hon. member and I am sure—

Mr. Bryden: I am sure the chairman would appreciate that and I would, as a member of the committee.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, I would be very glad to lend it to the hon. member and trust he will get it back.

My reason for not being entirely in agreement with the proposal of the hon. member as to the change in the form of the estimates was that in my opinion it did not really give you the information that you were anxious to get. I think when he sees this programme budgeting he will find that he is getting information that is a great deal more helpful to him. He gets the figures as well, but he gets the programmes, and if it is in estimates, he can find out what the estimates consist of. The federal government is looking into this and this is along the lines of their exploring such a practice. They intend to bring it in gradually in the various departments. We would like to, and hope that we can do this for a couple of departments next year to try it out and see how it works. We are as anxious as members are to have the estimates in a form that will be meaningful to those who wish to criticize them.

Mr. Sopha: It used to be said of that great Canadian, Hon. Leslie Miscampbell Frost, that he was that sly old fox of the Legislature, but I can see, in listening to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that some of the infection from Hon. Leslie Frost rubbed off on him. He carries on the tradition here, because he appears to agree with the member for Woodbine, and he agrees with the member for Bruce, and he knows in his heart that come next year, after the winter snow has gone in the same place, in the same stage, that he will have made no changes at all.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, no.

Mr. Sopha: No changes at all.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. member for Woodbine has more confidence in me than that.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, well, I recall in respect of the very modest request by the young lion from St. George—or should I say the dragon—to print in the estimates the comparative figures for the previous two years, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer turned—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is not good enough.

Mr. Sopha: No, the Provincial Treasurer turned the dragon from St. George down on that very modest request. Now, the whole thing is wrong, and I can see—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, nonsense.

Mr. Sopha: —with glaring simplicity in listening to the Provincial Treasurer that this afternoon in his remarks, if you analyze them, he effectively de facto repealed The Audit Act of this Legislature. He repealed The Audit Act, because The Audit Act says clearly, in the clearest possible terms, that the auditor is a servant of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, that is right.

Mr. Sopha: And only the Legislature can remove him; and he is answerable to no other person than the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is true, I agree.

Mr. Sopha: Now, he tells my friend, the hon. member for Bruce, this afternoon that—if I paraphrase correctly, and I think I do—the auditor is not there to criticize the government.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, no.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Provincial Treasurer's very words.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, no, I did not say that.

Mr. Sopha: And when the hon. member for Bruce interjected at that point, and he said the one in Ottawa does—that will appear in *Hansard* that he made that appropriate interjection just at the right place. And the whole basis is wrong because the Provincial Treasurer should not even present the estimates of the auditor.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not.

Mr. Sopha: He should not even be responsible for introducing them to this House. If anything, if we are to select some appropriate person to pilot the estimates through the House, it ought to be none other than the first Minister himself, in order to show

us, and through us, the people of Ontario, that the auditor in the exercise of his functions commanded of the Legislature in The Audit Act is entirely divorced from the Provincial Treasurer. Now, I ask rhetorically, are we whistling in the wind over here?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, indeed we are not.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He is entirely divorced from the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Sopha: Three or four years ago—how long has the sales tax been among us like an infliction—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Too long.

Mr. Sopha: How long has that swarm of locusts been among us?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Ask the architect.

Mr. Sopha: About four years. It is about four years ago that we caught the hon. Provincial Treasurer cold turkey as they say in the vernacular, getting advice from the provincial auditor about the sales tax. We got him dead to rights. Before the sales tax was enacted in this province he had a big clambake, a meeting down the hall; in the evening, mark you, in the dead of evening, when the prying eyes of public scrutiny were away from the buildings, except for an alert pressman, who served in this Legislature for many, many years. Whom did he see coming out of the meeting of advisers about the sales tax but the provincial auditor, Mr. H. A. Cotnam? Indeed, and that was never denied by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, when it was brought to the attention of the government and the Provincial Treasurer wanted to get up—I remember that night so well, it was an evening session, and he wanted to get up and make some denial of that accusation and the restraining hand of Hon. Leslie Frost held him down, held him down.

An hon. member: That is right.

Another hon. member: The strong hand.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You have a wonderful imagination.

Mr. Sopha: We will not forget it; that is on the record for all to see. And, of course, he has not only repealed The Audit Act, he has emasculated the functions of the provincial auditor. He says, "Should he criticize?" I have looked hopelessly through a succession of reports of the provincial auditor and you never see the whisper of a criticism of any expenditure by this government. You scarcely ever see—he used to say a number of years ago, he directed a few remarks to that $1 million payment to the teachers' superannuation fund and said that was bad budgeting, to do it that way. But I think they have done away with that payment in that form. But no other criticism.

Let me point out a couple of things. I, on my own responsibility, said in this Legislature—and not a soul has ever raised a voice above a whisper to challenge what I said to this day—that many of the expenditures of The Department of Tourism and Information are illegal. They are beyond the law, because there is no permission granted by this Legislature for them to make them. I hope some daring soul some time in the future might have the temerity and the courage to take them to court on a quo warranto and say, "By what warrant do you spend the public money in this way? Show your legal justification." There is not a thing in The Department of Tourism and Information Act that says they can spend any money other than for the promotion of this province with tourists—with tourists. That puts Fairbairn right out the window—that puts him out of a job in disseminating the political propaganda. Oh, I have said that before, and I'll say it again. I am still waiting for somebody to challenge me on the legal validity of that opinion, although I do not pretend to be a constitutional lawyer.

Another one I thought he might criticize: I would like to know where I ever voted on behalf of the people of Sudbury in this Legislature to send the hon. Provincial Secretary to Australia. I was never asked to vote for that. I note with interest, in that regard, if you let me just fill in the skeleton, that in 1964-65 we voted $10,000 to him for travelling expenses. During the year he spent about $6,978—just a bit under $7,000.

The following year somebody in the Treasury benches decided the hon. Provincial Secretary had got too much for the preceding year so the Treasury board cut it in half; they cut it in half and they voted him $5,000 for the year ending March 31, 1966.

Let us continue the tale. For this year $3,500 was voted. They have dropped it again by an appreciable amount; they took $15,000 off him and yet he had the colossal gall at the public expense, using taxes, paid by my people in Sudbury, to cart himself off to Australia and spend $2,300 of the public money. I would think that the provincial auditor ought to mention that and suggest to the hon. Provincial Secretary that if he

wants to go to Australia he should pay for it himself, and not use 2,300 hard-earned dollars of the public money for a free junket to Australia.

The question of whether he did us any good in Australia remains perhaps the greatest question of this part of the 20th century because we have never had a report from him. But because the Attorney General was going to that big law convention held out there he decided that it would be a good idea for him to go. Where is the vote in this Legislature that said he could go? That expenditure might be illegal, in itself, but does the provincial auditor ever question that? Does he ever say, "Hey, young Johnny, where do you get the licence to spend $2,300 of the public money?" Oh, no, not a syllable, not a whisper of criticism. Certainly we expect him to criticize, that is what he is paid for—

Mr. Whicher: He has good subjects to criticize, too.

Mr. Sopha: He is paid to see that every cent of the public money spent by the Treasury board, which is the final arbitrator—probably dominated by two men and I have said that before, probably dominated by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Labour, because the other ones on it, I sized them up and they have not got the intellectual vigour of those two. They probably are very much in the shadows while those two are in the limelight. They probably dominate it. The final arbiter comes along and says, "We will allow such-and-such an expenditure." I would think that the auditor should go to the Treasury board—and if he is not there he is represented there, and that is the place where he makes his views known—put on the brakes and say, "Wait a minute, hold the phone for a second, until we see if the Legislature has authorized this expenditure." Apparently not, apparently not and if he does object, of course, you know the procedure under The Audit Act—but he has never exercised it.

If his advice is not taken he is entitled to write a letter to the Legislature. He is entitled to write out the letter and table it on the table of the Clerk of this House, objecting to it. But money has become so free and easy to this government—all they have to do is raise the sales tax to get another $120 million or $150 million—that they have become the last of the great spenders. Everything is first-class; it reminds me of Damon Runyon, Ben Hecht and some of the other more well-known newspaper writers of the 20's: "Always go first class. Money is no object."

Another thing I have often wondered about is his functions. The hydro-electric power commission, which owes more money than the government—it owes $400 million, the last time I counted it, more than the government of Ontario owes. Maybe it is more now. The last time I checked—

Mr. Whicher: The government is catching up.

Mr. Sopha: —it, the hydro-electric power commission owed $400 million more dollars than the whole of the government of Ontario. We never hear any assessment of that and every dollar of Hydro borrowings—some of it in the United States at premium rates—every dollar is guaranteed by the government of the province. We never hear any assessment; in fact, I think I am sure in saying—and I will soon be corrected—I am sure in saying that the books of Hydro are not even audited by the provincial auditor; they are not. No.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: They are not; probably they do not want it. They hire their own firm and that firm, of course, by reason of the hiring contract becomes their servant to them and a government unto itself, like Hydro. They do not want any interference by a stranger who is not hired and paid by them, of course not. Well, where is it taking us, where are we going? If Hydro owes—I think, it is something in the neighbourhood, no, I had better not say; I know it is $400 million more. It is in the billions that they owe, $2.8 billion; the province owes about $2.4 billion.

Where are we going, why do we not hear from the provincial auditor about this? Can we afford, in view of all the other commitments we have in the world of social problems, can we afford this big expenditure? We never hear an assessment, an independent assessment. The reason, to go back to where I began, is plain. The auditor has become a servant, he has come under the dominion of the Provincial Treasurer. After 23 years, they have got him completely under their control. And in such a position, he has not the inclination to criticize, has not the desire or maybe he would hurt the hon. Provincial Treasurer's feelings if he criticized. I notice they are on a first-name basis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): They would not go to lunch any more.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member for Brant says, "They would not go to lunch any more." Well, that is the way I put it. In closing, I say that it is a bad time for the Spences. The one in Ottawa is getting it from the Tory Party and the one here is getting it from the Liberals and the New Democratic Party. But they have a great forbearance. When all is said and done, the Spence boys have made a great contribution to the life of this province.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, as my friend was talking I had occasion to look at The Audit Act, and I think periodically we should refresh our memory as to what it contains. I think the point that my colleagues from Sudbury and from Bruce have made, and the points that we have made in public accounts over the years about the provincial auditor's independence do not need too much repetition, except perhaps a reference to The Audit Act. Once the auditor is appointed—I do not know if the hon. members are all aware—do you know that he cannot be removed except by request of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Certainly.

Mr. Singer: Certainly. By putting that into The Audit Act you indicate his independence. Surely he should be independent.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He should be.

Mr. Singer: Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We agree entirely.

Mr. Singer: Well, you do not agree entirely.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes we do.

Mr. Singer: No, you do not.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Surely you do not object to me agreeing with you?

Mr. Singer: You have got him here in front of you and I just wonder how independent that indicates he is. It seems to me a few years ago that the Deputy Treasurer sat at the other end of the table, and it was only after we started this criticism that the Deputy Treasurer has been removed.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Never!

Mr. Singer: Never been? Has the Deputy Treasurer never sat with the auditor in this assembly?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would not think so.

Mr. Singer: Well that is my recollection.

Looking through The Audit Act it is very fascinating the various things that he should do. In section 20, where it talks about his annual report to the assembly it says, amongst many things that he should do, he should report such matters he desires to bring to the attention of the assembly, as to any important change in the extent or character of any examination made by him, and so on.

I have had occasion to look at the report of the auditor of the province of Newfoundland. In the broad sphere of Canadian economics it is a comparatively small province, it spends may $150 million a year. Now as a part of the public accounts of the province of Newfoundland, the first section of it is the auditor general's report. He goes through the usual style of a report of an auditor and it comes under a number of headings.

At heading 22 his report covers some 37 different headings. He heads it "Audit Observation." These are things that the auditor of Newfoundland deems it proper he should comment upon. He says, for instance:

> My 1963-1964 report offered the opinion that potential revenue from entertainment tax was not fully realized by the province because of unsatisfactory procedures followed in carrying into effect the provisions of The Entertainment Act 1953, and also because of deficiencies in the Act including the lack of provision for Department of Finance to audit collection directors. To date the position remains unchanged.

Certainly that sort of comment should alert the government, and if not the government should alert the Legislature that something is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Quite proper.

Mr. Singer: The auditor there has taken two years in a row to comment on what he feels is a very serious mistake in the conduct of that government. He talks about income tax of pre-union origin in previous reports to the House of Assembly, and refers to the fact that no action has been taken to collect the outstanding valid assessments and to write off the accounts which are uncollectable:

> If it is not the intention of The Department of Finance to pursue collection of valid assessments appropriate action should be taken to have these accounts and the uncollectable items written off.

There are perhaps a dozen observations along these lines. Mr. Chairman, no one is going to convince me that if the auditor of New-

foundland can find this sort of thing to comment on, if the auditor of the government of Canada can find this sort of thing to comment on, that things in Ontario, with an expenditure of $2 billion, are all perfect. Because search as I might through this report, the auditor's report of 1964-65, I am unable to find a really critical observation addressed from the auditor to the government. Now, if Ontario is able to spend some $2 billion, collect and spend some $2 billion and do it without making a single mistake worthy of the auditor's comment, then I think Ontario is almost a Shangri-La.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): It is.

Mr. Singer: I just do not believe it. My friend the hon. Minister of Agriculture and I just do not share the same views on that.

I would think that there must be—my friend from Sudbury has mentioned a couple of items—there must be many items which deserve the auditor's comment in connection with these various matters. Therefore we are forced to come to the conclusion, year after year, that the auditor does not set himself up as a critic of government, as he is supposed to do, as a servant of the Legislature as he is supposed to do. We have made the suggestion over many years that the public accounts committee—first we had a battle getting it started and finally when it was started—the public accounts committee should be chaired by a member of the Opposition. The government has not seen fit to do that yet, and I do not know why, but that is a custom used in the United Kingdom, it is used in Ottawa and I think it would be a custom worthy of emulation here in this province; unless the government feels there is something to hide and they must keep a member of the government party as chairman of that committee. There is a good democratic process that a member of the Opposition be the chairman of the committee on public accounts and there seems to be no reason why it is not done here.

Without expanding on the obvious, Mr. Chairman, those are the observations, and I would commend to the Provincial Treasurer's attention the public accounts for the province of Newfoundland for the year ended March 31, 1965, to show what can be done in the light of a critical analysis by the public auditor.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member for Downsview that I am hoping to go down to Newfoundland this year.

Mr. Singer: You do not have to go down, I will lend you this.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. Mr. Rowe is a very efficient Minister of Finance. I know I shall be calling upon him and I will discuss what you have said about the provincial auditor.

There is one thing I think I should make clear, and that is that in presenting the estimates of the provincial auditor, I do so to obtain funds to carry on the office of the provincial auditor. I do not come here to defend the provincial auditor or to praise him. He is responsible to the Legislature. As an individual I am well satisfied with the manner in which he carries out his duties, but he is entirely free to criticize this government as much as he likes. There is nothing in The Audit Act, there is no influence. He is in a position to use his own judgment entirely in this matter.

With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury, who has left the House, I was a little amazed at his remarks about Hydro. There is a committee on commissions that sits and has the opportunity to look into the affairs of Hydro.

Mr. Whicher: A $3 billion organization.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There is an opportunity in the presentation of the estimates of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, vote 609, and there was not a person in this House opened their mouth about Hydro or asked a question and it went through like that; not one word said.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it was never before the House.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It certainly was before the House!

Mr. Bryden: What vote was before the House on Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Allan: It is on page 53, vote 609! This is to provide for the province to share the cost of construction and installation of plant and equipment and expenses and so on. And not a word, not an hon. member from the other side of the House said anything and it carried without any discussion.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Really; can one feel that the comments we are getting here today are very sincere?

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the item to which the hon.

Provincial Treasurer made reference, referred to only one specific operation of Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This is so but I think the hon. member will agree that when any item comes up, and this is the hon. Minister who reports to the House for Hydro, there is a good deal of latitude given in the opportunity to discuss the operations of Hydro at that time.

Mr. Bryden: I had the impression that this year we were getting away from this.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Getting away from it? Who got away?

Mr. Bryden: You are quite right.

Mr. Whicher: May I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer: Is the provincial auditor responsible for post-audit as well as a pre-audit?

Hon. Mr. Allan: He is responsible for the figures that appear in this auditor's report. He does not do a post-audit of all the expenditures, but he does a post-audit of all the revenue and is quite free, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Downsview regarding the criticism of the auditor in Newfoundland, the auditor here should take the same interest and make the same criticism, if there is reason for it. I think this is criticism that falls within the responsibility of the auditor; that is the way in which the taxes are being collected. Is the operation efficient; are people escaping the payment of taxes; who should be paying them?

I think it is very proper that the auditor should watch this carefully.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer: Does it not say in the government's manual of administration that he is also responsible for the post-audit of receipts of public moneys and for the audit of Crown agencies as authorized by individual statutes?

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right.

Mr. Whicher: Then the point is there is only a post-audit of receipts, but not expenditures of the figures that are in your auditor's report?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Whicher: Well just to summarize, Mr. Chairman, my contention is that it certainly puts the auditor in an absolutely impossible position. He has got to audit something and give criticisms on something for which he signs the cheques. Now this is not the way that any corporation does it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He is not required to sign the cheques.

Mr. Whicher: But he does.

Hon. Mr. Allan: If he decides he is not going to sign the cheque, that is it, it is not signed.

Mr. Singer: Then you have not got a cheque.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it stops right there.

Mr. Whicher: But then we do not know anything about it. Then the Opposition does not know anything about it. Do you consider this to be fair? I mean, the auditor of any responsible corporation in Canada is there for the benefit of the shareholders. He steers the corporation on the path they go for the good of that corporation and he gives at meetings and in books, in auditor's reports, suggestions that he has for management.

Now, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): I doubt that, oh, no. He just says he has audited the books and found that they reflect an accurate story of the company's operations.

Mr. Whicher: Yes, and that is what happened with Atlantic Acceptance too, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am talking about what you said he did, the company auditor.

Mr. Whicher: But if the auditor sees that there is something wrong he says so to the shareholders of the company, you see.

An hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Whicher: But the auditors of these corporations, they do not do a pre-audit; if they do, it is an internal matter. But the auditors representing the shareholders of all these companies in Canada give a post-audit, and they give criticisms where criticisms are warranted.

I can tell you in this instance that our auditor is in an absolutely impossible situation, not placed there by himself, but by the government. He cannot do anything else.

How can he criticize something where he signs the cheque?

Hon. Mr. Allan: He does not. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of difference of opinion, and I have great respect for the opinion expressed on the side opposite. The opinion

of the government is different. This is it: So far as the result is concerned, so far as the opportunity of the hon. Provincial Treasurer preventing the spending of money that should not be spent is concerned he is in a position now to prevent that, even better than by a post-audit. This is where we think the strength of the pre-audit is. If money should not be spent, he does not sign the cheque.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is no point in belabouring this point with the hon. Provincial Treasurer because he simply will not see—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, I listened to everything you said.

Mr. Bryden: Nobody in this House has suggested that there should not be a pre-audit. What has been suggested is that the pre-audit is an executive function and it should be carried out by an executive officer. The post-audit is a legislative function and should be carried out by an officer of the Legislature. There is no officer of the Legislature, in fact, to carry it out.

Furthermore, the hon. Provincial Treasurer says there is a difference of opinion between the government and the Opposition. That is true. We should put the thing on its true basis, however. There is a difference of opinion between the government and the public accounts committee which represents all parties in the House. I think that should be noted, that the difference of opinion is broader than merely one between the government and the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, may I say with great sincerity that the objections that have been presented today have been noted.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1501 carried?

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I notice there is an increase in salaries for this year, of approximately 15 per cent. The hon. member for Sudbury brought this up, but I was wondering, is the department planning to increase its staff in order to assume greater responsibilities, for example, to audit such boards as the workmen's compensation board of Ontario, or Ontario Hydro for that matter?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, there is no intention to have the provincial auditor audit the provincial Hydro. This has been discussed many times and I do not think it is my responsibility to discuss it with you; it is a matter of government policy.

There will be additional responsibility of the auditor this year, and I am surprised you forgot to ask me about this. I was hoping you would; I had such a nice answer for you.

Mr. Whicher: The vote is not over yet.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have the accounts of the supreme court of Canada, the official guardian and the public trustee.

Mr. Sopha: No, the accountant of the supreme court of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: His brother would not permit him in the other court.

Vote 1501 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of the provincial auditor.

Clerk of the House: The office of the Lieutenant-Governor.

ESTIMATES, LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR

Vote 1101 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of the Lieutenant-Governor.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I did not think we were going to be able to present our estimates so quickly after the Lieutenant-Governor's were called.

Mr. Chairman, in the past it has been my practice, when presenting the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs for your consideration and approval, to describe the organization of the department and to indicate how it provides assistance to the municipalities. This year I feel there is no need to describe current departmental organization and branch functions in detail as I have done previously. Nor shall I, at this time, deal with the changes in the provincial economy that have serious implications for municipal government. You are all well aware of the problems facing municipalities and, I trust, the general nature of the department's programmes to alleviate them.

Rather, in the time at my disposal, I intend to highlight the actitvities of the

department over the past year an to describe the programmes for the current year.

Before dealing with each of the departmental branches I would like to describe a new branch, the research branch, that will be formally established in the near future.

Up to this time, each of the branches has done its own research in order to recommend new programmes and to evaluate the effects of current programmes. By and large this research was done on an ad hoc basis by officials who were withdrawn from their regular duties to undertake it.

While this type of research was adequate in the past, the increasing complexities of provincial-municipal relations has made it imperative that a new approach be taken. The research branch, staffed by persons qualified to carry out detailed projects, will expand the research capabilities of the department and co-ordinate the research carried out in the operating branches. I also anticipate that this branch will act as a co-ordinating body for any research undertaken by other government departments that may have implications for municipal organization and development.

One of the major projects I expect the research branch to undertake will be to provide factual data for the area review commissions by working through the office of the municipal studies programme co-ordinator.

The office of the co-ordinator was established early this year to provide full-time assistance in the administration of the programme of local government reviews. Another function to be performed by the research branch in this important area will be to comment and make recommendations on the reports of the area review commissions.

Other areas of activity by the branch will include the examination of the effects on local government of existing or proposed provincial and federal assistance to municipalities including grants, shared cost programmes and shared revenues.

The branch will also study and report on the effects of government policy which involves a reallocation of municipal responsibilities or revenues. In addition, the branch will comment and make recommendations on the reports of any Royal commission or committee established by this or any other government having implications for municipal governments in Ontario.

I will now turn to the municipal assessment branch. The results of my department's policy of encouraging the implementation of centralized assessment systems have been gratifying to me.

At the beginning of this year there were 16 counties with 324 municipalities, and 4 territorial districts containing 70 municipalities, operating under this system. Since January, three other counties, Elgin, Wellington and Wentworth, have decided to implement countywide assessment in January, 1967. If acceptance of the system continues at the rate demonstrated in the past, I have every expectation that even more than 23 jurisdictions will be operating centralized assessment systems next year.

There have been suggestions from many sources that the centralized system be made mandatory for all counties. I do not feel that such a move would be feasible at this time. No assessment system by itself can produce good, bad, or indifferent valuations. A system may be good or bad to the extent that it allows the work to be carried out efficiently. However, the success of the system in terms of providing equitable assessments depends ultimately on the personnel that make the valuations.

Unfortunately, there are not, at present, sufficient trained assessors to operate centralized assessment systems on a province-wide scale.

There are now 361 graduates of the training course provided by the institute of municipal assessors, plus approximately 120 who will graduate this year. At a minimum, 1,500 professional assessors are needed before we can hope to provide equitable assessments across the entire province. So you can see there is still considerable work to be done in the training of qualified assessors.

The interest of my department in the training of assessors includes more than the assistance we have given to the institute of municipal assessors in the revision of their course material. Officials in the assessment branch are providing training in the use of the manual provided by the department to municipal assessors.

This programme is devoted to the practical application of the appraisal theory explained in the manual and the institute course. It consists of four two-week lecture course followed by field training. Courses in residential, commercial and farm assessment have been given to 250 assessors in eight counties using centralized assessment systems. Residential and commercial courses have been given in five cities as well.

A further step in the department's programme to improve the calibre of municipal

assessors was taken in January when regulations for the licensing of assessors were issued. Three classes of licences will be granted: regular, probationary and temporary. Some 1,500 applications have been processed by the licensing advisory committee and licences are now being distributed.

Regular licences will be granted to all assessors who are members of the institute of municipal assessors. Temporary licences will be granted to all those who were assessors as of December 31, 1965, but who were not members of the institute. Probationary licences will be given to all persons entering the field and are qualified to enter the institute's training course. The importance of the licensing programme is that from January 1, 1966, onward, all persons who intend to become assessors must possess the qualifications necessary to take the training course and must pass that course before they can practise as assessors in the province of Ontario. To the best of my knowledge this is the first time that professional qualifications have ever been made a prerequisite for employment as an assessor anywhere in North America.

One topic that has aroused considerable interest in the past few months has been the adoption of a new assessment equalization factor. I feel that I should outline the different methods used to prepare the old and new factors and explain why the method was adopted.

Prior to this year the equalization factor was the ratio between the local assessment on a sample of buildings in the municipality and the valuations of these buildings made by officials of my department. The department valuations were based on 1940 costs. That is, the equalization factor did not reflect the value of land in the municipality.

The new equalization factor is based on the sale price of real property rather than 1940 building costs. Officials of the assessment branch record the sales of real property in each municipality and, wherever necessary, adjust the sale prices to reflect market value. The average ratio of the local assessment placed on these properties to their market values becomes the equalization factor.

This new method of computing an equalization factor is superior to the old on two counts. First, the basis of equalization, market value, is more equitable; and second, the factor now reflects the value of land as well as of improvements.

It appears that as a result of the new method of computing the equalization factor the amount of total equalized assessment in Ontario will more than triple. Final tabulations will not be available until all municipalities and school boards in unorganized territory have reported their total assessment.

Now, dealing with the municipal organization and administration branch, during the past year the branch participated in a number of special studies of municipal organization. One of these involved the request by the councils of the town of Grimsby and the township of North Grimsby to provide assistance in their investigations into the possibility of a larger municipal unit in the area. Another study was undertaken in the Moosonee region to study the possibility of establishing some form of municipal organization in that area. This study has been completed and its recommendations are currently being evaluated by senior officials in my department. Other studies were made in the townships of Hanmer and Capreol, the township of King and the police village of King City, the police village of Augus, Hill Island in the townships of Front of Leeds and Lansdowne, and the Timagami area in the district of Timiskaming.

A major revision of the provincial grants and subsidies catalogue, the first since its introduction in 1964, was made by the branch and will be available within the next month. This publication has proved exceedingly useful to municipal clerks and treasurers, and beginning with this revision will be revised annually.

The services of the branch were also used in the local government reviews commissioned by the province. Statistical and other information were assembled for Niagara region local government review, the Peel-Halton review and the Lakehead review.

In view of the increasing importance of counties in the structure of municipal government, the branch prepared a study on the problem of representation on county councils. The study came up with a number of possible alternatives to the present system and recommendations for the amendment of the pertinent provisions of The Municipal Act are under consideration.

A further development in the branch has been the increased emphasis on field activities. These have included instructional seminars for municipal officials, departmental workshops given in conjunction with other branches and general advisory services provided on the request of municipal officials. The topics covered by branch officials include budgeting, tax levying procedures,

composition of councils and local boards and election procedures.

The branch's long-term programme on quieting orders is continuing. The object is to assist municipalities in removing ambiguities with respect to boundaries, dates of incorporation and legal status, and includes the preparation of boundary descriptions and maps. At the end of 1965 assistance of this kind had been given to all townships in the counties east of Ontario county. Officers of the branch visited the municipalities in Carleton, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, and Prescott and Russell to review the assembled material with local officials.

The municipal finance branch is undertaking continuous studies into various aspects of the financial operations of municipalities. These include studies of the implications of financing the cost of municipal services by borrowing, the sharing of costs between the various levels of government and the adequacy of the municipal revenue base to meet municipal responsibilities. To increase and broaden the scope of these studies two research assistants are to be added to the staff. In addition, because of the need to direct studies in the more specialized areas of provincial-municipal financial relations, consultants will be used on a part-time basis.

The branch does extensive work in analyzing and appraising the municipalities' financial position. I am pleased to report that before long it will be possible to give related advice in greater depth to government agencies and municipalities. A new section in the finance branch is planned to provide this service and to counsel municipal treasurers on different methods of financing municipal capital expenditures and on ways to improve the municipality's financial condition.

One of the most important tasks of the branch's information section is the publication of the annual report of municipal statistics. This publication, commonly called "The Blue Book," is supplied to every member of the legislative assembly. It contains a wealth of significant financial information relating to every Ontario municipality. It is the major source from which municipalities, governments and financial institutions get information about municipal finances. Although I have been gratified to hear it praised frequently, one cannot be complacent, and in the near future this report will be carefully reviewed to make it even more effective in meeting exacting, present day requirements.

In 1966, the education committee of the association of municipal clerks and treasurers of Ontario is preparing a thorough revision of its training course. The government is providing financial assistance to meet the cost of the revision of the training course and to reimburse 60 per cent of the fees paid by successful students.

As you know, the Legislature recently enacted The Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation Act. The corporation has been established to purchase from municipalities or school boards, debentures issued to finance the cost of elementary and secondary school board capital expenditures with funds borrowed by the province from the Canada pension plan.

The municipal finance branch is administering the day-to-day responsibilities of this programme in conjunction with the municipalities and school boards. The rate of interest applicable to the purchase of debentures by the corporation is well below the rate at which a municipality can borrow in the public money market. Consequently, the interest shown by municipalities, although expected to be great, has exceeded our expectations.

In 1965, officials of the municipal accounting branch visited the offices of over 130 municipalities and 20 auditors. In addition, contact was made with most municipalities and municipal auditors during the course of the year. It is hoped in 1966 to find qualified staff to extend the advisory services of this branch.

The most frequent problems faced by the municipalities and requiring assistance from the staff of the branch, are those related to the calculation of a wide variety of mill rates; the financial inter-relationships between the municipalities and their local boards; the apportionment of the cost of joint municipal projects, such as between a police village and a municipality; and the financial implications of municipal boundary changes.

In 1965 the branch began a complete review of annual financial statements of municipalities and local boards with a view to raising the reporting standards and to achieving uniformity in municipal financial information. It is expected the review will be finished in time to introduce the revised financial statements for 1966.

To make the knowledge, experience and guidance of municipal auditors and treasurers available to the branch in connection with its programme, I have requested the institute of chartered accountants of Ontario and the association of municipal clerks and treasurers of Ontario to appoint committees to advise the branch.

During 1965 the municipal subsidies branch, in the course of administering the various loan, shared-cost and subsidy programmes for which the department is responsible, made loan payments of $33 million and subsidy payments of $42 million.

The major programmes administered by the branch include: the municipal works assistance programme, the municipal winter works incentive programme, centennial grants and unconditional grants.

The municipal works assistance programme was designed to increase employment by making low interest loans with a 25 per cent forgiveness of principal to municipalities and school boards for augmented or accelerated capital works. The total funds allocated to the province have been loaned to municipalities and school boards and the loan forgiveness may reach $34 million.

The programme has been operating for 29 months and was scheduled to have ended March 31, 1966. However, earlier this year, along with the Ministers from other provinces and their representatives, I met with the Finance Minister in Ottawa to request an extension of the period during which eligible costs incurred on an approved project may be subject to the 25 per cent forgiveness.

I am pleased to state that a six-month extension has been granted, to September 30, 1966. As a result, more municipalities and school boards will be able to obtain maximum forgiveness benfits.

The federal-provincial municipal winter works incentive programme continues to be well accepted by the municipalities with a 10 per cent increase in participation expected in 1965-66; 342 municipalities are taking part, providing winter employment to over 1,700 persons. Under this programme the federal government reimburses 50 per cent of the direct payroll costs on approved projects and the province provides a 25 per cent reimbursement. Higher rates apply in certain designated areas.

Under the centennial grants programme the federal and provincial governments are making grants totalling $12 million to municipalities for a variety of projects considered suitable to commemorate the centenary of Confederation.

Unconditional grants are paid to each local municipality in Ontario. The grants, based on population, amount in total to $25 million annually and are applied to reduce the amount of taxes levied against residential and farm assessment.

This past year has been one of the busiest in the 20-year history of the community planning branch. In some cases the work has tripled. One of the most challenging jobs, and one which has absorbed a number of our senior staff over the past year, has been that portion of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study operation relating to population and land use projections to 1980 and 2000. It is fully expected that this project will be completed in 1966.

Speaking of transportation, I should mention that the branch staff has also had extensive association with The Department of Highways in their regional highway studies and urban transportation surveys in Cornwall, Sudbury, Ottawa, Midland and Wallaceburg. These studies are continuing.

There will be a continuation and strengthening of efforts to stimulate the establishment of joint planning areas of sufficient size and having sufficient resources to do an effective job in defining problems, setting goals for development and redevelopment, and recommending realistic action programmes. The increased interest of counties in planning is most encouraging. In the first half of 1966 we have had discussions with the counties of Elgin, Middlesex, Hastings, Prince Edward and Renfrew—this on top of our extensive associations with Waterloo and Brant counties last year.

Interest in urban renewal, both plan-making and project-implementation, is rising at a rapid rate, such as Brantford, Eastview, Fort William, Hamilton, Kenora, Kitchener, Sudbury, Toronto, Windsor, St. Thomas, Sault Ste. Marie, Port Arthur, Oshawa, and others, are presently engaged in preparing and/or implementing urban renewal projects. The rapid pace of the past year will be exceeded in the 1966-1967 fiscal period. Branch staff is to be increased in the near future to provide for the extension and intensification of our planning advisory role to municipalities and to undertake much needed research. The estimates before the House provide for an increase in the branch staff from 83 to 97.

Financial help is being given to planning boards containing areas without municipal organization. Discussions are occurring with interested parties and it is expected that agreements can be reached in 1966.

In the past at least 10 per cent of all subdivision applications made to the branch have not been recommended for approval. The reasons for approval are many and varied. The most common basis for rejection has been prematurity with respect to location and/or ability of the municipality to provide the required urban-type services to the

proposed development. Experience has indicated that a number of these applications would not have been made with resulting financial commitments by the applicant, had they realized in the first instance that the possibilities of approval were very slight.

It is my intention in 1966 to set out clear guidelines that will declare policy relative to such matters as urban development in rural municipalities, scatteration of urban growth and other matters.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What is that word, "scatteration"?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Scatteration.

Mr. Singer: What does it mean?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It means a few houses here and a few along the highway half a mile away. That is scatteration—in planning parlance. Not legalese, I do not think.

Mr. Racine: Is it in the dictionary?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes, I think you will find it in the dictionary.

As part of the department's research programme to meet the challenges presented by the expansion of urban development, I have continued the local government reviews in those areas where there has been an interest expressed in the re-examination of municipal organization. Since 1964 I have appointed four commissioners to prepare local government review studies.

The first study area which was delineated in 1964 consisted of the cities of Ottawa and Eastview, the county of Carleton and the township of Cumberland in the united counties of Prescott and Russell. In 1965 three further studies were established, first, in the Niagara peninsula, consisting of the cities of Niagara Falls, St. Catharines, Welland and Port Colborne and the counties of Lincoln and Welland; second, in the counties of Peel and Halton; and third, at the Lakehead involving the cities of Fort William and Port Arthur, and the surrounding townships of Neebing, Paipoonge and Shuniah in the district of Thunder Bay.

Each of these studies has been undertaken only after preliminary discussions leading to a local concensus on the part of the municipalities involved. In appointing the commissioners and establishing their terms of reference, I have placed no restrictions on the recommendations they may make. However, I have indicated to them that in implementing any changes, the government will not necessarily base its decisions on their recommendations.

Mr. Singer: They may not even look at them.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, we will look at them; do not worry about that.

The cost of these studies, which are shared with the municipalities in the study area, are estimated to be about $65,000, depending on the nature of the study area and the complexities of the local government situation.

The final report of the Ottawa-Carleton review has been received and is now under study by officials in the department. It is anticipated that we shall receive the final reports from the three other areas by the end of this year. I might add that the need for such studies in other areas of the province is acute and several requests for them are now on file in the department.

Having touched on the highlights of the past year and indicated the proposed programme for the next 12 months, I will now turn, in due course, to the individual items of the estimates. I expect and hope that I will be able to provide additional information when these are discussed in detail.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister a question. The grants to mining municipalities were not touched on by him, and they have disappeared from the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not think they have disappeared.

Mr. Sopha: I do not think they have either. May I ask the hon. Minister if he is going to say anything about them?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not at this time. In a general way—

Mr. Sopha: Is the hon. Minister hiding something?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Sopha: Are you hiding something?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not hiding anything at all.

Mr. Sopha: Have you got a surprise for someone?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion **agreed to.**

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The third order: Committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill 52, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 52 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

every individual as defined in The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962 shall pay to Her Majesty for the use of Ontario the taxes imposed by that Act in accordance with that Act,

as amended by the provision of Bill 82, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Resolution concurred in.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 82, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 82 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

every corporation as defined in The Corporations Tax Act shall pay to Her Majesty for the use of Ontario the taxes imposed by that Act in accordance with that Act,

as amended by the provision of Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 83 reported.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 86, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act:

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prevail excessively on the House, but I believe that my colleague the hon. member for Riverdale had a fairly major amendment which he wished to make to section 4, sir, and he is not here at the moment, not anticipating this arising this afternoon. Would the hon. Prime Minister consider holding it?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I really do not see that I can. We try to accommodate everybody in this House as far as possible, but you are on notice that these bills are here to be called in the normal course of business of the House and I think we will have to proceed.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): In respect of section 4, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. Attorney General if this section and the ones that follow it are really meant to correct the abuses that Mr. Justice Hughes is turning up in respect of his inquiry into the affairs of British Mortgage and Atlantic Acceptance? In other words, is this anticipating some of the holes that have been found to exist in The Loan and Trust Corporations Act?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Hughes has not yet, of course, reported and will not for some time; so one can hardly say that this can be anticipated to that extent.

There were some abuses that were perhaps apparent to us and places which needed some shoring up. This particular section goes some considerable distance toward that end.

Mr. Sopha: It seems to me on looking at this bill that the design of the draftsman is to make the lending policies of the loan and

trust corporations even more conservative—I use the lower case "c"—than they have been. I am wondering if that is the government policy.

In other words, as a result of the unfortunate affairs of British Mortgage and the anguish that it struck in the hearts of citizens of Stratford, has the government to some extent become panic stricken, or is it acting out of panic, in making the requirements for securities held and the activities of directors even more stringent than they were before?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the section is plain from the reading of it and on the marginal note. It is to increase the amount of paid-up capital that must be there before the corporation may borrow. I think that is the answer. Certainly it is an adidtional stringency, in a sense, but it is for the purpose of security. That is the aim of the section.

Mr. Sopha: It is well known—I would not have to adduce demonstrative proof to show—that the most conservative financial institutions in our country have been the loan and trust corporations. They will not lend a dime unless the security they get is gilt-edged. British Mortgage's experience, as bad as it was and as glaring as it appears to be in some of the deficiencies, I like to think of as an example that comes along just about once in a century.

Really, if you own a farm and a meteor strikes it at some point of time, that does not mean that you have to take out insurance policies against the farm being assailed by meteors, or you have to expect because one hit it in 300 million years that there is going to be another one next week. I like to think because we have had the phenomenon of British Mortgage that we can expect hopefully that we will not see another one for quite a long time and perhaps not in our lifetime.

After all, only one bank, so far as I know, only one bank ever failed in the history of Canada and that was the Home bank in 1924. We have not had a failure of a bank since, none is on the verge of failing.

So it is with the trust companies. They are very strong institutions indeed, with immense amounts of capital.

In fact, in respect of the capital they are inclined to be a little bit misleading because I hear them on the radio talking about their assets and they include in the asset picture that they give to the listener at eight o'clock in the morning when you are shaving, they include those estates under administration. Which is rather misleading, because that money is trust money administered by them. But they do not explain that to the uninitiate in the world of corporate financing.

However, to get back to what I was saying, they are indeed exceedingly conservative. I have been known to remark before that they want to have a mortgage on everybody's house in the country, that appears to be as exciting as their lending policies go. No one could ever demonstrate to me! I examine their financial statements, which they kindly send to all of us every year.

I examine them and I always calculate with the use of pencil and paper, because I am no good at mathematics in the head, I calculate the amount they have in equity stocks, blue chip, good equity stocks—like Inco, Falconbridge, Noranda, MacMillan Bloedel, Bell Telephone and so on. It usually works out to a high—this will be a very daring trust company—a high of 3 per cent. But that one—in the National club and the York club and the Toronto club, is probably thought to be way out, they are probably thought to be beatnik in their lending policies to have 3 per cent of their capital in equity stocks. Normally it is around 1 and 1½ per cent.

That demonstrates the great faith, of course, I say somewhat ironically, that trust companies have in the future of our country. It is a great faith. Small wonder the hon. Prime Minister has to go to North Bay and talk to those good chamber of commerce people about the dependence on American capital; small wonder that he had to.

Where else would we get the risk capital, because we will not get it from the loan and trust corporations. They will not invest in the future of this country. No, they prefer the government bonds, mortgages on people's houses, municipal bonds, Hydro bonds, province of Ontario bonds, with a nice safe rate of return, which I might say is a very handsome rate.

It used to be that governments could borrow, perhaps a decade and a half ago—governments—at somewhere around 3¾ or 4 per cent. They cannot now. Indeed, they have to pay 5 or 5½ per cent for the money they get from the trust companies and other classical financial institutions. They have to pay a premium rate for it.

But government borrowing is big business to these institutions, so what need do they really have to put their funds into equity stocks which, of course, is risking money in the development of this country? Of course, they will not. If there is any one institution,

if any economic historian would ever do a thesis on the subject—and one did, A. F. W. Plumtree did, but this book is rather dated now, being written 30 years ago; it is the only one of its nature that I know of—but if anyone did a thesis he would have to come to the inescapable conclusion that the one thing that has retarded the economic development of this country has been the conservative habits of the loan and trust corporations and the banks.

The banks are outside our purview but these institutions are within our purview. They have inhibited the economic development of our country. And what is the most sterling example of that? The most sterling example to demonstrate the validity of what I say is when the time came to throw the pipeline across the northern reaches of the precambrian shield, costing an estimated $80 million. None of these institutions in the purview of this Act would put up a dime; they turned them down flat. They had to go to the government of Canada, and their going to the government of Canada had very disastrous political results for a political party and an effect on Parliamentary institutions which we all remember.

The people of this country, as they have always done since Confederation, the people of the country put up the money for a big project; that is who always put up the money for big projects in this country, not these institutions here. They maintain the safe level of one per cent of their total assets in equity stocks; that is to say in the building and development of our country.

The mutual funds, on the other hand, are a happy contrast. I noticed one the other day—they sent us their report—85.8 per cent of their assets are in equity stocks, common shares, common stocks of companies, most of them trading on the Toronto stock exchange. There is a great difference in their attitude toward the great future of this country.

After all, the wealth of this country is behind all these institutions; these, like the debt securities. Well, I remember the day the Hon. Robert Macaulay, as he then was, stood in this House and made what I thought was a magnificent speech about the economic outlook of this country.

He referred to the affinity—that was not his word—but he referred to the affinity of Canadians for debt securities. Canadians like debt securities. They do not like equity securities but they prefer the good, safe gilt-edged government bonds backed by the province of Ontario or the federal government—that is these institutions.

So, if these institutions, controlling immense amounts of capital—really immense amounts of capital they control—if they will not invest in the future of our country by risking a dollar—and I am not suggesting, lest I be misunderstood, I am not suggesting for a minute that they start to put large amounts in, I would be happy if they put 15 per cent of their assets into equity securities. That would give me a complete feeling of euphoria about the confidence they demonstrate in our country and its development. But it is nowhere near that in common experience. And so it goes.

So, small wonder, I say, that the hon. Prime Minister has to go up to the chamber of commerce and get into the fight between Mitchell Sharp and Waalter Gordon. Apparently he leans toward the Sharp school, he has gone into that camp.

He says to the chamber of commerce people: "We welcome our American investors." But we will have more to say on that another day when we can really analyze that which he said and compare his speech in North Bay to his one in Winnipeg and just see how the two jibe. That will be a nice exercise for me over a weekend, to compare what I think are the inherent contradictions in the two speeches.

But I have made my point; who am I to quarrel with the knowledge of the draftsman and his responsibility? I just say for my own part I do not see that because we run into a phenomenon—and that is what I call it, an unusual event, the decline and fall of British Mortgage and Trust Corporation—that we should rush into legislative print as here and start to impose all sorts of harsh restrictions on the trust corporations by asking for increased amounts of subscribed capital, and so on. My view tells me that these trust corporations do very well. They appear to start from a genesis of organization by a few people, and in two or three years their experience and results appear to be magnificent.

Now, one other thing, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General contemplated the effects of that decision—a year ago it was, in 1965—where the mortgage was held by the court to be not payable because the company was not registered under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Justice Grant.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Justice Grant, yes, indeed it was; and I do not know that the decision was ever appealed.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Yes, it is.

Mr. Sopha: It is on its way to the court of appeal. Well, for my own money, Mr. Justice Grant is a very able judge and I would not—

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): That opinion is up to the appeal court!

Mr. Sopha: I suppose the attitude of the hon. Attorney General will be that there will be no action taken until the thing makes its progress through the court.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to say I am inclined to agree with the hon. member that the record of the trust companies has been a very excellent one. I would like to say again that this Act did not arise out of the British Mortgage situation. It was the result of a study that certainly needed doing, in our thinking, as a government policy. The section 4 in the reprinted Act, which is the section, I think, to which perhaps we are directing our attention, simply makes to apply to trust companies the insider trading provisions of The Corporations Act.

The section to which my hon. friend was addressing his remarks, I think, was the increased amount, which is really section 5 now, in the reprint, of the subscription, the capital which must be subscribed and paid up. The amount which must be subscribed was increased from $300,000 to $500,000 and the paid up capital moves from $100,000 to $500,000. This, I think it is quite apparent, comes about by reason of the expansion of our economy, the changing value of money and the great increase in transactions in the financial world, particularly the trust companies. It is not an onerous thing perhaps, but it is in line with the way our economy has moved.

With respect to the case you mentioned—I think it is the Wettham case, which was decided last year by Mr. Justice Grant—there are perhaps not provisions in this Act directed to that case which I believe is under appeal. But there is other legislation which is either before this House, or will be before it, which has certain provisions with respect to the 3/2 companies which will certainly have that situation in mind and will be effective in curbing such a situation coming about again.

Mr. Sopha: Does subsection 1 of section 4 mean that the company cannot tap that capital, they cannot use it, that it must always remain there, that $500,000?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I think it does not mean that, Mr. Chairman, at all. It means that there must be, for a company to approach the trust situation of borrowing, a trust company or loan company—I think it is speaking there of a loan company—it must have subscribed capital of $500,000 and it must be all paid up; then it goes into the business of borrowing money. It must have that capital. It must show that it has that solidity about it, that worthwhileness, the evidence that people are prepared to put up money to that extent, before it can be registered under this Act and do business.

Sections 4 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I feel I must rise on a point of order and appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to hold the rest of this bill until the hon. member for Riverdale is here. He is quite interested in it, and I feel that we did divert from the orders that we had thought we were going to be dealing with. It was not the fault of this party and I am sure the hon. Attorney General does not want the bill to go through the House in committee of the whole, until he has the opinions of the hon. member from this side, who is highly interested in this subject. I think that we could fill the rest of the hour with other bills, and I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, did this bill not go to the committee?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: May I assure the hon. member my information is that it went to committee and was thoroughly discussed at leisure and before the committee, and in public.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Also, may I point out that there is another opportunity. The bill will be up before this House for third reading and I also recollect the leader of your own party making an identical comment in regard to the hon. member for Bracondale, when he wished to raise something and he was not in the House at the time, and it was decided that this could be raised on third reading.

The bill has been before the committee which deals with legal bills. It has been

thoroughly examined there and your colleague has had an opportunity to put his point and he will have another opportunity before the bill is finally discharged from the order paper.

Sections 11 and 12 agreed to.

On section 13:

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General in respect of subsection 4, whether it has given him any concern that a finance company owns a large part of a trust company carrying on business in this province?

In view of the unhappy circumstances of finance companies at this particular time—I refer obviously to the fact that there has been quite a loss of public confidence in the shares of finance companies in recent months on the Toronto stock exchange; some of them have declined in value very dramatically. I refer to Alliance, as one, Union Acceptance as a second, and Traders, the company that I refer to as owning a large share in a trust company, has itself declined quite markedly.

Now, I ask him through you, Mr. Chairman, whether that has occasioned any scrutiny or investigation by The Department of the Attorney General, administering this Act, in the light of subsection 4 of the Act?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the hon. member's question to be: Does it give me concern that a finance company holds a large amount of trust company stock?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I should think that would be a very good thing for the finance company, that it held a large amount of trust company stock. If it were the other way around, I might have some concern.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is, if I understood your question right. Is the Attorney General concerned that the finance company had a large amount of trust company stock? Is that the question?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The trust company must subscribe and register under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act and meet these very conditions which we now prescribe as additional amendments to that Act; and I should not think it would be a bad thing if a finance company held some trust company stock.

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to be an alarmist, but they are all complaining—that is the finance companies—about the shortage of capital, which is precisely the reason that the shares of Union Acceptance declined so dramatically. My goodness, their second preferred shares went from $10 par; you can buy them at $3.50 now. Supposing Traders felt the pinch of a need of capital to loan and they sold their guaranty trust loans. Then what would it do to the market if they put a large block of shares to get additional capital to loan out through their several hundred branch officers across Canada, many of them in Ontario? What protection is there in the legislation, or indeed in this section, against such an eventuality and the harm to the other shareholders of Guaranty Trust?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, we could speculate on what the operations of any large shareholder placing his stock on the market, what effect it might have. I would not think it likely that a finance company or any other large shareholder, unless he found himself in extremely perilous circumstances, would suddenly throw such a block of shares on the market that he would destroy his own position by having to sell it at a very reduced value or price. I would think that certainly there would be, among the persons who are handling a situation of that kind, a presentation of that stock on the market in such a way that, while it might have some effect in lowering the value of the stock, it would not be a sudden disaster which would affect the trust company's position. I should not think this would be likely, but any situation I suppose is conceivable.

Mr. Sopha: I might add that I am one of those Canadians—and I do not think we are too small a minority really—who are somewhat alarmed by this interlocking ownership of large financial institutions. I look with considerable dismay on the reduction in the number of chartered banks, with their mergers; they become ever more powerful, monolithic corporations. They are outside our jurisdiction. Trust companies are within—I beg your pardon?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I thought you said that it was a sign of paranoia—

Mr. Sopha: What?

Mr. Bryden: —to be concerned about the huge monopolies that are growing up.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know what he is muttering about, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: That is what you said when I expressed a similar concern.

Mr. Sopha: I will go on; the intervention was not very helpful.

Mr. Bryden: I was just quoting you to yourself. That probably does not help you.

Mr. Chairman: On section 13, the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: A gentleman is a person who is never rude unintentionally. Do not let me depart from that and be rude to you. As I was saying, I look with considerable alarm on the intertwining of finance companies and trust companies such as the one that I have cited. With their growth and power, their growth and wealth, the accumulation of large amounts of capital, in my view, they become more dangerous to the public weal.

I sometimes think about my friend Mr. Sharp up in the other place. Mr. Sharp has been too close all his life to people in the National, York, Toronto clubs, when he was in the civil service, part of the establishment. And I wish Mr. Sharp would go down to the Ecum Secum bridge in Nova Scotia, perhaps to Duntroon, and see what the common people think, then maybe he would not allow the chartered banks to raise the interest rate. These people, let us face it, have profound influence on the politics and the economics of this country. I and others are much concerned about the degree of that influence and its sinister infiltration into our economic way of life in this country.

I cite one and I would be happy to see the government for the time being over there say to finance companies, such as Traders, "You keep in the finance business and you, Guaranty Trust, keep in the trust company business and never the twain shall meet. Between you, each keep in your respective fields."

Our American cousins, of course, have developed this notion to a much higher degree of sophistication than we have. They are miles ahead of us in this, in their recognition of the trust combinations and the conspiracies in restraint of trade and conspiracies to get control of the large accumulations of capital. They intervene immediately they see the warning signals, and the government in that free and democratic republic where people are so conscious of the due process of law, the government steps in quickly and says, "We will not permit this merger." We are in the middle ages in this province in that regard; we have never taken any legislative steps to prevent it.

I hope that subsection 4 here, of this section, and the section it was allied to in the original Act, might have gone much further than it does and demonstrated some concern on the part of the government about these sinister influences. But apparently, that is not in the government thinking. What I have said will not get me many votes in the private clubs but then I am not a member and not many of my constituents are members of them and I do not think I need to be concerned. But I do fiercely believe that more and more politicians have got to speak out against the concentrations of power that are building up in the financial world, that are getting so great that they appear to be able effectively to challenge the power of Legislatures as they are. And I do not think that is an extremist or an alarmist's point of view in any way. There has to come in this country a day of reckoning with these financial institutions and I hope that day is not far distant. The politicians have to say, "We are in control of the economic future of this province and this country, not you people." They have far too much.

I always like to buttress what I say by an illustration. What could be more demonstrative of the validity of what I say than the reconversion loan by the Diefenbaker government of 1958 or 1959, where they refinanced the war loans—many of them were war loans—and gave a tremendous premium to corporations such as this, such as are envisaged in this Act. That reconversion demonstrated the immense power, the immense political power, I say, of these institutions. Now, if any further proof need be rendered, I refer my listeners to Professor Porter's excellent book where he treats of them also and directs attention to the profound power they have. The people that run these institutions are the Upper Canada College graduates and their like, and part of the establishment—the Canadian establishment.

I implore the Attorney General, who is a very reasonable man, and very fair-minded: Another year let us have a look at these mergers and see whether in the interests of the proper economic development of our province there ought not to be some legislative directions about concentrations of power. You know, the Tory party has thrived on competition. It is a fierce believer in competition and keen competition for the leadership of the party—

Mr. Bryden: Since when?

Mr. Sopha: —is a prize example. Ever since Confederation there has been a fierce competition—

Mr. Bryden: The competition was only in the establishment.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, well, it preaches competition—it preaches it as its doctrine, its thesis. Then let us put that philosophy of conservatism into practice, and let us bring about competition between them. Every chartered bank in the country feels that it needs to own a trust company. To be with it, nowadays, you cannot be a self-respecting chartered bank unless you own a trust company. That is wrong, we could prevent that because trust companies are under our legislative control.

Mr. Chairman: And how does that come under section 13?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I am finished. Montreal owns Royal, Royal owns Montreal, Nova Scotia own Chartered; Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce owns another one—we will have to put a stop to that, you know. In fact it is smothering competition.

Sections 13 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 16:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, we are beyond 6 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, if there are further comments to be made on the bill, I would ask the committee to rise now—

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to give the impression that I have any more; I have nothing more to say.

Sections 16 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 86 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain resolutions and certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain resolutions and certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 131



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 6, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 6, 1966

Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Spooner, **continued** 4317

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 4350

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-first order; House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to tell you why I was not here this afternoon when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) was making his preliminary remarks on the estimates of his department.

It was my intention, naturally, to be here. I wanted to be with you when you were here at this memorial service for Sir John A. Macdonald this afternoon at 1.30. I found when I got home that the township superintendent of Willoughby, one Charles Ruch, passed away. He was a very close friend of mine and I wanted to be at that funeral at two o'clock, but I did not attend any more than the church service and I made it my business to get here just in time. When I walked in the door I understand that the hon. Minister himself had finished just one minute before.

Now, with that thought in mind, I find myself very unbiased in my opinions this evening. I was neither encouraged nor discouraged by what he had to say and I would like to go back to your memorial service here this afternoon when you honoured this great man, Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of this great country of ours when he brought about our Confederation. And yet, being in the Opposition, I would not want to give him too much credit. I understand that the Fenians at that time had something to do with bringing the country about and uniting the provinces, because they raided us in our area, Fort Erie, and down along by Montreal. And when the Irish came galloping into this country of ours, our people decided that they had better not fight among themselves but should get together and unite.

On Saturday of last week they did re-enact that episode in Fort Erie. I heard the bands playing, but I did not hear any shots so I did not bother to run in and pick up my 16-gauge shotgun to assist.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Was the hon. member for Bracondale there?

Mr. Bukator: I am glad at the moment that he is not here just for this moment, or we might get on to another track rather than on Municipal Affairs.

I really do not know, Mr. Chairman, where one ought to start on these estimates. I said this once before and I say it again, that the hon. Minister of this particular department does his homework, is on top of all of the bills that have come before committees and seems to know what it is all about. I find myself coming short of the mark when it comes to finding fault with his estimates and with his department, except that I have some documents before me that might help. I hope that he and his colleagues will take it in the spirit in which I will present it to them.

I know that the hon. Minister and the Cabinet members have had this presented to them, and yet I found this document so well prepared that I feel that I should read a bit from it. I have before me the submission of the mayors and reeves to the hon. Prime Minister and the provincial Cabinet. I will not better to read the preamble by the president of that time, Mr. Stronach I believe, the mayor of London; but I would like to read some of the comments that were made on page 3, and they are general comments:

> The municipality derives its revenue from direct taxation on real property.

Now everyone who has been in municipal affairs would know that.

> The provincial government, on the other hand, derives its revenue from 37 different sources, including taxes on corporations, gasoline, sales tax, races, logging and land transfers.

They make a reference to the total net revenue of the province from these various sources and this is, they estimated, $1,056,000,000 in 1963-64. On the other hand the municipalities with one source of taxation—and that is on their lands and buildings proper

—collected some $745 million in that fiscal year of 1963. It says:

> These figures indicate that municipalities with one source of taxation are collecting more than half of the total of what the province gets from 37 sources.
>
> As indicated, we believe that the property owner is a victim of too much taxation. It might be pointed out here that municipal taxes increase in accordance with the cost of providing local services.

On the other hand, there are the provincial government revenues from the sales tax—and that has been increased as everyone knows to five per cent. Other sources that I have mentioned earlier, point out that in that year you collected from sales tax alone $183 million.

This pattern of increased revenue without increased taxation appeared prevalent in the whole field of provincial taxation. In municipalities, slight increases in assessment failed to head off increase in levies.

The cost of education on the other hand is one of the most pressing provincial government problems facing municipalities today. I have here an illustration that I think would bear reading into the record.

Typical examples of the financial burdens placed on the backs of homeowners can be found by looking at the situation in three municipalities; namely the town of Kenora, the town of Keewatin, and the township of Jaffray and Melick.

In Kenora, 57.3 per cent of every dollar collected by the municipality goes for education. In Keewatin 60.2 per cent; and in Jaffray and Melick, 73.5 per cent of the tax dollar goes for school purposes.

As a result these and other municipalities have found it necessary to postpone and delay urgent public works projects in order to meet the cost of education and still maintain a reasonable tax base that will satisfy industry.

This in essence is the situation. Municipalities are contributing more and more towards the high cost of education and at the same time are attempting to create a tax climate favourable to location of new industry.

And we have all gone through that if we have had any municipal experience at all.

So this association feels that there should be an adjustment and I will read another paragraph or two to you:

> The association has reason to believe that the education cost will continue to climb because of the additional amounts of money which boards of education will require to operate and maintain the new vocational schools which were built by the senior levels of government. The association congratulates the government for construction of these schools but it hastens to point out that the high cost of operating and maintaining these schools, because of their nature, will be a major factor in subsequent municipal bills.
>
> In short the addition of these new vocational schools has created a genuine financial crisis in civic government and the association feels that government should contemplate taking on an entirely new approach to the problem.
>
> It therefore recommends that: 1. The provincial government assume 80 per cent of the cost of education; 2. The provincial government increase its grants for school construction costs so as to put them in line with present day costs; 3. The provincial government pay the board or a commission to define teacher categories and establish salary schedules for teachers in the various economic regions of the province; 4. The provincial government through its Department of Education produce a standard set of plans for school construction and that these plans be made available to municipalities thereby reducing architects' fees and, 5. The provincial government introduce a system in which it assumes a share of the outstanding debenture debt for schools thereby eliminating the debt from the books of municipalities.
>
> The situation with regard to education is an urgent one. The association earnestly implores the government and hon. members to give this problem serious consideration with a view of giving education and the municipalities a new deal.

I have not mentioned, and yet it has been mentioned by many of my colleagues, yes, and members on both sides of the House, that there are many people who are on fixed incomes. They have their pensions that they paid into for many years, and at that time maybe their dollars would have bought them quite a lot. Today, the same dollar does not buy too much. They find themselves in the position where they cannot maintain their homes and continue to live at the standard they were accustomed to when they were working. And constantly from year to year, the tax question, the mill rate for school purposes is added to the burden they have to carry.

This is an unjust tax structure, and we believe, and your association believes, that more of the tax dollar should come from the higher level of government.

Another unfair tax burden that the people in the municipalities have to carry is the one for administration of justice and I have made this issue every year I have been here, since 1959. I recall back in 1950 or 1951 a submission was brought to the Attorney General of that day, the Hon. Dana Porter, indicating to him that administration of justice costs should not be borne by the taxpayer or the county; the jurors should not be paid for in cases of court cases through the municipal tax dollar on land and buildings, but the cost should be borne by the province, and for very good reason.

You will find it in this day—yes, only yesterday at Long Beach there was a riot of some 200 youngsters involved in throwing bottles and empty beer cans at each other. They brought in seven or eight provincial police cars to break up this riot, and arrested five or six people. And I can assure you that the people of that township were not responsible. I realize the people who had the stores and concessions might have made a little money out of it—but people came into that area from all over this province and the United States, and it is not right for the people of that county or that township to have to bear those particular costs.

Now, one might say, "What do you have to pay for ?" Let me tell you what the municipalities or the counties have to pay at the moment. The administration of justice is not a basic municipal responsibility yet it is one which municipal government in Ontario assumes.

Under existing legislation the municipal taxpayer is obliged to supply jails and lock-up facilities, to pay the salaries of the jail guards, to finance courthouses for the county and supreme court, to pay coroners, pathologists, post-mortems and inquest fees, witnesses and jurors, to provide accommodations for division court and magistrate's court, to pay salaries of magistrates and their staff, to provide accommodation for a local law library and for lawyers, to transport prisoners, and to provide the funds for the administration of family and juvenile courts.

Now, I do not know what else they can be burdened with when it comes to costs. This is borne by the municipalities as I understand it and I realize there is a grant given to them by the government. The services provided are, generally speaking, of a federal and provincial nature, except in the area where municipalities use them for the prosecution of local bylaw cases and that is a very small group of people.

In comparison to the direct expenses of municipalities, the amount of money returned from fines and forfeitures is insignificant. Therefore, the association of the Ontario mayors and reeves petitioned the government to recognize and accept the fairness of the argument presented and to take other steps which are necessary to assist municipalities to assume the entire cost of the administration of justice, including the burdensome cost of building and maintenance of courthouses and jails.

This is not a problem that you have not heard about before. Municipal councils, with the way they derive their dollars, just cannot continue to pay the cost of these purchases. And I have cited a case to you such as the one at Long Beach.

They make reference to hospitals. It is very clear in my mind—and my colleagues here have made good arguments here pertaining to the hospital question. We do not feel that where we are asked to make contributions from our pay, or voluntarily, that we should also be taxed for construction of hospitals. The Ontario hospital services commission is deriving quite a revenue I think and they did not hesitate for a moment a year or so ago to increase their rates when they thought they ought to.

I can read this to you a lot more clearly than I can describe it to you myself:

> Municipal taxpayers, however, will continue to pay premiums to the Ontario hospital services commission and at the same time make capital grants for hospital construction through their municipal taxes. For these reasons, the association feels strongly that the provincial government, having entered the hospital field, as a result of accepting its own responsibility in this area, should assume complete responsibility for all future capital construction costs of hospitals.

The welfare problem is a serious one. Many people get welfare, I might say, through the goodness of the heart of the clerk or the administrator in that small municipality. Whichever it might be, they contribute to them on strength, woes and the sorrows that they hear from the people who feel they are entitled to some financial assistance, and in many cases they are entitled to it.

Welfare cost is a problem that municipalities have had trouble with for quite some time. I find in my experience in the county

council and in municipal council that in many cases the person who put up the best argument and did a bit of begging maybe got a little better contribution than one who did not speak too loudly on his own behalf. And people in most cases do tell the truth.

I questioned the hon. Minister of Public Welfare a year or two ago about the method that was used when they decided they would appoint a county administrator for welfare. Call him what you like, I do not remember his title, but this was a step in the right direction. At least it came to the county level and the clerks were not asked to approve the costs—the municipalities did not have to pay the costs of administration. They have set up county systems now and I think there are two or three counties that are doing that.

If that is working and working well in these particular counties, then it should be spread out and other counties should apply; it should be broadened. We believe, as people who have been, as I said before, on municipal councils, that this is another tax burden that people in those municipalities should not have to bear. Again I would like to read to you the way they sum up this particular problem in this brief of 1964. I know there is a brief of 1965 and another of 1966, but I felt this was exceptionally well done.

> Under the present arrangements the municipality is entitled to reclaim moneys expended on welfare for a person who has been resident for a period of one year and who has not worked for income during that period. No charge is made to the municipality in which the recipient formerly resided.

You know how that works; we know where 80 per cent of the money comes from, it comes from the province.

> The effect of the resolution approved by the Ontario welfare officers association would be to eliminate certain of these provisions placing a burden on the larger municipalities, because these are the places to which indigents flock during times of economic recessions. Thus, the association urges this government to make no changes in the present charge-back provisions on the grounds that the present legislation is adequate to protect municipalities.

Again, we believe that if the municipality has to administer welfare they ought to be paid for the time that is spent on those books by municipal employees.

I find here a very interesting notation or paragraph:

> The government has made no contribution for the cost of drugs. In the city of Toronto—

and that would be 1963—

> —last year the city welfare department spent $303,000 to provide needed drugs for indigent welfare recipients—

Lord knows they need them. If municipalities are going to provide drugs again the province should provide the funds.

I came across a very interesting document in one of our files downstairs and this, Mr. Chairman, would be one that would interest the hon. Minister of The Department of Municipal Affairs. It is down here, written in green ink on this front page. It says: "For release on Monday, June 28, 1965, at 2 p.m."

It would appear the hon. Minister was making a speech to some people and I was very much—I would not say amused—but I was very interested to note what was said on June 28, 1965. Here we are a year later, and it applies so well today. The Minister went on to speak about assessment. I would hate to read into the record this 20-minute speech of his; I would like to skim over the top and if I do put it out of context the slightest little bit I am sure the Minister will correct me. It is not my intention to do so.

> Last year the assessment branch of the department conducted a survey to determine certain facts concerning the condition of the assessment roll in each municipality of Ontario. Nine hundred and forty assessment rolls were examined in some detail. The results have already been communicated to the association of assessing officers of Ontario. I think it only fair that the municipal officials should be made equally aware—

I want to commend the hon. Minister for having the courage to put on paper data accumulated, including the following facts:

> (1) 46.2 per cent of the municipalities have neither revised or adjusted assessment values since 1956; 43.1 per cent do not use an integrated assessment system or manual; 17.5 per cent have no appraisal records of any kind—

Now this is in this very forward province of Ontario.

> —17.5 per cent have no appraisal records of any kind; 85.4 per cent do not use mechanical systems to prepare assessment rolls; 15.1 per cent do not close their assessment rolls by October 1 nor do they have any extension of time; 14.2 per cent

do not prepare their assessment rolls in accordance with the Act—

That is a revelation!

As I said, the hon. Minister is to be commended for putting these facts on paper. He has shown that there are some shortcomings in government's way of doing business, or municipal way, and I would say they are dircetly tied in with municipal affairs and therefore the blame should be borne by both the provincial and muncipal councils.

> Nineteen point one per cent did not include population on the assessment rolls; 17.3 per cent did not bother to assess or collect business taxes; 65.8 per cent did not send assessment notices to tenants; many were deprived of voting and school supporter privileges. In every county there is an unacceptable deviation in the ratio of assessment values to market values for the various municipalities.

The survey produced other startling evidence of poor assessment practices, such as, assessable properties missing from the roll; some summer cottages assessed for business assessment in what must be termed deliberate over and under assessment of property. It is safe to say that if the administration of the tax base of the senior level of government were as inadequately administered the nation would probably be bankrupt.

There must have been a lot of research done by The Department of Municipal Affairs to find these facts. The question I would like to ask, if we were to stop here and proceed with questions and answers: What have the hon. Minister and his colleagues, his experts, done about this particular issue? I am sure the Minister would answer that question when the time comes. Anything that was done would be a lot better than what has already happened up to this particular point. It would be interesting to know what happened in the last year anyhow.

> It is therefore imperative that we continue our efforts to develop better procedures and improve our training facilities for assessors. At the same time our municipalities must realize the importance of good assessment, and take steps to provide money and facilities to properly administer the tax base.

I say amen to that. That should have been and should be done immediately. And it says here—I am amazed at this particular paragraph:

> It may well be that individual assessors and municipalities will not support our programme. Should this be the case I want to assure one and all that I will not tolerate a condition to exist which has the effect of depriving citizens of Ontario of proper municipal services and the democratic privileges of wherever they live and work.

I suggest that there are three basic reasons at the present time why the assessment function is poorly applied:

1. Poorly trained, part-time assessors.

2. The use of outdated and inadequate assessment systems.

3. The reluctance of municipalities to appropriate sufficient funds to institute and maintain assessment efficiency.

Now, as one who does not know the laws of the province as well as he ought, being the critic of Municipal Affairs, I would pause at this time and ask: Is there no legislation setup now that would compel the municipalities to put in a proper assessment system? I think there is. I imagine the hon. Minister can tell me where it is. If there is not, then I would think it is about time you brought in legislation to compel municipalities to properly assess so these people can have their democratic right, which is their vote, and be taxed accordingly.

I might say that I was very pleased to run across the hon. Minister's speech because till about an hour ago, I did not have too much to talk about. This is excellent and, coming from the other side, you see the elephant as one of the blind men might see it. You might get some good out of what I have to present to you here tonight.

The institute of municipal assessors, to its everlasting credit, has for the last ten years provided its training course for assessors, fully aware that the institute could not or should not be expected to singlehandedly continue this programme. I have provided the funds to rewrite and improve the training course. I have always provided financial assistance to municipal assessors who avail themselves of the training course. I am convinced that this course is as good or better than anything available anywhere. With the assistance granted to students there is no reason why any practising assessor should be without proper training.

Now, I would say, having reference to that point, I think they should be pushed into taking that course and doing a job—better late than never—and that is now.

Having said that about assessment, I could add that the structure could stand a bit of

adjustment. I have had complaints about people who have warehouses—and I guess the hon. Minister has too, Mr. Chairman—who believe that by having to pay 60 or 75 per cent business tax for their storehouses where other businesses get by for 35 per cent business tax, they do not feel they are being properly treated, and there may be something there worth looking at.

You have done something I must give you credit for; you have brought about county assessors. One of the first counties in the provincial setup in the county group was the county of Welland, where I was the warden in 1951, and I think that was about the year they created a county assessor who did a better job of making it equitable for people to own property in that county. Since that time, you have county assessment commissioners, and you give, I see, substantial grants to set up their offices to assist them to bring about a more equitable way of taxing. I think this, if I might give the government a bit of credit, is a step in the right direction. I might use an expression I have heard from that side of the House though, "too little and too late"—that is in some areas.

I see a very interesting paragraph in this brief, and I would like to ask a question on this. I would appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would jot this down. At the last sitting of the Legislature, he sponsored an amendment to The Municipal Act which allowed the government to licence assessors and said: "I am hopeful that licensing can begin January 1, 1966." Now, I realize that is not too long ago and I would like to know how many have been licensed.

I see a page or two in this particular speech on planning. I have found, in my short experience on a planning board, from its very inception we have had some very good citizens who wanted to assist in this problem, because they realized then, Mr. Chairman, that planning was necessary and there were a lot of things being built in the wrong places. Subdivisions were not controlled, proper types of structures were not being built in the right area, and so they brought about a planning board in the city of Niagara Falls.

I was a member from its very inception, and I think that was 1946 or 1947. Mr. Nash, I believe was on the planning board at that time, and they were well on their way with a plan for that particular city. Then we decided to make what was known as the Greater Niagara planning board, and it took in the village of Chippawa and part of Willoughby township and Stamford township. This was a form of regional government without having the name at that time.

Now we found that on the fringe of these areas, there were people still doing many things that they ought not to do. They were building little buildings without services, and this becomes a belt of not exactly slum area, but of much, much poorer types of structure, compared to the rest of the municipalities.

Now this worked in one area of the province. I would like to call it an extended planning board, rather than a regional type. It seems that regions create some kind of a problem in the minds of some, and the hon. Minister said in one of his statements that we do not really define it properly, so that many people have different opinions of what regional government is; many people have different opinions of what planning boards are, and what regions they should cover. But it would appear to me that where you have the city of St. Catharines—and I do not see the hon. member for Lincoln here now—and the city of Niagara Falls, with two very well developed planning boards, that they could be encouraged by this government to become one and to look at each other's problems from the other side of the fence; to see whether they could not put the pieces together. When they put this puzzle together they would have a picture that our children would be proud of in the future. And so for regional planning, I think the door is open.

I called the hon. Minister's Municipal Affairs library—at least one of the staff did—to find out how many regional surveys were completed, and I find—and I stand to be corrected—that the only one completed was the report on Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton county, local government review. They did not call it regional government here, but they had this thing completed in June 1965, and they have the recommendations on the back pages and it would appear that they had quite an ambitious programme for that area. But I have watched the papers and I have heard people speak, and I find that in many cases the authorities are not at all happy with this report, and so the hon. Minister and his experts have decided they had better leave well enough alone; at least that is the way it appears to me from where I sit.

The hon. Minister shakes his head, as though I was not quite right on that, and he might put me right.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): You are right, you are perfectly right.

Mr. Bukator: You see, my hon. colleague says I am perfectly right. Now I stand in the middle, and would like to be a judge, yes in favour of the Minister; if he has put something here into existence, I would be the first to give him credit. I do not know what has made me so generous today, it must be the pills that the doctor has given me.

I promised another hon. member of this House that I would be about half an hour and I have exceeded that time, but I can assure the gentleman I will not be much longer, and that ought to make the hon. Minister and his colleagues very happy. However, many of my colleagues here among the Liberal members have so many questions to ask, we may keep the hon. Minister here until August, and then we will get serious about this business that we have been involved in since January.

The planning problem I think would be settled very quickly with the help of some of your experts—some of your people who have helped in some areas. I see you have put a man in in Sudbury; you appointed a man there to assist and Sudbury planning board thought so much of him, they hired him, and they took him out of circulation. That is a good step in the right direction; be generous with people and help them out. I am sorry that my hon. colleague from Sudbury is not here at the moment. He just stepped out. No doubt they got a very good man.

But I would like, by way of compliment to the government, to read this one paragraph pertaining to this problem:

> We in The Department of Municipal Affairs are trying to alleviate this condition somewhat, first by assisting permanent field representatives in various areas of the province to give general planning advice to municipalities. Two of these field men were appointed in 1963, one stationed at the Lakehead and one in Sudbury, with three more to be appointed in the future. Yet even we have been affected by the keen competition for planners.
>
> Recently our man in Sudbury was enticed away by the Sudbury planning board, making it necessary to find a replacement for him.
>
> The second method of alleviating the shortage of planning, would be the establishment in the department of a practical training programme for those who have had no formal education in planning but are interested in this field. This programme is designed to suit the needs of these persons selected and will include practical work with the department and with our field offices, as well, of course, under the direction of our senior personnel and, in some cases, it may even include admission into select courses of lectures at the university.

Now, this would be good if you could get them and I have made a little notation: "How many men have had the practical training referred to in the above paragraph? Have there been people appointed—are they taking this course at the university?" This would be interesting to me, and I am sure to other members of the House.

I was going to touch on some of the people who were hired to do some planning reports for the government and I would like to compliment our people in Lincoln county and in Welland county for the steps they have taken pertaining to regional government.

It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister would be impressed in the same way that I was that these men do want to find out what would make this work better. The Minister has a good team of workers there; he has his interim report and I was fortunate enough to be there at the very first meeting that you had at Niagara Falls to meet with these men. They agreed that they would go along with the government on a 50-50 cost when the time came about, but they were getting the survey made and I understand in the one particular instance that there were some 42 police commissions or police departments—some of them with as little as two men in one department and others had as many as 40. Now you certainly cannot run a police department efficiently with two men and give them each a day off a week. So in my opinion, I might hazard a guess and make a little prediction, that the sooner—and I am sure that this will come about—you can get these police departments under one head the better it will be for everybody of that particular region. That also now applies here in Toronto for the fire department.

There are many areas where they can eliminate administration costs and put them under one head and run much more efficiently than they do today.

I have covered the points that I wanted to touch on, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to ask one more question of the hon. Minister and that will terminate my comments.

I would be very interested to know what

has taken place on the Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton county local government review and what the government intends to do about it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to these estimates tonight, I would like to add to what the hon. member for Niagara Falls had to say. We regret very much that a friend of his passed away and he had to attend the funeral this afternoon. But there was just a little misunderstanding about the situation because the hon. member for Downsview asked me if I would fill in and appear first. At that time I said that I did not have my material here, that it was upstairs and I was not particularly anxious if the hon. member for Niagara Falls was going to get here.

Finally I shrugged my shoulders and said "All right, I will get my material," and I went upstairs. It happened to be that the hon. member for Downsview misunderstood my gesture of resignation and he conveyed the idea to the Chairman that I was not prepared to go on and that the hon. member for Niagara Falls was unavoidably absent. However, I do want to put it on the record that I was ready and willing to go on this afternoon but because of a slight misunderstanding here the business of the House was changed. However, that is by the way and no great harm has been done.

I do want to say, along with the hon. member for Niagara Falls, that I have a great respect for this hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I do not agree with him in some of his points of view and some of his attitudes, but at the same time I feel that he does take a very great interest in his field and works hard at it. He is doing his utmost under very difficult conditions to build up the municipal structure in this province.

I was interested to note that he is planning for increased staff—particularly staff in connection with urban renewal—and that the assessment training is going forward and he is upgrading his people and beginning the licensing of the assessors in the province.

I was also very interested to see the six-month extension of the municipal works' assistance programme. I think this is all to the good and should assist tremendously some of our municipalities which were very late in getting a programme under way.

The clear guidance that he mentions in respect to building policy and the scatteration of urban growth, I think, is good. Too often in the past we have seen urban sprawl reaching out beyond services with serious consequences for the future of that building and for people going into these areas not understanding exactly what was happening and finding themselves faced with the whole problem of developing urban services at a later date.

I would hope that while the hon. Minister is laying down rules for tightening up development and improving this situation that he will also think seriously about subdivision standards. He should try to bring those standards up a little more through mandatory legislation in the province. He should think seriously of such things as underground wiring which Europe has had for a couple of generations. Poorer countries than we are have found ways and means of putting wires underground, but instead of that we have had this blot on our landscape. While many of our municipalities today are undertaking to put wires underground, I think this is something to which the province should give direction.

Then again I think there should be serious consideration given to the five per cent provision in The Planning Act, because five per cent in our new cities no longer suffices. As our urban conglomerations go into the air with high rise apartments, then new standards, rather than the old standards applying to single family homes, should be evolved and they should be written into legislation. I would hope that in the future the government will give real guidance to the whole concept of providing adequate play space and adequate parks for our people.

I have been disappointed that the hon. Minister has not brought forward more legislation up to this point in the whole field of Municipal Affairs. After the select committee report was tabled it was expected that we would have a great body of legislation during the 1966 session. That may come yet but it would have been better, I think, if the hon. Minister had seen fit to bring that legislation before his estimates so that we would have known exactly what we were facing and what we might expect in that field.

In speaking about the hon. Minister and his interest in his work, I also would like to emphasize that he is working with an extremely outdated municipal system. His work is much more difficult than it ought to be because of this. We are facing a problem of major proportions, the problem of revamping and rebuilding our municipal structure in this province.

On April 5 of this year the hon. Prime Minister, during a statement on regional development, said this:

> It must be emphasized that this statement is concerned with regional development, not with regional government. Any regional development structures created by this government will be such that they will not disturb the existing power and authority of the municipal and county councils within the regions. Great caution has been exercised to avoid imposition of new forms of governments.

Now the hon. Prime Minister did go on, of course, to indicate that studies would be undertaken in certain areas which would lead to recommendations for adjustment in local areas of government. And he said:

> The implementation of our regional development policy will in no way interfere with such considerations of area of government, but rather could well lay the groundwork for changes which might eventually be appropriate.

Now the hon. Prime Minister's statement soothes the fears of local councils which like the status quo, and that perhaps might be the majority of small local councils in Ontario. But he seems to say that no change will take place in existing municipal and county councils within the regions. But then he does go on to state that studies are now under way which will point to appropriate changes.

What all this means is very difficult to assess. Perhaps he is assuring us that present local governments will remain as they are, but that in the fullness of time—that famous phrase—when the regional development plan is in full swing the necessary changes will just naturally occur peacefully and quietly without upsetting anybody or anything. Now that may be what he means. He seems to say that the present municipal setup is not working too well, not as well as it did a century ago, but that it is creaking along and when it does finally break down the government hopes to have the answers.

The Jones study of the Ottawa region referred to by the hon. member for Niagara Falls provides a dramatic answer to this leisurely attitude of the government. The study covered only the county of Carleton and the cities of Ottawa and Eastview and it spilled over adjacent boundaries.

In the study area, Mr. Jones discovered not only great differences in the municipalities in a variety of fields, but he also found that while there was in most cases an awareness that change was necessary, there was little agreement as to what these changes ought to be.

It well may be that the government hopes that, through the activity of the regional development corporation, differences in municipalities such as Mr. Jones highlighted might be minimized.

This may be in the mind of the government. But given the present imbalance, no matter how much the corporation might assist the smaller municipalities to industrialize and to improve services, Ottawa and Eastview in this instance are certain to grow much faster than the rest and the imbalance will increase over the years. Only by bringing all the municipal units in the study area and likely some of the surrounding ones as well—into one municipal government can we hope to accomplish some degree of equality among them.

Mr. Jones points out that 10 per cent of the area's population lives outside the national capital's greenbelt, while only 3 per cent of the jobs are to be found there. This imbalance, he points out, will increase until by 1968, 30 per cent of the population will be outside the greenbelt which will have only 5 per cent of the area's employment. This means that as the area grows, the industrial and commercial assessment base will remain within the city centre while an increasing part of the services will be demanded outside that centre. And this will pose a real problem in the days to come if great changes are not made.

Some of the existing differences between the 17 local governments in the area are seen by the figures given. There are 104 council members in the area with ratios of population per council member ranging from 150 to 1 to 11,000 to 1. Gross per pupil expenditure in elementary education ranges from $170 to $439. While this is true, the fact is that the suburban and outer municipalities are spending more per dollar of assessment on education but they get a lower standard of educational service than the urban ones.

In the area, welfare standards vary widely. Sharp contrasts are seen in the road standards. Public transportation is provided only by the Ottawa transportation commission and this just does not reach out far enough. Park, recreation and library services are provided only by Ottawa in any real measure. And these are used extensively by residents of other municipalities.

Sharp differences occur in the financial

status of the area units, in their ability to hire competent staff and to provide any or all of the services demanded by a modern community. Of the 56 submissions made to the commission, eight wanted no change. Six of these were from one township. They seemed to be pretty happy with their lot. The rest suggested change but there seemed little agreement on the extent or nature of that change. Eighteen recommended some form of metropolitan or regional government, but even here there was little agreement as to the form it should take or the powers that it should assume.

Mr. Jones listed seven deficiencies from which the review area suffers. I am not going to name them here but the seventh is significant. It says that the review area:

> —has not been sufficiently adaptable to changing needs, being bound by rigid boundaries, organizational structures and procedures which require external intervention by the province to alter them. It is not capable of self-evolution.

These are the words of Mr. Jones.

From this summation, I would gather that Mr. Jones thinks that something more than the mild medicine prescribed through the present government regional development policy is needed to bring the Ottawa area into the 20th century concept of municipal government.

Other studies being done in other regions may well come up with something of the same answer. Mr. Jones puts his position this way:

> In summary, the needs of local government in the review area require basic changes in the present structure. The form of change must not only provide technical solutions to known problems but must also create a political organization which will contribute to the development of a mature approach to local government within a framework of increasing freedom and responsibility.

I agree with the hon. Prime Minister when he said in his now famous Inn-on-the-Park speech, and I quote him: "All organizations, government and private—"

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Which version is the member quoting?

Mr. Young: Well, this is the version which was tabled in the House.

> All organizations, government and private, must be aware of the need to study and to understand the problem of our increasing urbanization. Otherwise, the remedy may fail because the cause has not been understood.

I agree with this. That study, this kind of examination, is vital for the understanding of the area, and for the understanding of these people, of their problem and the ways to solve it. But study must not be an excuse for action. The Ottawa study has been in for a year now; June, 1965 is the date on the front cover.

We hope that an intensive educational process is now going on in the area to explain the solutions offered by the report. And perhaps the Minister can tell us what is happening here. Certainly the report itself shows little agreement as to what should be done, that is, as far as the submissions of the units within that area are concerned. And so far no legislation has been offered or even suggested by the Minister in respect of the study. With delay the situation in the Ottawa area becomes more acute.

There is no question that the government will not get complete agreement among the Carleton municipalities as to what should be done—as it did not achieve it in the Metro of a decade ago, or during 1966 for that matter. It will have to take the best advice it can get; it will have to conduct a reasonable amount of local discussion and then it will have to legislate.

I would hope that in other areas the Minister will press forward with his basic regional studies. There are at least a dozen areas in the province where the need is apparent and where it is pressing and urgent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the basic components of a virile democracy is a strong local government. This concept was enshrined in The Baldwin Act of 1849. But with the changing techniques of the industrial age and with the ease of transport today, local governments are no longer adequate to handle the task facing them in a modern society. The result is that they are dwindling in importance and in power. It is true that some of our cities with large populations and an adequate base of taxation are able to keep up with present-day needs and they do have a genuine sense of power and of purpose, but too many smaller municipalities, which had meaning and function when they were set up, have become in large measure routing administrators of provincial policy and provincial funds.

A look at population figures of Ontario municipalities shows what is happening. Of our 978 municipalities only about 427 have more than 2,000 people; 280 have more than 3,000 and only 212 of them are in excess of 4,000—that is less than a quarter. Even 4,000

people can hardly form a viable, local municipality in today's complex society. More than that, three-quarters of our local governments just cannot afford the staff and equipment to do an adequate job for their people.

This has been documented time after time in this House. The situation is so bad, as a matter of fact, that almost every Minister of this government recognizes that most present municipal units are just too small and too weak to be of any use in the administration of his department, so he ignores them.

The hon. Minister of Health requires 35,000 people before a health unit is formed. The hon. Minister of Highways divided the province into 14 field areas for effective highway administration. The hon. Minister of Tourism and Information has 32 tourist council regions. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is carving out regions for regional detention centres wherever he can.

And so the story goes. The smaller municipalities are losing all power and all meaning. They are almost universally ignored in the administrative processes of this province, and that makes for a real problem for the Minister himself.

When they were originally set up the local governments had charge of practically every local service offered their citizens; and the people looked to them for these services.

But the new age and new technology demanded larger units of administration for many of these. Instead of the municipalities combining and enlarging to meet the new needs, larger new administrative devices were evolved to which the local governments contributed in money and personnel.

Some cities tried to keep up by annexing parts of neighbouring municipalities with all the resultant squabbling and difficulties. Some succeeded fairly well and continued to function largely as they were designed to do. This would be the case only of our large cities. Then new services appeared and were demanded by the public. Conservation, public health, tourist promotion and planning are among them. These in turn demanded larger areas of function than the small local municipalities could provide, so new districts were set out to handle them.

All too often, as has been discussed in this House, boundaries of various units were established without consideration of others already in existence. The result is that we have as many sets of boundaries as we have Ministers. In fact, some Ministers have different boundaries for different facets of their administration.

So today we have a wide variety of such administrative units, some large and some relatively small. Some include towns and cities and some exclude them; some are corporate bodies and some are not.

It would seem that no two of these intermunicipal bodies are organized in the same way. There is no pattern of appointment of representation to their boards and no common ground in their meeting schedule. Often jurisdictions overlap with resulting conflicts. Municipal councils give them little direction except indirectly through councillors who may sit on their board.

Little or no reporting is done back to council. Small municipalities tend to concern themselves with residual things not handled by intermunicipal bodies. They therefore deal with a shrinking volume of items on the agenda, even though it may take longer to deal with those matters. They pay their share of the bills and they often leave it at that, even though the activities of the intermunicipal boards have a profound influence on the lives of municipal citizens.

But the province does have a fairly high degree of influence over most of these intermunicipal bodies. It helps with financial grants, it gives personnel assistance and its appointees to boards are often experts in their field who speak with powerful voices at board meetings. Since there is little co-ordination between the bodies themselves there is little tendency to combine in order to resist growing provincial influence here.

While this happens, while the influence of the province grows, the power of the vast majority of Ontario municipalities is dropping almost to the vanishing point and strong local government as set up in the The Baldwin Act is disappearing. Strong local government can be restored in Ontario, sir, and it should be. But only if the smaller municipalities combine around a strong central city in regional municipal governments and then only if the functions being removed from them today are handed back. But these powers can be returned with safety only to political units large enough and strong enough to assume them and to assure that they will be successfully administered. The hon. Prime Minister indicated on April 15 that:

> It is our intention to work toward the gradual establishment of common administrative and planning regions among the operating departments and agencies of provincial government.

He recognizes the need to bring present ad-

ministrative boundaries into harmony. But while he asserts his allegiance to the principle of regional government, he does not take the logical step and say that where these boundaries are harmonized they will also be the boundaries of new municipal government which will have power adequate to the task of co-ordinating and administering all local services within those boundaries.

Unless this happens, Mr. Chairman, unless we have strong local government with real authority, then municipal governments as we know them will simply wither away and the whole administration of the province, outside of strong city centres, will be in the hands of administrative units of the provincial government.

The select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts saw this danger clearly and it made recommendations designed to restore local government to its proper place in a democracy. That is why its recommendations with respect to regional government; that is why it was concerned about getting rid of so many of the present boards and commissions and returning power to the elected representatives of the people.

This government hesitates to upset cozy, local councils by giving strong leadership implementing the recommendations of the report. But that leadership is needed, and it should be given now. Certainly study is necessary, certainly surveys must be made; but more is needed than is happening right now. This government must not allow the present process to continue whereby local government is gradually losing its function and its power.

If present trends are not arrested they will inevitably lead to a sad day for Ontario democracy. The roots of that democracy will be cut off and the political drive and energy which once emanated from local councils and which should still be coming from that source, will be a thing of the past. Only by a thorough reorganization of local government, only by a coming together of small units with larger ones and all combining into new local power centres. Only by meeting the organizational needs of this century and of this urban-centred technological age, can we restore strength and dynamism to local governments.

To do this the government of Ontario must move faster than it now seems willing to do. Studies must be stepped up, legislation must follow as soon as possible to implement the select committee's report. The Baldwin legislation of 1849 must be replaced by the Spooner legislation of 1966 and 1967.

An hon. member: Not a chance!

Mr. Young: Baldwin had vision and the courage to lay the basis of a local government system which served well for a century, but events have made it obsolete. The big question now before us, sir is whether the present Minister of Municipal Affairs will make himself immortal by possessing the same courage to set a pattern for modern, vibrant and dynamic local government for the next 100 years of our history. He has the opportunity now to lead for the next 100 years of our history.

We have the opportunity now to lead. The time is ripe and the know-how is available. He will have to face strong forces of inertia and opposition, just as any pioneer has to, but the opportunity is beckoning. Will the hon. Minister respond to the opportunity of his lifetime?

This afternoon we gathered to pay tribute before the statue of Sir John A. Macdonald. Who knows but that a century from now a group of Ontario stalwarts may gather in front of another statue, with the inscription: "He was the father of regional development in Ontario. He restored strong local government to the province."

Perhaps the present Minister will qualify for that honour and perhaps his name will be on that statue. Only time will tell.

An hon. member: What a hope.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, if I may have the opportunity of making a few comments about the recommendations that have been presented to me tonight by the two hon. members. I may have to examine the two documents.

The hon. member for Niagara Falls reminded me of the recommendations contained in the briefs of the Ontario mayors and reeves association which was presented to the government in 1964, and of course there was another presentation made in 1965.

The general comments which the hon. member has made with respect to municipal taxes could probably be said about provincial taxes as well or also of federal taxes. We are all trying to reduce taxes and at the same time continue to improve and enlarge services at all levels of government, whether it be the municipal, provincial or federal level for that matter.

Now in examining the statistical report of the department, the blue book, you will find statistics which show the increase that has taken place in the amounts of municipal

assessments and municipal taxation, the municipal and education levies over the years. At the present time we are quoting figures for a period of 10 or 11 years, and these are rather revealing in many ways, but they really do not prove any more than what has already been proven by the remarks of the hon. member this evening. I know these things as well as he does and I have no answer for it.

I can only say that there certainly is no comparison today with the services that are provided in all of the municipalities of this province and of this country with the services that were provided 10 or 20 years ago.

Members of municipal staffs are better paid than they were then and that has meant that it has been possible to attract more qualified people to work in municipal administration in practically all of our municipal corporations throughout the province. The services of protection and the services of a social welfare nature and the services provided in planning the community in redevelopment programmes and all these things have been greatly improved and, of course, someone has to pay for these services.

It is fortunate, I think, that in many of the municipalities in this province, a large portion of the municipal expenditures are paid for by industrial and commercial assessments which in large part is not the recipient of the particular individual or personal services.

I was rather interested recently to read a statement made by a person who, I think, is well qualified to speak on this subject. The title of this short memo is, "What 100 New Families Mean."

> New families in 100 new homes in a municipality means an actual population increase of 472 more people—118 more children in school and 149 more cars on municipal streets. It also means that such a population jump requires $172,000 for additional school expenses and a cost of $27,500 annually for additional municipal police and fire department personnel required to handle the service needs of these new arrivals. Such 100 new homes also require 567,000 gallons of water a day, almost three more hospital beds and 704 additional books in the public library.
>
> Direct municipal taxes pay for only half the municipality service costs. The remainder comes from commercial and industrial assessment, federal and provincial grants and borrowings, to be paid by the next generation.

That is indicative of the progress that has been made in this province regarding the increase in our population. All of us at the level of government, whichever level it is, attempt to spread the dollar as far as it can possibly go. Now there have been gradual improvements in the financial support of municipalities and the municipal services. The hon. Minister of Public Welfare has some legislation before the House which will mean improved financial support to municipalities in connection with social welfare services.

I appreciate the position of the mayors and reeves association and the other important municipal association, the Ontario municipal association, composed of people who are elected and appointed at the local government level and the problems which they have to meet. But just to say that education should be supported to the extent of 80 per cent of the cost does not necessarily mean that that would settle the problems of the municipalities of this province.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Try it out.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It is all right to say try it out, but I know very well that that is just putting your finger in the dyke; that is not going to help the situation at all. It is a much broader subject and problem than that alone because education is only one feature—

Mr. Singer: Well, tell us the answer.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not going to tell you the answer because that is not my responsibility. I am not the one who raises the money to pay grants to municipalities and the hon. member knows that. I think that later on this evening there might be some additional information provided to the House in connection with these matters.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister is keeping us in suspense; let us get to vote 1305.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not keeping you in suspense at all.

The hon. member for Niagara Falls quoted from an address I gave on June 28 in which I dealt with a very complete detailed examination of the assessment roles of all the municipalities of this province and I made certain information available not only to the assessors association but also to municipal organizations. As a result of that, a study was made of these assessment roles that fortified my recommendation, which had been made to the House, that we would begin a system of licensing assessors to know the capabilities of the assessors in this province.

So far we have received 1,550 applications

and we have processed 1,023 of these applications; the balance of 527 applications has been deferred and some of the applicants in this group of deferments have been requested to take the training course. Other applications are not being dealt with because they are improperly filed.

Rather a strange thing is that 69 municipalities have not been heard from at all and are now being circularized for the third time. There are 39 municipalities that have no assessors of record as of this date. Now that is understable but the 69 municipalities who have not yet replied pose a problem because you would think that somebody would reply to two letters. Now we are sending out the third one.

Mr. Singer: Are you sure they are still there?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, we are sure they are still there, at least they are still paying their bills because we have not placed them under supervision yet.

Mr. Singer: They take their grants?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: They take their grants, yes.

Mr. Singer: They cash the cheques?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: They cash the cheques so we know they are there.

Mr. Singer: Why do you not hold up the grant cheques; that would bring them in.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That always has a very salutary effect. As a matter of fact, I did that not so very long ago when we were trying to collect $35,000 from one municipality that had over-collected from us and we did not have any arguments about collecting when we owed them money. That settled that problem.

However, by some time this year these municipalities of course will have to wake up because their assessment rolls will probably not be found to be satisfactory.

We are making progress in this field of municipal assessment. We now have 16 counties with 324 municipalities and four territorial districts containing 70 municipalites operating under centralized assessment systems. Since January of this year, three other counties, Elgin, Wellington and Wentworth, have decided to implement county-wide assessment in January, 1967. So that will mean that by January 1, 1967, there will be 23 jurisdictions operating centralized assessment systems.

I made some remarks this afternoon in connection with the training of assessors and I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat them this evening.

I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. member in connection with area planning boards and their responsibilities. That again is a field of municipal activity that we stress very much and I would say that we have made considerable progress in co-operating with municipalities in various areas of the province to form area planning boards, to provide these boards with sufficient finances so that they may obtain the services of properly qualified staff and office facilities, and so on, to perform the responsibilities which they have.

At the present time, Dr. Mayo is a commissioner examining the whole area of Welland and Lincoln counties and their municipalities. I have hopes that Dr. Mayo's study report will be available by early fall.

Insofar as the report which was completed last year on Ottawa, Eastview, and the municipalities of Carleton county—that report, though printed in June of 1965, was not available until August of 1965. At that time I called a meeting of the representatives of all the municipalities in the area covered by the report to a central place in Ottawa at which I presented them with copies of the report and advised them that I expected that by the end of November I would receive from them their criticism of the recommendations and the contents generally of this report.

Unfortunately, that period of time was too short because before the middle of November it was obvious that a number of the municipalities in the area of Ottawa would not have sufficient time to examine the Jones report, so I was asked to extend this time. I extended it and then later on it was found that even the later date was too soon. By this time, of course, we were into the month of January, 1966.

We have had in the office for some time the Goldenberg report on Metropolitan Toronto. There is only a limited staff to deal with these matters and our first responsibility was to bring legislation before this House dealing with Metropolitan Toronto. So I advised the municipalities in the Ottawa area that I had no intention, because of not having time to present any legislation to the 1966 session of the Legislature, of dealing with the recommendations contained in the Jones report, and that the matter would have to be—

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister is going to miss that chance of becoming immortal.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will tell the member quite frankly I am not a bit interested in becoming immortal, not at the present time. I want to stay mortal.

An hon. member: The alternative is a serious problem.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The alternative is pretty permanent. It is just like old age—there is nothing wrong with old age because the alternative is pretty permanent.

Let us go back to the Ottawa-Carleton report.

Since the Legislature has dealt with the amendments required to the metropolitan corporation government, the staff of the department concerned with these matters has now been instructed by me to spend their full time in examining the report on Ottawa. And I have said that as soon as my responsibilities here came to an end, that I would then deal with the matter personally. I propose to, after having the Murray Jones report examined in great detail by the staff officers, and I hope to reach certain conclusions as to just what recommendations we would make as a government and as a department to the municipalities in Carleton county.

I propose then to go to Ottawa to meet with the municipal representatives, to place some of these matters before them—and I think hon. members realize that there are quite a number of recommendations in the Jones report that are just not acceptable today. As a matter of fact I think some of them—and I am supported in this view by people in the department—some of the recommendations really are a few years too soon.

However, the Jones report is a very detailed examination of the socio-economic conditions in a particular area of the province and in due course of time—in the fullness of time—the report will be given complete examination and we will then proceed to obtain as much as we can of the co-operation of the municipalities involved. I am sure that no one would want me to call in the Fenians to raid Ottawa and I do not want to start any wars; there are enough of them on at the present time.

The hon. member for Yorkview had some very good suggestions. I have taken note of these and I know he has great experience in this. We try in the department, in the community planning branch, to be more and more specific and to be more and more exacting in approvals of subdivisions, in the province. The standards that are required in the municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto are not necessarily the same standards that would apply in the mining country where I live because conditions are different. We try to assess these demands and requirements on the best advice that can be had, and we realize that there always has to be a raising of these standards. For instance, with regard to underground wiring; I think that that is a very important point, and I would hope that the day might come when we might be able to make this one of the conditions of approval of a subdivision, that all the wiring would have to be underground.

We realize that you have to deal not just with the developer, but you have to deal with the firm that provides the services, Bell Telephone, Hydro, and so on.

I might say with respect to the hon. member's recommendation that the 5 per cent land allocation provision is perhaps not enough, that is something with which I agree and I have asked some of the department people to give some thought to an examination of this particular feature in the hope that we might find there should be greater support by a developer of the needs of the community for land for open space, parks and so on. This is an area of study that I hope would be undertaken by some of the staff people in the research branch, which we are establishing.

I would have some area of disagreement though with the member's suggestion that the powers of municipal councils are disappearing. I think if you will review legislation which I have had the honour to bring to the House in the last several years, you will find that every once in a while we brought in something that gave back to the municipality certain powers which had been taken over by the province, through some agency, either The Department of Municipal Affairs, or otherwise. Mind you, when you have services that are provided on an area basis to a number of municipal corporations, then of course it is necessary to go into the appointment of a board, or a commission, that is responsible for providing this particular service. I am thinking particularly of conservation authorities.

We try in our legislation to indicate that the municipal council has authority to appoint some of its own members to this type of body. I do know that sometimes the member who is appointed, the member of council—I have had this personal experience—comes to the conclusion that that is sort of his private prerogative and he does not report to anybody. Of course the council itself can settle

that by insisting not only that they get an auditor's report and an annual report from the organization, but that they do obtain regular reports from their representative on the children's aid society, board of directors—

Mr. Young: They never do!

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, if they do not, then it is their fault and if the electors get to know that, I think that the electors are the ones who should press the council to see that there are reports given at reasonable times.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that I have not covered all of the points that have been raised by the hon. members, but I would hope that during the course of the detailed examination of the estimates that I may have the opportunity of answering in more detail, some of your questions.

On vote 1301:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1301, I would presume that the studies like the Jones study and so on, come under item 4, do they?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes, that is correct, sir. Commissions, inquiries and research on municipal government.

Mr. Singer: Last year, the hon. Minister read to us ten or 12 areas where studies were indicated.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I read nine.

Mr. Singer: Nine in which he was going to do studies. Four were indicated for immediate action and I have not heard in his remarks what has happened to the other five. I would have thought by this year he would have been able to make it about 19 or 20.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The other five have been postponed.

No. I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have had these four studies. We have not proceeded with the other five. Actually, we are waiting to obtain these other reports, because it is my feeling that having these four reports, and the very intensive examination of Metropolitan Toronto by Dr. Goldenberg, that that may indicate some areas of general agreement that could be made to apply to simliar areas in the province. From that, of course, then this same situation existing elsewhere would not have to be examined in such great detail. I thought that it would be wise to wait for a little while, just to see what we could find out from the reports we now have under way.

Mr. Singer: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Yorkview's good wishes directed towards your longevity will have to apply if we are going to see any action in connection with any of these reports.

The hon. Minister sounded awfully convincing a year ago, and I could understand when he complained about the shortage of experts, and he did set a priority list of nine, and some of us looked forward, in any event, taking the hon. Minister at his word, that we would perhaps see a couple of bills before us in this session of the Legislature, dealing with an Ottawa area reorganization.

Interesting to note the hon. member for Russell—I am sorry he is not here tonight—the hon. member for Russell took occasion to differ very strongly with the approach of the Jones report and his view of what should happen in the village of Rockcliffe. But I wonder how long the hon. Minister is going to think about it and hold discussions about it. Does he really expect that the change is going to bubble up from below, or is the government eventually going to make a decision and say this is the best we think can be done and we are going to do it.

How is the process going to work?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I think if the hon. member were to consider what happened with the recommendations that were presented by Dr. Goldenberg, he might learn how those were dealt with. There were points of disagreement between Dr. Goldenberg's recommendations and those of the government. In due course of time, or in the fullness of time, legislation was brought here, it was debated, it was passed and goes into law. The same will apply to these other areas, if legislation is necessary.

We must bear in mind that The Municipal Act and other Acts under which municipalities operate, contain at the present time in many areas, much legislation which is already in effect which can be used to accept some of the recommendations which may be contained in some of the study review reports that are now under way.

I said a year ago that I hoped to have nine of these area studies undertaken. I mentioned at that time though, that there were not too many consultants in this field of activity and I was not aware that there were as few consultants as there really are. That is also one of the reasons why I was not able to proceed with the full nine studies that I mentioned during my estimates a year ago.

Mr. Singer: We still have 977 municipalities. We do not seem to be moving anywhere

and the fullness of time seems to be getting fuller and fuller and fuller as time goes on. Can you give us any target dates, for the Ottawa area, or any one of these areas in which the studies—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Ottawa is the only one that is completed, that is correct. The Niagara region will be completed by August 30, 1966. The Peel-Halton local government review, which includes two very large counties and other municipalities, is expected to be completed by September, 1966; and the Lakehead review, which is under Commissioner Eric Hardy, is to be completed by the end of this year.

We had hoped that Mr. Hardy would have completed his study at the Lakehead before the end of December, but unfortunately he had some troubles also with staff, and remember that the staff engaged in this kind of work are not composed of people who are classified as a clerk one. Actually, one of the officials of the department had to spend some time finding a replacement for staff that Mr. Hardy had expected he would be able to have with him in this particular review.

So that the problem is not just cut and dried, that you can issue an order to a consultant and say: "Well, Mister, go to work." I think it is probably very similar to a lawyer who is asked on the day that an accused has to appear in court to handle his case saying, "Well, it is too bad; we better ask for an adjournment so I can study your case." Pretty well the same applies to people who are engaged in this line of work, that they are not waiting at the front door for an order to arrive, so they can go to work this morning.

They have work planned ahead and we have particular reasons for choosing these particular people, to undertake these particular reviews.

I have hopes that we will be able to get at the other four or five areas where I mentioned we are interested in having reviews of this kind, but I am telling you that it is just not possible to date. Again, in the fullness of time, we will get at it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am bothered by this. The hon. Minister announced what sounded like a very bold step forward a year ago. Now, in June 1966, four studies having been ordered, one having been in hand for the better part of a year, we still have not made any progress. The hon. Minister said that the cost is also being shared by the local municipality. In other words, he is still expecting the initiative to bubble up from the local areas.

To anticipate that the real initiative for change of this type is going to come from the local areas, I think, is being overly optimistic. The initiative in this area did not come from the municipalities that now form Metropolitan Toronto; the initiative came from the crisis that existed. The initiative came from the fact there was no water, there were no sewers and there was no ability to borrow and there were not enough schools and that sort of thing, and those pressures built up so that the government eventually moved in, ordered the study and then passed the original Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Now, some of us believe that similar crises exist in these other areas, and the Minister waits first to get a request from the local area. Then he waits for the consultants, and he has only been able to find four of them in over a year, and waits until they can get their work done. And it is going to take at least one consultant, the last one he mentioned, until December of 1966 to complete his work, so that it has taken from over a year ago, until December of this year—what, 18 months—for that one to be done.

Even with the one he has in mind, there is no indication that they are studying it. It is complicated; in the fullness of time we are going to have some more hearings. Is there any government planning insofar as action is concerned? Are you going to wait until everybody says this is what we want, and that is the way we are going to do it? Because if you wait that long, you will never get a single change made, you know that.

When are you going to hold your meetings in Ottawa? When are you going to make your decision? When are we going to see legislation?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I have not got my diary, but I will get it for tomorrow morning. Now I tried to answer you, very pleasantly, and I am still being very pleasant, by quoting to you the experience with the Goldenberg report. You know what happened to it. It was presented to this House, it was dealt with, it was debated here at great length. There were areas of argument and the government made a recommendation to the Legislature which was accepted. You were very pleased with having had the opportunity of proposing an amendment, I think it was, to Bill 81, which we accepted. Was it not in that bill you made an amendment?

Mr. Singer: Oh, it would take more than that little amendment to stop my criticism.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, that should keep you happy. But I tried to explain that there

are only so many hours in the day. I find now that there seem to be fewer days in the year; I do not know whether other people are finding the same thing.

These are matters where you are going to go into areas and change their municipal government, their local government, which in my opinion, and I am supported by the hon. member for Yorkview, is most important in the democratic process. And I am going to tell you that I shall make haste slowly, and if you cannot achieve everything that is in Murray Jones' report today, perhaps it will come in the fullness of time.

There are some recommendations there that are very valuable, very important, and in due course of time we shall deal with them in a co-operative spirit, with the municipalities. We will eliminate those points on which we are able to get general agreement, and in the other areas where there cannot be general agreement, it may be necessary for the government to say, in the way of legislation, this is what will be done, because we think it is for the betterment of municipal government in this area.

With that in mind I think that I am entitled to time to examine these matters, as well as the other reports which are very important. It is all right to say one report is one report, but remember that the Dr. Mayo study covers a very large area of the province, involving two large counties, with quite large populations, and I think we have to be careful that no mistakes are made, that improvements are improvements for the betterment of the services of the residents of those areas.

If we bear that in mind, I think that we will make reasonably good progress and that the people who are the ratepayers of these areas will themselves be able to see the advantages that are inherent in supporting larger units of municipal administration.

As you yourself have said on so many occasions, municipal administrators have to make a career, a lifetime career, of their opportunities in municipal administration, and I think that there is a new era of thinking developing in this field. It is not always necessary for us to name the commissioner to undertake a particular review of an area. We do much of this work ourselves in the department. Some of our officers are highly trained people in this field of activity. I gave several instances this afternoon where staff people have given advice to municipalities.

For instance, in my own riding, recently, two municipalities got together and formed one police force, under the terms of The Municipal Act. I talked to the two reeves of these municipalities myself last fall. It is rather a strange thing that they began to give it some serious consideration, and here just recently, the two municipalities passed bylaws. These bylaws were approved by the police commission of Ontario, and I read in the newspaper when I was home last weekend that the joint police department is now operating.

I know of three other neighbouring municipalities that I had contact with myself just recently, and they evidenced some interest in another area of municipal administration. I have asked our branch office to arrange a meeting with the municipal councils to give them what advice we may be able to and that may be of help to them.

There are many other instances. In these estimates, there is a figure of $90,000 for instance, which is for townsite surveys and designs. I am getting into details of these now, but that is an indication of the type of work that is performed by the staff people.

To give you an example: in Timagimi, which is in the district of Timiskaming, north of North Bay, a mining operation is being developed, and there will be a population of perhaps 2,000 people moving into this area in the next few years. It is necessary therefore for the department to interest itself in the establishment of the community.

Mr. Sopha: It is in the district of Nipissing?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, pardon me, it is in the riding of Timiskaming. I do not think I used district, did I? It think I said riding, and at the present time Timagami is in the riding of Timiskaming. After the redistribution bill it will be in the riding of Nipissing.

Mr. Sopha: It has always voted Liberal anyway.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: In Timagami? I do not remember now. I did not check the 1961 by-election, It does not matter.

Here we have staff people who have examined the requirements of that area—and there are other areas as well. There is another mining community to be established north of Sault Ste. Marie. We have done a lot of work assisting planning boards, in enlarging their sphere of activity to become area planning boards. These are all features that are not necessarily confined just to investigations conducted by commissioners appointed by the department.

Mr. Singer: I was intrigued by the hon. Minister's statement that there are 39 munic-

ipalities that have no assessors of record. What do you do with those?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: This is caused by the fact that the assessor's appointment has come to an end, I presume, with the end of last year and the municipality has not yet appointed a successor. Many of these municipalities appoint an assessor each year and these 39 have no assessors of record as of this date; that is, a few days ago. I would hope that between now and September 30 they had better hurry up and get an assessor appointed.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would define for us the area of the Niagara study?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes. It will take in the city of St. Catharines, the other municipalities in the county of Lincoln and then in Welland county it takes in the cities of Niagara Falls, Port Colborne, Welland and all the other municipalities in Welland. They are listed on pages 54 and 86 of the 1966 municipal directory.

Mr. Young: The eastern part of the peninsula then is encompassed in this study?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes.

Mr. Young: Is it the hon. Minister's feeling that this would be a logical area for a new regional government?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That we do not know. That is why I have asked Dr. Mayo. This is all the eastern end of the peninsula shown on the map in the municipal directory; for me to forecast what Dr. Mayo is going to recommend as being necessary for improvement in local government in Welland and Lincoln counties is just an impossibility. Now, had we considered the department's officers could undertake this study ourselves we would have done so, but unfortunately we have not the staff to enter into a large area such as this and to do the detailed study that this would require.

Mr. Young: Yes, I quite understand that, and appreciate the fact of the necessity that these people have freedom to assess it. But the thing that occurred to me, in the Jones report, Murray Jones looks at the county of Carleton and the two large municipalities centered in it and he also spills out into one, I think, of the municipalities east—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes.

Mr. Young: He seems to be confined to that area and he makes no suggestions really for outside, whether or not any larger area should be encompassed. I am wondering whether this is a sort of a term of reference in the government's thinking that regional governments should be about the size of one or two counties, and whether or not the people making the study are free to say, "Well, this is not a viable unit, it should take in bigger territory."

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There are no restrictions necessarily as to the extent of the recommendations or the advice that may be given by the commissioner. However, in establishing the terms of reference for the commissioner, we have examined, our staff people have examined, the situation and have reported to me. In the case of the Jones review it was our opinion that the two cities and the county, then the township of Cumberland, which is in Prescott and Russell, were really part of a socio-economic unit. It would appear from the surface anyway that this would be the area to study. Now by the same token, the commissioner might have recommended that his terms of reference should be enlarged if he had found in his studies that the area that required to be examined was not contained within the terms of reference. There is no limitation really.

Mr. Young: I can appreciate the fact that in a large city like Ottawa and the area around about it there might be adequate population and tax base for a viable regional government, but the reason I raise this question is that the Ministers of the Crown here seem to regard their administrative units as fairly large. Their experience is such that they have chopped the province up into fairly sizeable units for the administration of their departments. None of them, it seems, would consider that a small area is large enough.

Now it may be that the Ottawa area is big enough, I grant that; it may be that the east end of Niagara peninsula may be, but I doubt if any of the Ministers have taken that small an area in the Niagara peninsula as a viable unit for administrative purposes. It just seems to me that these somehow should jibe, eventually, boundary-wise.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I was going to attempt to reply to the hon. member for Yorkview. I do not think that you could necessarily say that the provincial government services in a particular area should have the same geographic boundaries for each department. I was Minister of Mines and we have service areas in The Department of Mines that bear no relationship geographically with the districts that are operated by The Department of

Lands and Forests. These are designed to provide governmental administration in a particular area. For instance, in The Department of Municipal Affairs we have something like seven offices outside of Toronto, seven field offices. We are going to move one of our offices some time this year to another area.

Mr. Bukator: Niagara Falls?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: We have given consideration to Niagara Falls, but I do not think it has top priority. I want to be very frank with my friend, the hon. member for Niagara Falls, because he has been a friend of mine for so many years, I would not want to mislead him with the idea that we are going to move 10 staff people to Niagara Falls next week.

But I do not think that you could necessarily say that you can divide this province of Ontario like a pie and then say, "Well, all departments of government are going to work in this northeastern district and all other departments are going to work in the northwestern district and these are the boundaries of these districts." I think that would be an impossibility, at least today.

Now when that statue to me arises in Queen's Park, of course those who will be here then will probably decide that I was entirely wrong.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned a few minutes ago the survey or the study that his department had done in Timagami. I wonder if he could inform me where the townsite is going to be situated exactly? There has been a lot of rumour up there, but the people now are to the point where they need the housing. I am sure the Minister is aware of the shortage. The Sherman Mines would like to start to bring in their technical staff, but they have no place to build homes for them up to now. There is also the question of whether an improvement district will be established there. Could the hon. Minister tell me?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, there has been very close co-operation between the officials of The Department of Municipal Affairs and the chamber of commerce in Timagami, because it hapens to be one of the few community organizations. There has also been very close co-operation with the school board.

I myself have been to Timagami, I met with these people, I have spoken to them; and of course as the hon. member knows, I know very many people in Timagami, having lived in northern Ontario all my lifetime.

There has also been very close co-operation with the officials of Sherman Mines and we in the department conducted a very extensive survey of the area surrounding Timagami in the hope that we would find an area of land that would be suitable for a townsite that eventually will house some 2,000 people.

An area has been found. I am sorry that I am not in a position to tell hon. members immediately though—I know I cannot tell you here—because of the fact that The Department of Public Works of the province has instructions to acquire land and I am sure that we all realize that when a government agency goes out to buy land the price seems to go up like the Gemini 9—in an awful hurry. I know that the officials of Public Works are working now and have been for some time with the owners of these lands in the area where we wish to establish this townsite.

I will be glad to tell the hon. member privately where it is, I think he is entitled to that, but I would hope that he would not ask me to say it here in public because it might have some effect on the value of the land. Of course every dollar that we spend to acquire land in Timagami is going to be reflected in the price at which the lots will be sold to the people who will need them to build homes. We will have, we hope, not necessarily a model community, but we will have a well planned community which will be sufficient to serve the needs of this mining development which is taking place in the Timagami area at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: A repetition of Carter's folly.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I would hope not. I have had some experience with the reference the hon. member just made and I think that department officials have learned considerably over the years in matters of this kind. We are treating this as if we were private developers. We are going to see that the minimum services are provided but the streets will not be paved with gold, at least not next week. It may take some time. But I think we will be able to develop a townsite in Timagami which will be a credit to the community and to the area and will be suitable for the people who will find it convenient to live there.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, the question is not where the townsite will be, I am not really interested in that—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, I thought that is what the member asked.

Mr. Smith: The question is when it will be.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, as soon as The Department of Public Works has acquired the land, then our engineers and surveyors will go in and survey. I know that Sherman Mines intends to move a number of houses to Timagami. I have had correspondence with them myself. I think that within a very short period of time the department will be able to tell them exactly where they may move these houses.

We have to watch this situation; there are still no water or sewer services available and these houses will have to be placed in an area where they will eventually form part of the community which will have these services. In the meantime, these are not being made available, we are not going to permit them to build side by side, because of the pollution problem.

Mr. Smith: A further question in regard to the area that is now built up—it is not any type of organized municipality. The question there is, will an improvement district be set up there or what will be done with the present—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Before the Ontario municipal board at the present time there is an application by a sufficient number of petitioners to hold a hearing to establish and to create an improvement district in the area of Timagami. No hearing has been held yet and one of the reasons for deferring or postponing the hearing is that we have not yet quite concluded a complete examination of the area which will be included in the improvement district.

As a matter of fact, I spent some time on this very question this morning. We are not quite certain of the extent of the mining development or the ore body itself and of course we wish to place the mining operation within the boundaries of the municipality because it has quite a good effect on the revenue to the municipality.

While I am on this subject, Mr. Chairman, I might add something to the hon. member's question in the form of an answer. In improvement districts in this province in the past, it has been the practice to have the board of trustees of the improvement district also act as the public school board.

In this particular case of the incorporation of Timagami, it will be our recommendation to the Ontario municipal board that this practice no longer be followed because in Timagami they have had for 30 years, or more, a very efficient, well-administered public school board which covers a very much larger area of territory than the municipality should cover. Therefore, we want to leave the public school board as it is now, an elected board with its responsibilities over the area which is contained within the geographical boundaries of the public school board. Then the board of trustees of the improvement district will be only concerned with the municipal administration.

Now, the present hamlet of Timagami will be included within the boundaries of the improvement district and we have made no studies in detail, at the present time, of what it may be possible to do in the way of adding water and sewer services to Timagami. They have some water supply now through the Ontario Northland Railway, but we have not made a complete examination of that and we will wait until the improvement district board of trustees has been formed and the municipality is in operation.

Mr. Smith: Can the hon. Minister tell me when he anticipates this will come before the municipal board?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am sorry, I cannot tell the member that at the present time. We will make a note of it and will make some inquiries, and let him know.

Mr. Smith: I have another question, Mr. Chairman, on another subject. In regard to the Jones report there is a recommendation that hydro commissions on the local municipal level be abolished and I am sure that the Minister has had some representations on this matter. I wonder if he is prepared to make a statement on that at this time or not.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, I am hardly prepared to make a statement on it in detail, Mr. Chairman, except that as far as I am concerned, I think the public utilities or hydro commissions in the province have been reasonably well administered and it is pretty well in the hands of the local council as to whether they wish this operation to be carried on by a committee of the council or by a commission. We have not examined in depth whether there should be any amendments to current legislation in this matter.

As far as I personally am concerned, I feel that the hydro public utilities commissions have done a reasonably good job. Sometimes some of them have been a little difficult to deal with because they like to hide some reserves under the table. That is a complaint that I have heard from some of the municipal councils. I think at the present time, without going into the detail of the existing legislation, that these matters can be operated and

controlled either at the level of the council or at the level of the commission.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I have a question or two about the Jones report. The Minister has mentioned that he expects to meet with the representatives of the municipalities in the next few weeks.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, please do not cut me down to a few weeks; I do not know how long we are going to be here. There are still three or four departments to bring their estimates into the House.

Mr. Racine: In the next few months then.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You would be on pretty safe ground with, in the next few months.

Mr. Racine: My point is this, Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of unrest at the present time in those municipalities. They do not know what to do. They have a lot of work to do and have many improvements to make in certain areas, but they do not want to do anything until such time as the government has taken a decision on this Jones report.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think I left it entirely to them. I asked the municipalities to let me know last fall—I gave them the months of September, October and November to begin with to advise me what they thought of the Jones report. I did not get enough reports to form a corporal's guard, so I had to extend the time. Then several of the larger municipalities—and I appreciate their position—insisted that even to the end of December was not long enough.

When they let me know what they think of the Jones report and the recommendations —other than to say that it is no good, of course, I would pay no attention to that and I am sure the hon. member would appreciate that—but if they would examine the Jones report in detail, as most of them have now, and give me the benefit of their advice I would be very pleased to have it.

There should be no unrest among the municipalities in Carleton county. If they have public works they wish to undertake, there is nothing to stop them from proceeding, nothing at all, because whatever services they provide for themselves today are not going to be useless tomorrow, unless they are spending money unnecessarily, and I would doubt that those people would spend money unnecessarily. They are pretty sharp.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, here is a part of a newspaper article taken from the Ottawa *Citizen* of October 29, 1965, and with your permission, I would like to read this, and perhaps the hon. Minister would like to comment on it. Possibly what is written there is not according to facts, but if I may be permitted to read it:

> The Jones recommendations were greeted by a storm of protest. Rumours are growing that the Ontario government now feels it would be futile to try to implement the report. Mr. Jones himself has been quoted as saying he feels his controversial plan is now dead.

Now this is part of the report published in the Ottawa *Citizen*, a very reputable newspaper, and naturally if that is the case, then possibly what the hon. Minister should do is to take—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Call on you; you are an undertaker!

Mr. Racine: I do not know whether I can do anything about this. As a professional mortician, I do not think that I could bury the Jones report, but perhaps I should bury some of the individuals who are not doing anything about the implementation of this report.

Mr. Chairman, my suggestion is this, and I think that I have already said it in my remarks on the Throne speech debate, that possibly what the hon. Minister should do—he and his advisers and the department—is to take a decision and bring it to the Legislature and say: "This is our recommendation." I do not think that he will ever regret a consensus of opinion or a unanimous opinion on the part of the municipalities in the Ottawa area, so I think that this is the only solution that may be brought to this problem at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, insofar as the newspaper story in the Ottawa *Citizen* of last October is concerned, I would suggest to you, sir, with great respect, that it is pure speculation. Insofar as Mr. Jones making statement to the effect that his report was dead, I have never heard of that, and as a matter of fact, I saw Mr. Jones just a few days ago.

Now if you are of the opinion that we should not consult the municipalities in Ottawa and the surrounding area, I would beg to differ with you in that regard. I think they are entitled to a full consideration of their opinions and I intend to do exactly that. I have explained why it has not been possible to deal with the Jones report during this session of the Legislature. I think that is reasonable. I have given reasonable explanations of the delay and I think I am entitled

to deal with the matter in the due course of time when I am through with the responsibilities which we all have in this Legislature. When that happens I already have staff examining the Jones report in detail and I will give it full consideration. But I must assure you that it is my full intention—and I differ with you in that regard, sir—to meet with the municipal representatives of the municipalities that have been studied by Mr. Jones before I bring any recommendations before the Legislature.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I did not, at any time, infer that the municipalities should not be consulted. I think they have been consulted; I think they have presented briefs; they appeared before the commission and they have been invited by the hon. Minister to make some comments since. I think they have had every opportunity to present their point of view and I do not suggest to the Minister that he take a unilaterial decision in the matter, but I believe that at this time he and the officers of his department should know the attitude of all the municipalities concerned. This is my point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, these reports that the hon. Minister so often refers to and, I might say, uses as vehicles of procrastination, have the most unlikely names to them —Smith and Jones. It makes one wonder in a momentary lack of imaginative qualities whether such people actually exist or not.

If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, the question of monuments will be a convenient jumping off place for what I have to say if I make but a small and passing reference to them.

Monuments and human history can be very transitory things and their meaning can change from generation to generation; I would draw that to the attention of the hon. Minister, if he looks ahead to some material memento that he has passed this way with the rest of us. Poor old Wolfe has lost the word "victorious" in Quebec City because of the changing climate of the times. I recall when I was at the relief of Hong Kong at the end of the war the Japanese were very fond of monuments to their dead and they had built one at the top of the island, at the highest point of the peak and they had used Canadian soldiers to carry the materials to the top of that island to build the monument. Major-General Festing, the commander of the occupation forces, ordered the Japanese to go up and take that monument down and carry it piece by piece to the main square of the city of Victoria and there to build a public comfort station for the use of the allied forces. So they change, depending upon the attitudes of the people.

Now, I just say this to the hon. Minister; it is very apt that he should say that the monument will be in Toronto, because I would doubt that a monument to him would be built in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not in Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: No, not in Sudbury; I fear that there would not be one.

Just so I will not be described as a Johnny-come-lately to the idea that Lesage's government was defeated yesterday for being a big city government, then the same damnation might befall this one for having too great an emphasis on the needs of the big cities.

During this whole session of the Legislature we have not seemed to get outside the demands of Metropolitan Toronto—and the horizons of the Treasury benches never seem to reach north of the French River—which after all may have had its problems in regional government. Perhaps it did. It never seemed to me that the citizens were suffering too much. It has a fine transportation system on which for 20 cents they can get down to their place of work. You cannot get to your place of work in Sudbury for 20 cents; there is not even a bus system. There is anarchy in the transportation system.

Perhaps other parts of the province need to be looked at to see if a regional government system would be of advantage to the inhabitants; specifically the Sudbury basin, perhaps it is apt for regional government. The citizens of Sudbury are ready to admit that after six years of experiment, that annexation of the adjoining township of McKim and half of the township of Neelon has failed.

How many times has he heard that the annexation and amalgamation of the outlying areas, making a municipal unit of 54 square miles, has given the inhabitants and ratepayers of that community more problems than it had before. Now, how that came about of course will remain a mystery, until somebody writes his memoirs and discloses the whole sordid and unhappy story.

Up until this year, I say, and I will not dwell on the vote, that at least Sudbury and 58 other mining municipalities got a recognition in the estimates. The item grants to mining municipalities now apparently become the assessment grants, which is a pseudonym

that is unacceptable to the constituents I represent. They have become a statute, instead of a viable unit of municipal government. The hon. Minister did not even grace us with a passing reference to what The Assessment Act might mean for the mining municipalities, and particularly Sudbury. No, he preferred to be bland and coy when I addressed a question to him after his own presentation.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Sorry, I did not presume that you addressed a question to me in connection with this matter, and if you are dealing with vote 1305—

Mr. Sopha: I am leaving it. I leave it, I have made my point. I have said that you preferred to be coy and bland and I do not withdraw those words.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I was not coy and bland.

Mr. Sopha: You replied to me by saying, I do not intend to say anything about it right now. That was the reply and *Hansard* will record it.

But I say this: There are 1.75 million people in the Metro area here. That is fine. They have their problems and you properly dealt with them. But the whole point is that out in the boondocks, in the rest of Ontario which sends all but 27 members to this House, there might be problems that demand attention, and specifically my own area. Maybe it has come to a point in its history where regional government is the solution to it.

Now, with summoning up a little bit of courage, half an inch of courage, if it can be measured on the scale, this government goes into the Sudbury area and says, we decide that International Nickel Company shall support the home for the aged. Then a little later on, having got away with that, without too much difficulty, they go into the area and they decide the International Nickel Company shall contribute to public welfare. Then of course they come to the regional organization of children's aid societies and they lose all courage. Having tested Inco twice, they are ready to back off. They will not take them on again. The hon. Minister of Public Welfare no longer has the necessary stamina to go after them.

Maybe the answer in short, and the hon. Minister knows whereof I speak, maybe the answer is that the smelter should come into the greater municipal complex. He agrees with me that the smelter is assessable in Copper Cliff, as the smelter is in Hamilton. I forget the name of the company—Stelco—the Stelco smelter is assessed for municipal purposes in Hamilton. Algoma Steel's is assessed for municipal purposes in Sault Ste. Marie. Perhaps the time has come that we give up this bits and pieces approach, and decide that the smelter should contribute to the municipal rate.

Now, I have lost the Minister's attention completely, and I will have to speak to the hon. member for Nickel Belt, who is sympathetic, I am sure, to what I have to say.

My hon. friend from Ottawa, I notice, gets up and complains that Ottawa is lacking some approach towards regional government. At least they have a study; they have a study made by somebody with the unlikely name of Jones. At least they have a study, so that is progress. Sudbury has not got a study.

Mr. Singer: They are no further ahead.

Mr. Sopha: No, they are no further ahead. I can tell the House that I know from my observations of the hon. Minister, that he is engrossed, he is obsessed, he is taken up to the point of fetish with this business of assessment. That has become virtually his whole life.

He inaugurated the plan of assessment, and as long as he occupies this portfolio, he is going to push with great vigour, the institution of district assessing units. He has not got the district of Sudbury yet, he has got his own district to the north, Cochrane, and he has got a few others, and I believe, Algoma, is coming into the plan. But while he is absorbed in that fetish of district assessment and the equalization of tax rates, these other gross problems remain wanting. They remain wanting for attention and the years go by, the burden gets greater.

The citizens of Sudbury provide these municipal services to International Nickel Company. Police, fire protection, education, and all the rest of them, and this year they got a ten per cent tax increase for them. Now, where is the study that has been inaugurated to assist those people towards some form of panacea for their burdens?

I am not one of those so modest as to think that because I say these things in this Legislature they do not get results, because I took the occasion at the ides of March to make some remarks about the necessity of sewers and water in the adjoining townships, and lo, and behold, within a fortnight after I had made my remarks, that great monolithic corporation, the OWRC instituted a study, and we are going to have the results by Christmas; when the Arctic monsoons blow

over the north country, we are going to have the result.

So one can get some results; one can get some results by speaking up, and for that reason it becomes perfectly apparent and even the hon. member for Nickel Belt would not get up and deny what I say, because he is aware of the attitude of the people in the basin, towards the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. No monument will be built there to him; in fact it is not too great an exaggeration to say that each time he passes through, he asks a blessing that he survives.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I was up there two weeks ago and the mayor gave me a key to the city. What about that?

Mr. Sopha: That is only a little exaggeration. It may be that he will meet a martyrdom comparable to the Jesuits.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1301.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I have made my point.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You do not wish me any harm, but—

Mr. Sopha: I have made my point, and I merely draw this to your attention, that if you got the same degree of support in the rest of the province as you get in northern Ontario, for what you do not do—your lack of support is in direct correlation to the neglect of the area—there would be 54 members on that side, and there would be 54 members on this side of the House, just as apparently turned out in Quebec, because you hold half the seats in northern Ontario.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): It was the Liberals in Quebec.

Mr. Sopha: Just half of them, that is all you have been able to get. If the rest of the province voted the same, you would not have the commanding, overwhelming, and sometimes tyrannical majority that you have in this House. That is the reflection of your big city attitude that I have been referring to for some weeks now, and it has taken on some meaning, after the result yesterday in La Belle Province next door, that you concern yourselves with bigness. All that you think about is bigness, and the big people have your ear. Their pleas are heard and they are translated into action.

The little people out in the boondocks, beyond the range of the human voice, and only as close as the telephone, they do not really matter. They can be forgotten and you can palliate them and give them some balm for their ills, by arriving in town some nice October, and taking out a pair of cufflinks—as you do so nicely, take out a pair of cufflinks—and you say, Here, Mr. Clerk, this is for you in appreciation of what you do for us.

That clerk in that municipality is the best friend you have. He is the best friend—well, the only one—just about the only one.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The mayor is a friend of mine, or he would not have given me a key to the city. He provided me with a police escort fore and aft to get out of town.

Mr. Sopha: And you need it. We want no mayhem. I can hardly wait until we get to vote 1305, and find out in real terms what The Assessment Act means—$6,455,000, because that is quite a bit above the usual $5 million or is it $5.75 million, that was voted when the mining municipalities were identified as such, and the Minister comes from one himself.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member wait until vote 1305 for that?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. It is a pity that the report of the mining committee was not introduced and tabled in this House before we dealt with these estimates because that report, as it will appear, would give ever so much more substantiation to what I say from this side of the House, because I could point to the assistance and the support of ten members of the government, including the very able chairman to the north of you, the member for Cochrane North, and including several senior members of the Legislature, the hon. member for York North and other men who have been here a long time. And I could point to the lines and say there is an impartial jury of your own supporters—here is what they have to say to you. No, I will never live to see the day that any monument will ever be built to the hon. Minister in northern Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, one year ago I asked the hon. Minister if he was taking into consideration some sort of tax relief for senior citizens and he mentioned at that time that it was under study in his department. Now, since that day the city of Hamilton has been successful in having a bill passed in this House that would provide for this type of relief. May I ask the Minister if this study has been completed and have any conclusions been arrived at as a result of the study?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, the answer is no, studies have not been completed, therefore no conclusions have been reached.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister not intend then to pass legislation similar to the clause contained in the Hamilton bill that allowed a municipality to give tax relief to senior citizens?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, is no; because in my opinion the Hamilton legislation is not as broad as the present legislation which is now in effect in the Act.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the government went along with the Hamilton legislation because this legislation received the consent of the House.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is quite correct, in spite of the Opposition from the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Newman: The Minister did not vote against it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, now, listen, I am not going to carry things to that extent. I made my presentation before the committee on private bills.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, usually when we get these estimates we get the annual report of The Department of Municipal Affairs—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, the report of The Department of Municipal Affairs has been in the hands of hon. members for at least five weeks.

Mr. Singer: The report of the Ontario municipal board?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The report of the Ontario municipal board was filed by the hon. Provincial Secretary about the same time.

Mr. Singer: Have those been circulated to the members?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes, my dear sir, they have.

Vote 1301 agreed to.

On vote 1302:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): On vote 1302, the Minister knows the concern I have had in the Donmount Village area and I have gathered the impression in the course of the time that I have been interested, that there is some strain between the community planning branch of his department and the city of Toronto in the area of urban renewal.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There is some—what is the word the hon. member used?

Mr. Renwick: Strain.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Strain?

Mr. Renwick: I do not know quite how to express it, I just get this impression that there is not that degree of co-ordination in their activities, or of harmony in the way in which they are going about the affairs in Donmount Village and perhaps elsewhere; that there may not be that consultation by the city officials with the community planning branch which would be necessary to make such a scheme go through smoothly.

I have heard it said, Mr. Chairman, with a sense of irritation that they do not have these problems elsewhere in the province of Ontario but just in the city of Toronto. I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would feel that he could make a statement as to whether or not there is this kind of irritation or lack of co-operation or lack of co-ordination or lack of consultation between the city of Toronto and the community planning branch in relation to all the many problems involved in urban renewal. Certainly I have this impression that there is something basically wrong in the relationship between the city of Toronto and the community planning branch of the department.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would advise the hon. member that there is no strain between the city of Toronto and The Department of Municipal Affairs. I am sure that the city of Toronto council and the officials of the city know exactly what their responsibilities are, and I can assure the hon. member that the officials of my department understand their responsibilities also. We have no intention of telling the city of Toronto what to do, they know exactly what they are responsible for. When we receive requests from them to do certain things that are our responsibilities, we shall do so forthwith. Let me assure the hon. member that there is no strain between the city of Toronto and ourselves in spite of the fact that sometimes you may read things in the newspapers.

I say with very great respect that we conduct our business in a businesslike way and we are quite prepared to meet with the city at any time to discuss with them, with their staff, exactly the problems. I am assured by my staff that there is a very close relationship between the staff of the department and the staff of the city of Toronto.

Again, with very great respect, when the

politicians get into it sometimes there are things said that would seem to indicate, as the hon. member has used the word, some strain. I am sure that there is none of that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is strain between the city of Toronto and the hon. member for Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I hope the member will accept that assurance.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I was not speaking of a broad range of stress or strain that there might be; I was speaking purely in the area of the urban renewal scheme which is focused, as I understand it, in the community planning branch of the Minister's department. Even the brochures which the community planning branch distribute indicate that the co-ordinating function is provided by the Minister's department through this particular branch.

I can quite understand that in an urban renewal scheme relationships between his department and the city of Toronto would be conducted with the greatest of decorum and the greatest of concern as to a recognition of what steps belong to the city and what steps belong to the Minister's department. But surely the Minister must recognize, as he has stated on other occasions and other members of the government have stated, that it is an urban renewal partnership. As I understand it, it requires a high degree of co-operation and co-ordination between this branch of the government and the city on the one hand and the federal government officials on the other hand, to make certain that these schemes are carried out with the greatest of concern for the people in the area who are going to be displaced by them, and with the greatest concern for the efficient development of the scheme.

Now, it certainly does not accord with the impressions which I have had, and I am not speaking about the relationship between politicians at the city level or politicians in this Legislature, I am speaking now of the kind of co-operation between the community planning branch of the Minister's department and the planning officials and other officials who are involved in urban renewal schemes in the city of Toronto.

It is not very long ago that it was said in this House these things do not happen in other parts of the province, but we seem to have more difficulty in Toronto with urban renewal schemes than elsewhere. Is the Minister completely satisfied with the degree of co-operation that exists between his community planning branch and the city of Toronto? Is it, in fact, operating as a partnership or have you simply said: "Well, these are our responsibilities" to the city; and "These are our responsibilities and we will carry them out this way and we will not have a free and informal interchange from time to time to make certain that these schemes are carried out with facility"?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I have examined the situation with respect to the urban renewal projects in the city of Toronto with great care, because I read the newspapers occasionally also. I want to assure the hon. member and the hon. members of the House, that there is close co-operation between our departments. We have tried to the fullest extent to give the most expeditious service to the city of Toronto.

Remember that we have responsibilities also to the taxpayers of Ontario and to our federal partners. It happens sometimes—and I am not saying that it has happened in the case of this particular Napier Place-Donmount Village urban renewal project—but sometimes it happens that the report that comes to us from the municipality is not quite complete and therefore there are delays.

These documents have to be examined by not only officials in the community planning branch, they have to be examined by officials in the law branch; they have to be deposited with central mortgage and housing corporation so that their officials can examine them. These matters all take time, but I want to assure you that wherever possible we have dealt with the approvals that have been required as expeditiously as we possibly could. We have processed them in a very minimum of time to be sure that we would not have any complaints against our section of the administration.

The city of Toronto has certain responsibilities which are very clearly understood by them with regard to this whole question of urban renewal and I think that they are fulfilling their responsibilities, which are perhaps greater than ours in that they are the ones who have to deal with local people who are being displaced and must be placed somewhere else and for whom accommodation must be provided, and so on. But let me assure you that it is not possible that two administrations should become involved in the same project. That just is not possible.

In this particular case, as well as in other urban renewal projects in the province, these matters have been left to the municipalities with the support and advice of our department and the support and advice of representatives of the federal agency concerned. I can assure

you of that, because I have gone into a very deep examination of all the documentation in connection with these matters. I would say that if we continue as we are there will be progress made—there is progress being made day by day in dealing with these problems; which are very serious, there is no doubt of that.

I can appreciate the situation where people find themselves in the position where they receive a certain amount of money for their old home which is going to be demolished. It has not any more value than that, and they have to go and be housed elsewhere. The city has that responsibility and the city has those facilities to take care of this situation. I am not going to tell them what to do in a particular instance, because they know what their responsibilities are and how they can come face to face with those things. We hope to give them the greatest co-operation, complete co-operation at all times in the light of our responsibilities and in the light of the responsibilities of the federal agency concerned.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on this particular question that the Minister has brought up and which is of concern to me, is it correct to say that before the price which is paid for any given property in an urban renewal scheme is in fact paid and an agreement reached, that price is cleared with the urban renewal partnership on which the Minister's department is represented; so that it is in fact true that it is not just the city's responsibility, but the city has to get the approval of the community planning branch to the payment which is going to be made for any given property, or is this truly a matter that is entirely within the authority of the city? Does his department in conjunction with the federal government or as the focal point for an urban renewal scheme, in fact exercise control over the price which is paid on expropriation?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I cannot give you an answer for that, but I doubt that we are concerned with individual properties. We are only concerned with the total of the project. If you bear with me—I am sorry that there are no page boys here at the moment so that I could get the answer for you, but I cannot give it to you now. Would it be satisfactory if I got it for you later?

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps the hon. Minister could let me have that particular answer tomorrow.

Does the Minister have any impression that the city of Toronto is being unnecessarily inflexible in the basis under which they are determining compensation for properties expropriated in urban renewal schemes? Again, it is part of this overall impression that I have. I receive the definite impression that the community planning branch of the hon. Minister's department considers that there is an unnecessary rigidity in the city's approach, the city's method of evaluation of properties for compensation purposes when they have been expropriated.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, we do not value the property; it is up to the city administration to value the property.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on this question—now that the Minister was good enough to write to me on this question of expropriation and to state very clearly his position on the question of expropriation and referred to the fact that it was a matter basically of concern to the hon. Attorney General and he has now referred the matter to the law reform commission. Would it be the intention of the Minister, through the community planning branch, to make any presentation to the law reform commission as to any views that he, as the Minister in charge of this community planning branch, might have on the question of expropriation of properties in urban renewal schemes and of other interest in properties in urban renewal schemes to try in some way to overcome the problem which exists in Donmount village, but is quite obviously going to exist in other areas, both in the city of Toronto and in the province? I think it would be most helpful if the hon. Minister could see his way clear to make a considered brief and presentation to the law reform commission on this topic so that the government could express its views on it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I cannot answer that question. That is a speculative question. The hon. Attorney General having referred this matter to the law reform commission will have, of course, available to him and to his officers, and no doubt will wish to have the benefit of the experience of all those departments that are concerned with matters of expropriation of properties. I would think that in due course of time, we may be asked to give our opinion with respect to matters of this kind.

I am hardly in a position to give the hon. member a promise that that will be done, but I would think that in the normal operation of government that would be a feature where the Attorney General would wish to

have the benefit of our experience in dealing with these matters.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that particular point, what I gathered from the very polite way in which the hon. Minister expressed himself is that he will take some initiative to express the views of his department on this question of the expropriation of properties in urban renewal schemes rather than perhaps just wait for the Attorney General or the law reform commission, which are not directly concerned in this specific area, to ask him would he perhaps on his own make some gesture toward presenting the viewpoint which he must have —he must have some considered views. Either he thinks the question is one which does not merit any attention because it is not a problem in urban renewal schemes, or he recognizes, as I believe he does and as he said tonight he does, that it is a problem and it is a problem related to the compensation which is paid on expropriation.

Now, I am not asking for a promise from the hon. Minister, but surely we are entitled to some suggestion that he is going to be interested in the problem, which has been of concern to myself, my colleagues and other members here.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, that is a very difficult question to answer. I think I made a reasonable statement a moment ago, and there is a wealth of information and a certain amount of jurisprudence that is available to those people who are going to prepare material to present to the commission—the law reform commission. That being the case, I would think that if you had my undertaking that I would place the responsibility in the hands of the hon. Attorney General, where it is now, that would be sufficient, because I think the law reform committee will want to have the benefit of the experience gained by various departments in dealing with these matters.

I am not in a position to give you a promise, I know you have not used that word, but I think if we leave it as it is the matter will take care of itself in due course. It is almost like the person who writes you a letter and if he does not get a reply within four days, he says did you get my letter. Well, then, you have got to spend an hour and a half to find where his letter is, in the process of going through the department's activities of various branches. I have had that experience. We have developed a little system now, that when we get a letter, we send a postcard, that says, yes, we got your letter. And in due course of time we will pay some attention to it.

Mr. Sopha: That is a very normal reply.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Normal reply.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on this vote, in my community, because of the acute shortage of homes, practically anything that has four walls and a roof is saleable. Now the hon. Attorney General has introduced legislation that is termed The Consumers' Protection Act. My community has had a resolution adopted that would be a home buyer protection resolution, and I would like to bring this to the attention of the House, because I think it is worthy of merit.

This is to protect the individual buying a home, a home that in some instances should have been condemned and torn down. This was adopted by the Windsor city council on February 28, 1966:

> Whereas it should be the aim of the city to encourage a high standard of housing in the municipality and consequently to improve our methods of enforcing and administering the minimum housing standards bylaw; and whereas everything possible should be done to protect all persons who purchase homes especially those in low income groups to ensure as far as practicable that such purchasers are made aware of the condition of such house in relation to the provisions of the city's minimum housing standards bylaw; and whereas the city should discourage the sale of houses for continued residential occupancy which do not meet the provisions of the said bylaw; therefore be it resolved that the Minister of Municipal Affairs be urged to recommend general legislation to permit municipalities which have adopted bylaws respecting minimum standards of housing to register at the respective registry office all orders issued under such bylaws for repair or demolition of buildings so as to put prospective owners of such property on notice regarding defects in the condition of houses affected by such orders.

I would assume the hon. Minister has been given a copy of this resolution. Does he plan on acting on this at all?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, Mr. Chairman, I received that resolution from the city council and I replied to the city council. I was unaware that they had sent you a copy of it, or I probably would have sent you a copy of my reply.

Mr. Newman: May I inform the hon. Minister that I get all copies, so I would appreciate replies too?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am afraid that is another promise I am not able to keep, because I must tell you that there is certain correspondence between city councils and mayors and other officials of municipalities that is just not available to members of the Legislature. I am sorry.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am only referring to any copy of a resolution that is sent to the hon. Minister and sent to me then, because if—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: How do I know whether they sent it to you or not? When it is marked on the letter that a copy was sent to someone, I send them a copy of my reply.

Mr. Newman: You have a point there, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1302?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, what was your reply to this resolution?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, I do not know. I receive in my office somewhere between 50 to 100 letters a day, and in due course of time, in the fullness of time, I reply to them. I cannot tell you what I replied to the city of Windsor, but I can tell you this, that I do not think there is any legislation coming in The Municipal Act this year that will deal with that particular matter.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, may I have an expression of opinion from you? Do you think this is worthwhile?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: As I remember it, there was an investigation carried on in connection with that resolution—an investigation carried on by my law branch and it was their recommendation that it was unfortunate that this would create a problem in the matter of registering these documents. But I am not sure of that. I will find the answer tomorrow and I will deal with it in the House, if you wish, or personally.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: One cannot fail to note the precision and clarity with which the hon. Minister deals with the problem of the city of Toronto, raised by the hon. member for Riverdale, but one raised by my friend from Windsor-Walkerville, is met with vagueness and obtuseness, about what the reply was, or the attitude of the department, which only proves the point that I was making earlier.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1302 carried?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave that vote, I did not really believe that there was all that precision and clarity in the reply that I got from the hon. Minister.

Would the hon. Minister, if it is not too small a project in the many that are before this community planning branch, tell me what the present state of the Blake street project is, in the riding of Riverdale?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will have a reminder on the situation on the Blake street project in one moment.

Mr. Sopha: It is a Toronto section—

Hon. Mr. Spooner. Why are you so mad at Toronto? It is a nice place; they have a nice city hall.

Mr. Sopha: Because they engross the whole attention of this government. That is what I have been trying to point out. This session might aptly be called the Toronto session, because it has engrossed the attention of this House, and I have pointed to areas of neglect in the north country, where there is no action at all, but I pointed out that my friend from Ottawa at least has got a report. Now in this area, just let me make this additional comment.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Take a look at the editorial page of the Toronto *Daily Star* where it mentions the futile mentality of "the Robarts clique", because we have removed a couple of seats from the city of Toronto. This does not jibe with what you are saying at all.

Mr. Singer: That is not an editorial, it is a letter to the editor.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is on the editorial page.

Mr. Sopha: They may say that one day, but they are conscious of the $14 million per mile highway down there and they are conscious of the announcement of the Minister of Highways on the largesse of spending $700 million to meet their needs.

An hon. member: $700 million?

Mr. Sopha: That is what he said.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Over how many years? 20 years.

Mr. Sopha: That is what he said. Over 20 years he is going to spend $700 million. It compares very favourably with some of the rabbit tracks that you get in the northern part of the province.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, come, come.

Mr. Sopha: No, I do not exaggerate, and I would not be accused of saying things on the hustings that I would not say here to your face; that you are engrossed with bigness, big cities, while the boondocks, the people who live in smaller communities, just go by the wayside.

Now, on the tenth day of June, next, a delegation is going to come and see the hon. Prime Minister, I am told, and they are going to say to him perhaps the time has come to make a regional study of Sudbury, to see whether it is an apt situation for regional government.

You will notice where the initiative comes from. The initiative comes from the community to the hon. Prime Minister, not from The Department of Municipal Affairs, flowing outward into the thither reaches of the province.

Oh no, it does not come from there, sir, it gets its genesis at the local level. That is my complaint in essence and nobody will convince me this night that it is not a justifiable one. I know in my heart, with the ability I see in this House and see the people who occupy the time of the House; the majority of the members of the New Democratic Party, three in the back row, one in the second and one in the first, are all Toronto members. My able friend, the hon. member for Downsview here, and the Minister of Reform Institutions, they are the eloquent people who occupy the time of this House and that is why the city of Toronto and Metro gets the attention it does from this government.

The people from the north country who speak on the floor of this Legislature are very few and scattered—

An hon member: There is nothing for them to do; the member has said it all.

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment. Who can point to the last time the Minister of Mines ever said anything on behalf of northern Ontario? I cannot recall in recent years hearing the Minister of Municipal Affairs ever utter a syllable on behalf of the people north of the French river. The Prime Minister, of course, he has his own special formula, he comes up into the north and tells us what great people we are, with fine Christian virtues, and what a great future—always in the future—we are going to get.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: In answering the hon. member for Riverdale, I hope I do not get another lecture on Toronto.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister is very well versed on Toronto and its needs.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am? That is not what the mayor said. In connection with the question asked about the Blake street project, Mr. Chairman, there has been communication between the city of Toronto and the community planning branch about this project. A certain number of questions have been raised on the part of our branch with respect to the problems that are apparent in this suggested project.

So far, Mr. Chairman, my informant advises me that he does not believe that a formal application has yet been received.

Vote 1302 agreed to.

On vote 1303:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under vote 1303 — legislation was recently passed to permit by private bill the spending of funds by a municipality for promotional purposes up to the extent of, I think, $100,000. The limit today for certain municipalities is only $60,000. That figure today is unrealistic. Does the Minister plan on introducing general legislation that would allow municipalities over certain population to increase that?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The answer is "yes."

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 1303 agreed to.

On vote 1304:

Mr. Singer: On vote 1304 there are some questions I wanted to ask.

There has been considerable discussion in recent months about the whole question of exemptions under The Assessment Act. The opinion has been expressed, with greater and greater frequency, that the long list of exemptions that we have throughout the province of Ontario are no longer serving the purposes that they were originally designed to serve. In fact, our tendency has been to add to the exemptions rather than decrease them.

Quite recently as well, sir, there has been the suggestion that perhaps the various religious institutions that are exempt under The Assessment Act be no longer given that exemption, that if it is necessary that they

be subsidized in some manner that perhaps a grant system could or should be initiated or they should be supported in another way.

I would like to hear whether or not the hon. Minister has any views insofar as the various exemption sections are concerned. There were recommendations by the select committee on municipal affairs, but we have not seen any change at all insofar as these recommendations are concerned. The exemption sections have not been changed one iota.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, this is an area of The Assessment Act that has not been completely examined in detail because this question of exemptions is only one part of the re-examination of The Assessment Act, involving actual assessments as well as exemptions. I am sorry, but there will not be any appreciable or important amendments to the present Act dealing with exemptions at this session, coming up this year.

Mr. Singer: Is there any reason to expect that the matter is under study and it will be a year or two—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Yes, I should have qualified my statement by saying that yes, the matter is under study not only by The Department of Municipal Affairs but by other agencies of government which are concerned with not just the matter of assessment and municipal taxes and exemptions but of provincial support of municipal expenditures.

Mr. Singer: What about the question of business tax? That was referred to earlier this afternoon. There were some very pertinent recommendations by the select committee in relation to that. Those again have not been changed. We get the some old complaints about inequalities and so on, and there are genuine inequalities in the assessment levies on the various business taxes.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps I should say, Mr. Chairman, that much of what the member says is inextricably bound with the Smith committee report which we had hoped to have much sooner than this. They are examining the whole area of municipal taxation. I would hope that from the committee there will be some wide recommendations made which will be considered by this government and I would assume that we will receive that report in time to examine the recommendations.

You see, really, when you analyze it, the Smith committee has perhaps even a larger task than the Carter commission has, because not only is it dealing with taxation in this province in relation to the federal government, but it was given very specific terms of reference to deal with the whole question of taxation between this government and the municipalities. While there definitely has been delay in what might have been done, and the recommendations of the select committee perhaps have not been dealt with as quickly as they might have been had the Smith committee not been appointed, still it would be really folly to attempt to go at a revision of many of these things.

The member mentioned business assessment in particular. We realize that some of the business assessments are not in tune with today, but until we have the comprehensive report we hope to get from the Smith committee, it is the decision of the government that we will not attack the problem in a piecemeal fashion. I would hope that when this Legislature resumes after this session is completed, we will be able to bring forward legislation and changes, which I think it is obvious to all of us, need to be made. Until we deal with the entire matter, we do not propose to deal with portions.

Mr. Singer: I can understand in the broad concept the whole question of exemptions could well be dealt with, but I am surprised that the depth of the Smith committee studies would be such that they would concern—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This was my answer.

Mr. Singer: Would they be going deep enough to concern themselves with whether or not a wholesaler should pay 75 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that submissions have been made to the committee by interested groups and I would hope that their studies will go that deep.

Mr. Singer: Fine—we learn a little bit as we go along, because all of these groups came, I suppose, with greater frequency before the select committee than any other groups. The majority of our briefs dealt with various submissions in relation to business tax.

I did not know they had been directed as well to the Smith committee, but it would seem that we really do not need the Smith committee to determine whether it is fair that a wholesaler should pay 75 per cent because years ago wholesalers were in far better positions than retailers; or whether we still go with the old puritanical idea that

distillers and brewers are bad and you tax them 150 per cent. It would seem to me these things could be dealt with perhaps along the lines recommended by the select committee without getting into the whole broad theory of taxation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: These are all a matter of opinion and judgment. I do not see how you can ever really deal with that problem, that is, if you are going to alter the percentage of assessment to a distiller, a brewer, a wholesale grocer or a wholesale hardware man, you are going to affect the revenue of the municipality in one way or another. You know and I know that you cannot remove revenue from a municipality today without replacing it with something else; so that really in our view, Mr. Chairman, it is quite impossible to deal with these things other than completely and as a whole.

It would be very simple to alter The Assessment Act and to change the percentage assessments of, for instance, a brewer or a distiller. But what do you do to replace the revenue removed from a municipality when such action is taken? In other words, it is a whole problem and we have the report of the select committee and we have the Smith committee carrying out its studies. We would have wished that its report would have been in before this, but it is not and those are the facts of the situation. When it does come in, Mr. Chairman, we will deal with the matter in its totality.

Mr. Singer: Would the same type of thinking apply to the provincial government paying full taxes to municipalities on provincially owned property?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No doubt there will be a recommendation on this area as well.

Mr. Singer: Well, it is going to be a mighty report when we see it.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): I have two questions of the hon. Minister, and if he dealt with these in his introductory remarks, I apologize.

In regard to the assessor's manual, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us approximately how many municipalities still do not use the provincial assessment manual, or assessor's manual, and second, if there has been consideration given by the government making it mandatory by municipal assessors to use the provincial manual. That is number one.

Number two is the question of assessment appeals. The hon. Minister is well aware, I know, of the problems we are having in certain areas of downtown Toronto regarding assessment appeals at the moment, and I was wondering if he has given any consideration at all to shifting the onus in regard to these assessment appeals from the person appealing the reassessment to the position where the assessment commissioner must justify the reassessment. In other words, shifting the onus completely from the back of the citizen at the moment who is doing the appeal over to the civic employee who is doing the reassessment.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that approximately 50 per cent of the municipalities in this province today are using the assessment manual. In my inadequate remarks earlier I gave a listing of the number of municipalities where the assessment is under a centralized assessment system, either through the county assessment commissioners or district assessors. To make the assessment manual mandatory at the present time is not feasible because our examination through the licensing procedure for assessors indicates that there is not a sufficient number of qualified and completely trained assessors to undertake the use of the manual at the present time. We have our training course available through Queen's University and we have the support of the association of assessing officers of the province and I think that all in all, we are making considerable progress in the training and retraining of municipal assessors.

Insofar as this question of appeals is concerned, at the present time we have not considered this manner of dealing with assessment appeals would be of any value in attempting to settle some of the problems apparent in some of the appeals that have been dealt with lately in this area—if I may be forgiven the use of the words Metropolitan Toronto — because of reassessment. However, this is a matter which is under active consideration and it may be that before too long some better method of dealing with assessment appeals may be developed.

But at the present time, Mr. Chairman, there is no legislation contemplated dealing with this matter.

Vote 1304 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of this department and I would like also to go to the order paper for second readings and the House in committee to deal with those bills in the committee stage.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.15 o'clock, p.m.

No. 132

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 7, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

5

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 7, 1966

First report, standing committee on highways and tourism, Mr. R. G. Hodgson 4353

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4353

Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4353

Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4353

Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4353

Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4353

Public Libraries Act, 1966, bill intituled, Mr. Davis, first reading 4353

Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4355

Dentistry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4355

Pesticides Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4355

Water Resources Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, first reading 4355

Estimates, Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Spooner, concluded 4356

Legal aid, bill respecting, Mr. Wishart, on second reading 4372

On notice of motion No. 29, Mr. Gisborn, Mrs. Pritchard, Mr. Trotter, Mr. S. Lewis, Mr. Ewen 4387

Recess, 6 o'clock 4390

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to welcome visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the east gallery, students from Rawlinson senior public school, Toronto; and in the west gallery, students from St. John's separate school, Newmarket.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria) presented the first report of the standing committee on highways and tourism, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 121, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, The Public Libraries Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: By way of very short explanation, these are the usual amendments to the educational statutes. I might draw your attention to three or four items of interest.

There are many amendments, some of them of a housekeeping nature, in The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act. It is being revised to extend the maximum period of attendance at secondary schools without fee from six to seven years.

In The Schools Administration Act we are dividing the school year into three terms and replacing the Easter holiday with a fixed week long vacation towards the last part of March. At the Easter season there will still be the Good Friday and the Easter Monday holiday and the school year will be extended by one day to compensate for the Easter Monday, but there will be a fixed holiday period in March every year, if this legislation is approved.

We are also extending the provisions of the $3 per day board and lodging to include secondary pupils in territorial districts who live outside the school sections or separate school zones. It has been confined to these areas prior to this time. It would also apply to secondary pupils who live in high school districts in territorial districts and who are

permitted to attend other secondary schools to obtain courses not available within their own school system and the $3 per day provision formerly covered only secondary pupils who resided within the school sections.

There is a further amendment providing for the triennial election of school boards in a manner that will be consistent with a Municipal Act revision. It further authorizes a maximum monthly honorarium for all trustees, including those who serve on the three-man boards. There is a further provision providing for an additional honorarium for the chairman of the school board, not to exceed 25 per cent of the honorarium paid to him as trustee.

There are several provisions regarding the election of school trustees and a further provision, that was mentioned earlier in the sittings, to permit a school board to establish special classes for pupils whose knowledge of the English language is inadequate; and also a provision to provide for the co-operative use of administrative accommodation and advisory in-teaching personnel by several school boards.

There are three or four amendments, Mr. Speaker, to The Separate Schools Act. This will allow a separate school board to once again share administrative accommodation and advisory in-teaching personnel with another separate school board.

There are some changes in The Public Schools Act. One amendment that would be of interest would allow a member of a municipal council or board to qualify as a candidate for trustee without resigning from the council or board, providing his term of office has less than two months to run after the day of nominations.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): In any municipality?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Another amendment would make all of the qualifications for public school trustees uniform. This takes up a good portion of the statute and is primarily technical in nature, but we are trying to consolidate all these within the one Act.

A new section of the Act will make it possible for a county to issue debentures for a county school area, and there is a uniform appeal section which will provide for arbitration where there is disagreement as to the formation, alteration or dissolution of a county or district or township school area in a union school section.

These are some of the highlights. All of these bills will be going to the education committee for thorough discussion there.

With respect to the changes in The Public Libraries Act, perhaps I may give some of the background information.

In 1964 The Department of Education agreed to finance a survey of library service and organization with the Ontario library association looking after specific details. The result was the publication early this year of the report entitled *Ontario Libraries* by Mr. St. John. I understand that all members of the House have had copies of this particular report.

The survey focussed its attention on public libraries, although it dealt with school and other library facilities as well. It recommended that legislation be provided for an Ontario provincial library council and that provisions for regional library service be improved. We have accepted these recommendations and have followed certain other recommendations in the report.

Part 1 of the bill outlines the powers and responsibilities of library boards in municipalities. Part 2 provides for an Ontario provincial library council and advisory body which will receive reports from the regional library boards, consider a wide range of questions relating to libraries in the province, and make recommendations to the hon. Minister of Education with respect to the development and co-ordination of library service in Ontario.

This council will be composed of 23 people, 14 of them representatives of the regional library associations and nine appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

Part 3 generally provides for the establishment of boards for regional library systems. Although these boards are to be elected and appointed under the provisions of the legislation, regional boards do, at this ment, exist for regional library co-operatives established in 13 out of 14 regions presently in Ontario. The 14th region, of course, will be Metro, and provision for the Metropolitan Toronto library board is included, as the hon. members will recall, in Bill 81.

Part 4 provides for county libraries and tied to this are the regulations under The Public Libraries Act. These are for 1966 and they provide for distribution of some $5 million grants to the libraries. Additional grants will be provided for the regional library boards, the county library boards and boards in larger municipalities.

We anticipate—and we can get into this

in committee—that there will be further regulations when the new legislation comes into effect on January 1, 1967.

This will also be going to the committee on education.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister could explain the logic in presenting us with these six voluminous Acts after we have sat here for five months without hearing anything of importance from him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is just an indication that the department and the government are working very progressively and the Acts are not voluminous. If the hon. member will check the legislation, he will find two or three of the Acts are perhaps two or three sections in content, they are not voluminous.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if this progressive department has taken steps to provide us with a report of the department before the estimates come before us?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will deal with that in the estimates.

Interjections by hon. members.

THE PHARMACY ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The amendments proposed in this bill are intended to bring up to date the definition of "drug" by prescribing the last editions of the *British Pharmacopœia* and other publications to extend the operation of the provisions of the Act relating to election of members of the council, registration of members, discipline of members and information to be endorsed on labels placed on poison containers.

THE DENTISTRY ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Dentistry Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order—

Mr. Ben: A point of order, the seconder is not in the House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the seconder was in the House when he undertook to second my bill; he is not very far away.

Mr. Speaker: We should not get so technical.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My colleague, the hon. Minister of Labour, would be very glad to second the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The purpose of these amendments is to provide for representations upon the governing board of new faculties of dentistry—at the present time, of course, there is only one in Ontario, but a second is pending—to abolish service under article by dental students, an old provision; to enlarge the present provisions respecting practice and procedure, and disciplinary matters, so as to accelerate corrective action in cases of improper conduct; to establish and confer on a discipline committee power to hear and determine charges and award penalties, except when the penalty is cancellation of registration or suspension of registration for more than 12 months, in which case the penalty must be imposed by the board; to provide an appeal in disciplinary cases from a decision or order of the discipline committee to the board with a further appeal from the decision or order of the board to the court of appeal; and to increase the penalties under the Act.

THE PESTICIDES ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pesticides Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to introduce additional measures to control hazards to health in the use of herbicides and pesticides.

THE ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement before the orders of the day.

I would draw the attention of hon. members of this House to the booklets which have been placed on their desks. This booklet, *Water in Ontario,* was prepared under the auspices of The Department of Energy and Resources Management in co-operation with seven other Ontario government departments and two provincial commissions engaged in development and control of provincial water resources.

The publication outlines the programmes of these agencies and indicates how they are working to ensure that the province's water requirements will be met now and in the future. It will be distributed widely throughout the province to those interested in learning of our policies in this vital area. Plans include distribution to schools, travel bureaus, government offices, municipalities and to the general public as requested. I commend it to your attention.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 28th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS
(continued)

On vote 1305:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Perhaps the hon. Minister would be so gracious as to inform us why there was the deletion made of reference to grants to mining municipalities after that term had become sanctioned by years of usage. Perhaps he would inform one of the uninitiated where the grants to mining municipalities appear in this vote and in what amount.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I am advised that the reason for the change in the terms used in describing this particular vote was to identify the subsidies and grants according to the enabling legislation, which is contained in The Assessment Act. The amount of mining revenue payments included in this vote is $6 million and an amount of $445,000 is payments to county and district assessors.

Mr. Sopha: I beg your pardon. What was the amount to mining municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Six million dollars.

Mr. Sopha: That is an increase of—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Some half or three-quarters of a million, I think, over last year. Something like that.

Mr. Sopha: It becomes perfectly apparent that we pass another anniversary when no further assistance is to be given to the very sorely pressed mining municipalities, notwithstanding the perennial pleas that are made to the government for further assistance.

These pleas, of course, have always fallen on deaf ears. I can say at this juncture of time that I am very enthusiastic in respect of the largest and most important of the mining municipalities, the wealthiest and the one that produces most of the revenue under The Mines Profit Tax Act—that is to say, the one I represent, the Sudbury basin. Never before in its history has there been a concerted effort by more groups of vigorous and intelligent citizens within the community to make their feelings known to the government.

I mention one: the Sudbury and district municipal association has forwarded the plea to the Minister for consideration. But the Minister once again—as he developed the entrenched habit of doing—relies upon the failure of the Smith committee on taxation to report, and he replied to them. I was shown a copy of the letter. Indeed, reference to his reply was made in the Sudbury *Star,* and the only solace he could give them was that when and if the Smith committee reported, there might be a further consideration of government policy.

Because there is some suspicion that the Smith committee is waiting for the Carter committee to report, the Sudbury and district municipal association framed a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada, asking that busy man, a man with many other things to cause him anxious reflection—if he would do what he could to get the Carter committee to report, so that the Smith committee could report. All this is a tale sadly told, of course, that is a reflection on the commonsense of the people in charge of the government of our country, both at the national level and the provincial level.

I sometimes wonder what we Canadians would do if we did not have the spate of inquiries and Royal commissions and various other boards to keep us interested in all of the manifold and oft-times very exotic things into which they inquire. In fact, some wag said at one time that if the Russians ever sent rockets across the North Pole to attack North America, the Canadians would set up a Royal commission to look into the matter. Perhaps

we can have the saving grace of being able to be amused at ourselves to that extent.

That is the deplorable situation. That committee has been in existence now for several years and I pointed out just recently that the association of mining municipalities made its representation to the Smith committee in 1964. The hon. Provincial Treasurer, a very sensible and reasonable man, allowed himself to agree with me during his estimates that he, too, was saddened by the fact that the committee has not reported heretofore. In respect of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, I sometimes think, Mr. Chairman, that he finds it a convenient crutch to use as an excuse, if I may change the metaphor, to evade the necessity of giving an answer.

I might say this, and I am careful in the choosing of my words, that there has grown up in the Sudbury basin a very definite feeling that one hears from time to time, expressed by people in municipal government, that they wonder aloud to each other just how sympathetic the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is to the Sudbury basin.

Put another way, he himself, coming from a mining municipality, and indeed having served on the municipal council there — I believe he at one time was the reeve or the mayor, if he was not I hope I do not do him an injustice—he was certainly a municipal clerk and no one on the government benches ought to, from the point of view of experience, have more intimate knowledge of the difficulties of financing local government in a mining municipality.

Of course the whole concept and the whole basis is wrong. It is wrong from start to finish. It is archaic and outmoded, and no longer fits our system of democratic stable and strong municipal government. The idea that mining companies should be exempt from municipal taxation might have suited the first two or three decades of this century, when mining was a very risky business and it was good public policy that mining ventures ought not to be hobbled by municipal politicians who might make unrealistic and very stringent demands upon the mining venture, which was attended by a very high degree of risk. This risk is an outgrowth, it is a product, it is correlated to our geological formation in northern Ontario and the very erratic incidence of minerals that are found in the precambrian shield. But that system certainly no longer fits, what is in fact, in the case of Sudbury, a very highly industrialized community. Sudbury is not a mining community in the sense that Porcupine was a mining community, or in the sense that Cobalt, the birthplace of them all, was a mining community, or Matachewan, or the Golden Mile in Teck township.

Sudbury can be more aptly called an industrial community and it is as much an industrial community as the city of Hamilton is in respect of the steel mills, or Sault Ste. Marie in respect of their steel industry and there are more similarities with those two latter communities than there are with the classic concept of the mining community. However, notwithstanding that evolution during this century, the government continues to insist on using the archaic notion that mining companies need not be responsible financially to the municipalities which house the workers whom they employ.

Now, looked at another way, the historical development in the Sudbury basin has been attended by the very notable characteristic that these industrial giants, Falconbridge and Inco, have surrounded themselves in the cocoon, the protective cocoon of municipalities. That is to say they built the municipality around their plants and they have, during this century and even until this day, protected themselves from municipal interference by controlling the local government.

That is the case in Copper Cliff; it is the case in Lively, in Levack and in the township of Falconbridge. The local government of those towns is what the company says it is, and I do not think the management of even International Nickel Company would condemn me for saying what everyone recognizes to be the truth. It is a very convenient way of restricting interference from municipal politicians that is unwanted and very much unwelcomed.

Well, the problem for the edification of hon. members is basically this, and some hon. members might find some refreshment in the fact that for the moment we are talking about some area of the province that is not Toronto. That might be entertaining in itself, that we get outside of Toronto and talk about another area.

The problem is basically this, that these industrial giants do not pay their way municipally. They pay their way partially, in the sense that the province exacts a tax from them and the province repays to the municipalities a grant in lieu of industrial assessment. In the case of Sudbury, just a little under $2 million.

Now, the hon. Minister sometimes seems inclined to feel that the $2 million—and let us take a round figure—just about equates all

the other deficiencies. Because I have heard him. He has hurled the naked figure at me; $2 million, not relating it to anything but the mere size of $2 million. He seems to have a conception that $2 million, after all, is more money than I will ever have. It is a lot of money, and he hurls the words. He says $2 million, that is not a little bit of money.

Well $2 million is a relative term. It might be a lot. To a man who goes to the Fred Victor mission to get a handout, it is an Everest-like amount of money; but to a municipality with a budget of $7 million or $8 million, as Sudbury has, it might, in its proportion to what is needed to be done with that amount of money, take on a very different complexion so far as quantum goes.

The city fathers of Sudbury would be wont to say that if they got something like $3.5 million they would be closer to the mark. I have mentioned before, and I need not repeat at great length that the citizens of Sudbury had a 10 per cent tax increase this year which I venture to say was not reflected in very many other municipalities or was not to be found in many other municipalities of comparable size in the province. The citizens of Sudbury face many financial problems. That dragon-like monolithic organization, the Ontario water resources commission is breathing down their necks and telling them they have to expend $5 million for a sewage treatment plant sometime in the next five years, Sudbury being one of eight or nine municipalities of the province that does not treat its sewage up to the present.

On the other hand, they are also told that if hospital beds are going to be furnished in anything near adequate numbers for the incidence of sickness in the community, then maybe an amount of $12 million must be raised locally in order to build the necessary hospitals and make extensions to existing ones. Right now a group has reported that there are no fewer than 1,200 beds short in the hospitals in Sudbury.

It boggles the mind for a taxpayer in Sudbury to conjure up a solution to his difficulties, of an impending further increase in taxes unless it comes from one of two sources. The one is an increase in the grants under The Assessment Act provided in this vote for an opportunity to tax, for municipal purposes, the installations of the International Nickel Company. Now, I dwell on that latter company not because I want to distinguish it or discriminate between it and Falconbridge Nickel Mines, but merely for geographical reasons, insofar as International Nickel Company is much closer with its installations to the borders of Sudbury than Falconbridge is. Indeed, International Nickel is in a community that abuts the western edge of the city.

I made reference last night, and it is important to reiterate the matter in order to emphasize the inconsistency of the approach of the government. The government knows and demonstrates that there is a moral obligation on the International Nickel Company to pay its way. The government knows that and the government has translated that conviction into action in two places. The government has decreed that the International Nickel Company shall pay its share for the care of elderly citizens—the senior citizens. It did that a number of years ago in a statute when it sent the provincial municipal assessor into the town of Copper Cliff and ordered the clerk of that municipality to put the smelter on the rolls at the nice tidy sum, the inviting sum of $47 million. Now, that is a wonderful piece of assessment that is much sought after. That is the amount it put on the rolls for the purpose of financing homes for the aged. Then the next time it did it was a couple of years ago with The District Welfare Act when, once again, the provincial assessor went into the town of Copper Cliff and ordered the clerk to put it on the rolls for the purposes of district welfare. I might say that it is a system that works very well—a very efficient system.

Of course, the moral and philosophical basis of that move by the government is plain for everyone to see. It is merely saying to the company, "Your work force grows old and retires and must be cared for. Whenever a mass of society gathers together in civilized living there are going to be economic and social dislocations and those will occur in your work force and in each case it is morally right, equitable, fair and just that you should pay the cost of those dislocations."

Well, no one can quarrel with that proposition except the mayor of Copper Cliff and the clerk and a few of the councillors of Copper Cliff. They conjure up arguments to quarrel with those propositions and every once in a while they give vent to them, but so far as I am able to determine, nobody pays any attention to them. The least people to pay attention to them is The Department of Public Welfare; it just goes in one ear and out the other, so far as I am able to determine, and before that legislation—just to illustrate in real terms what happened—before The District Welfare Act and the setting up of a district welfare unit, the amount paid by the

town of Copper Cliff for welfare per year was under $1,000, because although the Bible says, "The poor you shall always have with you"—not in Copper Cliff. The poor are not permitted there. If anybody gets poor in Copper Cliff they were in the habit of moving them out—they move them to Garson or Hanmer or Blezard, so they have no welfare problems. Well, after the government decreed that they go into the district welfare unit, the amount Copper Cliff had to contribute for welfare rose from less than $1,000 to about $72,000. Everybody in Sudbury basin thought that was only fair because International Nickel Company was paying its way for a social dislocation.

Now, to show its inconsistency; whereas it will do this on a hit-and-miss basis, the government did not do it in the children's aid society because, again, a group of society is congregated in a municipal unit to provide a work force for a very large industry. As they they grow old, and some of them are going to be in need of welfare, so that group is going to father illegitimate children. It is a normal incident, the mere fact that society lives together.

So the same philosophical basis that applied to the homes for the aged and the district welfare could well apply to the children's aid society, the care of fatherless or unwanted children, but the hon. Minister of Public Welfare pulled up on the reins in this case and he was unwilling to take the same logical step in the financing of the children's aid unit on the district basis that they had taken the other two in. I hope I made myself clear and lucid for you, Mr. Chairman, and for all members of the House.

Well, the next logical step, of course, as I see it, is that the government recognized the principle that this company must pay its way for municipal responsibilities in whatever form they occur—in whatever form—without distinguishing certain municipal responsibilities and saying that the company will pay its way for that one but not for that one.

Surely the same case can be made, I say to the hon. member for York North who became acquainted with this problem, the same case can be made for the provision of police protection, for sewers and water, for fire protection, for education, and all the other services that a municipality must provide, as can be made for any one of them that you may select helter-skelter.

Now, that delineates the inconsistency of the government's approach and I am prepared to say—I am prepared to repeat what is bruited about in my community, that you hear whenever this matter is discussed, that the government is afraid of International Nickel Company. That is what the citizens of Sudbury think. International Nickel Company is a very large and very powerful international corporate organization. It is an organization of immense power and immense financial stability. People in my community, and with some justice, have come to the conclusion that the Treasury benches fear that monolithic corporation and are unwilling to press it too far. I would not be surprised at all to ascertain, if I had a way of ascertaining, that as far as the International Nickel Company is concerned, they just about see the handwriting on the wall.

I would not be surprised to learn they are prepared to accept their municipal responsibilities and to pay their fair share for the provision of those municipal services that their work force requires to live in an orderly society. Now, I will say this about Inco, they are never heard to say that they cannot afford to pay, they do not put it that way, when the workers come to them with wage demands they never say it is too expensive or we cannot afford it. They always put it in the vein, we are not disposed to pay it, we are just not inclined to accede to your demands. Looking at their balance sheet, one would wonder how they could ever conjure up a reasonable argument that they cannot afford to pay it when they make something in the neighbourhood of $150 millions net profit after taxes in the previous year.

I use the time of this House and employ whatever lesser talents that I have to say in the most clear and precise terms to the Treasury benches, through you, Mr. Chairman, that it is nothing more or less than a moral duty on the part of that company, and the government is the vehicle for the carrying out of that moral duty, that the company in the exercise of its duties should pay its way, and should provide the municipal services to the population it has created.

The company created the population and brought the workers there. Were it not for the deposits of base metals that are to be found in the ground there by way of anomaly, the hon. Minister of Mines will understand this word anomaly, this does not occur in the earth's crust in very many places, were it not for the incidence of the great and magnificent ore body, very few people would live in the Sudbury basin because it is not hospitable to other arts employed by

mankind such as agriculture or forestry, and there might well be more caribou or moose in the area than there would be human beings. The people are there, in short, because they are employed in moiling in the ground for the base metal, to the great profits of the company that has suzerainty over the ore deposits.

I turn to the next logical step in my argument, and that is once again to advert with the hon. Minister to the question of regional government.

There has been developing in the Sudbury basin an interest in the concept of whether the basin and the adjoining municipalities is an apt site for the erection of some form of municipal government on a regional basis. I do not pretend to know the precise terms of the report of the municipal affairs committee which sat over a number of years, but I have heard enough in this House to indicate to me that the members of this committee advocated the development of larger units of municipal government than those presently existing.

I mentioned last night in the House that there appear to have been no studies undertaken by The Department of Municipal Affairs in the Sudbury area to determine whether regional government concepts would fit.

It is a very practical solution to me, because regional government would mean there would be no further reason for the exclusion anomalously, as up to this time, of the town of Copper Cliff from a system of regional government. Copper Cliff would naturally have to be included in it and, of course, that would mean that the regional government system would have the availability of the assessment of that smelter; I repeat, at the handsome sum of $47 million.

Now, $47 million—I am attracted to the notion to relate that with our present tax rate of 80 mills that the citizens of Sudbury pay $50 million of assessment, that seems to me to be a nice tidy $4 million of taxes in any one year of municipal taxation. Perhaps that is just about the right amount.

I want to make reference in the same vein to the work of a young man of the Sudbury basin. He is a former alderman of the city, Robert J. Keer, who spent a great deal of time and effort in composing a thesis which he entitled, "The case for economic survival, Sudbury." In essence, his thesis is that an assessment should be made of the installations of the mining companies at their fair value, that they be taxed for municipal purposes by the provincial government, and that assessment and the resulting taxation derived from it would be distributed among the several municipalities that make up the basin on a per capita basis.

On the surface that would appear to be a very fair and equitable way of approaching the matter. But no matter how you slice the pie, no matter from what vantage point you look at it, what Mr. Keer and other people in the basin are directing their attention and their efforts and their energies towards is nothing more or less than the bringing about of the reform of the existing formula whereby there is some form of direct taxation of the mining installation.

Try as he might, and I throw down the gauntlet to the hon. Minister, he is sold on his formula under the thirtieth regulation made under The Assessment Act. I think he had something to do with its birth, and perhaps the pride of parentage commits him to it so that he is unwilling to see any reform to it. It has variously been referred to as the McBain formula because Mr. McBain, a municipal official in northern Ontario, was also one of the parents of it.

Any person who looks at that formula made under The Assessment Act is defied, he is absolutely defied, without having two or three hours to put aside and a number of sharp pencils, to figure out just what it means. The formula from beginning to end is fictitious and arbitrary. It is replete with arbitrary assessments that appear to have no basis in reality. With a great deal of mathematical gymnastics performed every year, The Department of Municipal Affairs is able to work out down to the last cent how much the mining municipalities will get.

The whole point is that the formula is not related to anything. It stands in the abstract like a sky hook attached to nothing; not related to need, not related to a fair and adequate provision of municipal services.

I am not saying on behalf of the people of Sudbury that they expect to walk on streets paved with gold, or they expect to have municipal services of a quality not vouchsafed to other municipalities.

I am saying that the people of Sudbury expect at least equal treatment, and they are not getting that. They are not getting that from this Minister because this Minister does not allow himself to translate into real terms any sympathy he might have for them and their needs. So delegation after delegation—you need a cemetery three times as large as Mount Pleasant cemetery to bury them when they go to their heavenly reward, the numbers

that have comprised delegations that have come to see this hon. Minister about the problem. And I can tell you, having been there, they often get the sharp answer from him too. He is not always pleasant: he is often very sharp with them. That delights me to some extent, because often these delegations are composed of Tories. I like to see them fight among themselves to some extent.

We have a Liberal mayor now and it may be because of the difference in politics that the Minister will treat him with a little more consideration than he did the several Tory predecessors. However, that is venturing into a very speculative area.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Speculative is right, and it is personal, too!

Mr. Sopha: Of course! As I pointed out last night, the treatment Sudbury gets at the hands of this government in the way of payments made to mining municipalities under The Assessment Act is reflected in the lack of enthusiasm of people in northern Ontario for this government at the polls. That may be a two-way street, I do not know, I do not know to what extent. I have never really given that much thought to determine to what extent the lack of enthusiasm of the government is a reflection on the lack of success at the polls of the government, a government which has become accustomed to a large majority, an overwhelming majority.

No doubt the Treasury benches get some vicarious pleasure out of the fact that they sit surrounded on one side of the House, spilling over to the other side of the House, by large numbers of sometimes too enthusiastic supporters. That may give them a sense of power. I perhaps am going to write a thesis some time to determine how long it takes a government in office with a large majority to come to the conclusion that it rules with the divine right of kings. I think it used to take about 20 years for governments to come to that conclusion, but I think it is getting shorter now; about five or six.

Mr. Chairman: I would like the member to stick with vote 1305, please.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but all these things are related in part to the larger picture. Over the years I have put Sudbury's case before the House, there seems to be no relief in sight. Perhaps the solution is that Sudbury make another application to annex Copper Cliff; that was done, of course, in 1959, and it failed.

The government's attitude toward that was shown I think quite clearly after the municipal board—and that is quite a sordid story itself, what happened there, I will not go into that today—but after the municipal board made its decision that Copper Cliff was not going to comprise the greater city of Sudbury and all the plums were not going to come in. But, all the areas with problems, they were going to be given to Sudbury, those areas where sewage and water services had to be provided, those areas that had inadequate schools, those areas that had something less than reasonable fire protection, those areas that had virtually no police protection, all those areas with problems, would be given to the great mother city of Sudbury.

Something that might financially benefit the city of Sudbury, that is to say, the mining installations in the town of Copper Cliff, they would be kept out and kept out they were. Well, immediately the injustice of that order was seen and recognized and an appeal was made under The Municipal Board Act to the Cabinet. The Cabinet under the aegis of the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated its attitude to it because it was unwilling to intervene and make any further direction or order to the municipal board. By way of comparison, the Minister got himself into some trouble last year with the townships of Hanmer and Blezard and the municipal board became extant, an illustration of when the Cabinet well intervened, and they intervened to instruct the municipal board to hold another hearing about the amalgamation of those two townships.

Such aid and comfort and succor was not avaliable to the city of Sudbury so after six years of the amalgamation experiment, it is regarded as a failure. It created more problems than it solved. It imposed a more harsh and oppressive burden on the city of Sudbury than the citizens had been asked to bear before amalgamation. And all the while the magnificent mining installations of International Nickel Company remain outside the boundary and immune from municipal taxation. Now, is there any other industry in the province, can any hon. member, Mr. Chairman, show me any other industry of an industrial nature that does not pay its way municipally? Ford Motor Company does at Oakville. The large industrial plants within Metropolitan Toronto do. Those industries at Kitchener, Sarnia, Cornwall, all over the province, they have to pay their share of the municipal burden for the education of children of workers, provision of all the municipal services. What is the rationale? What is the logic, I ask rhetorically?

Perhaps somebody who is gifted with

greater insight than myself will be able to get up in the House and point out to me, maybe the Minister himself will be able to get up and point out to me just what the moral basis is, the philosophical basis, the hard reality, the rationale that International Nickel Company and Falconbridge Nickel Mines should be singled out selectively with favouritism, preferred, and all the other synonyms that go with it, that they alone are singled out in the whole province and they are told, "No, you do not have to pay your way, your share of the municipal burden, because we, the government, have decreed it to be that way." Well, I doubt if the hon. Minister will give us any expostulation on that score, he does not pay much attention to me, he does not need to be bothered.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I always pay attention to the hon. member and he knows it.

Mr. Sopha: He does not need to be bothered about it, he does not need to give any justification, he never does give any justification. Certainly he never gives any in the city of Sudbury that I ever heard. Not the Minister, I should not single the Minister out particularly, the same thing can be said about the whole of the Cabinet, at least that part of the Cabinet that journeyed to the city of Sudbury in October of last year. A magnificent brief was presented to them by very responsible citizens, indeed, one citizen is a very vigorous supporter of this government, and makes his support known through the columns of the newspaper that is disseminated in the community; and he was one of the chief heads of the committee which presented the brief. Well, they heard the brief, the Cabinet and the Prime Minister looked at them, looked him in the eye, no doubt he smiled—I was not there—he twinkled, and he said, "This will be considered."

Then there was dispute about what he added. That led to some hard feelings—what he added. There are some there who said that—and they were willing to take affidavits on it—that the Prime Minister said that "a Cabinet committee will be set up to study the contents of this brief and they will report to me."

There were some who were willing to take their oath on the King James or the Douai version that he said that. But the Prime Minister subsequently denied he said that. The Prime Minister said that what he said—and they did not have the facilities of tape-recording that they follow the Prime Minister of Canada around with—the Prime Minister said that "I will see that this brief is passed to individual members of the Cabinet for their comment."

Now, there are two different concepts, of course. The one testifies to more vigorous action and deeper consideration than the other. Well, when the time came that this had to be put squarely to him, he, being the Prime Minister of the province, what he says he said was what governed because after all, he is the final arbiter. And in the result, of course, whether it has been passed to individual members of the Cabinet or whether, in fact, they set up a Cabinet committee, nothing has been done. Nothing has been done and there is no aid in sight.

Well, all one can do is to keep trying, keep trying to draw attention to this injustice. Sudbury is a long way away, 250 miles over the horizon, four hours by car, eight or nine by railroad, an hour by plane if you can afford it—out of sight, out of mind. They only send a very few members to the House. In the whole of northern Ontario, after all, there are only 12 of us, six in the government, six in the Opposition. That is all there are. We are less than half the numbers of Metropolitan Toronto where, I believe, under the redistribution, they will send 27 or 30 members. So in political terms we do not count very much. Our ills and our complaints and our cries for justice, in the final analysis, they do not count very much. We are not near the seat of government. We are not as close to municipal government as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is close to the telephone call from the mayor of Toronto. All the mayor of Toronto has to do is pick up the phone and dial. The Metro mayor, the same with him, that is all he has to do, is dial—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The mayor of Sudbury does the same thing.

Mr. Sopha: —and say, can I speak to "Wilf"?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The mayor of Sudbury does exactly the same thing.

Mr. Sopha: Do not tell me he can get you on the government line because now that the liquor control board and the water resources commission and the workmen's compensation board, and 89 other tribunals are using it, you cannot get it. You cannot get it yourself.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not know what line the mayor of Sudbury uses, but he telephones me occasionally.

Mr. Sopha: It is your line we are talking about. The hon. Minister, captivated by the paeans of praise from the hon. member for Yorkview. He is going to build a statue to him.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You said not in Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: His destiny is fixed. He will be immortalized. They could put a statue up next to Sir John A Macdonald down there.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): They can lean on each other.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It would be nice to have that unveiled on the feast of St. Wilfrid, which is October 12, in case you are interested.

I am just giving you a date. If you want to establish and unveil a statue to me, I would appreciate it if you would do it on October 12. That happens to be the feast day of St. Wilfrid.

Mr. Sopha: If they want the ceremony to go in an orderly fashion, whenever they unveil the statue in Toronto to you, they had better not invite me as the keynote speaker.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Or the mayor either.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Would you be prepared to speak at it?

Mr. Sopha: Or the mayor? No, no.

Mr. Eagleson: Just the figures will be there, the morticians and the people.

Mr. Sopha: I have come to the end, Mr. Chairman. I say I have made my speech, and I do not follow the guidelines set down by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. The Provincial Treasurer suggested that we should ask questions, make inquiries of the Minister. I have not attempted, in using the time of this House this afternoon, to pose any questions. I do not particularly care if the hon. Minister responds to what I have said. I have made my point. I have placed before you the facts as I see them, and the way I placed them before you, in my view, are not open to dispute. They are not open to contradiction, the facts I have placed.

I am only interested in hearing from the hon. Minister, if he is prepared to get up and say in the not too distant future, in a reasonable period of time, that the Treasury of this government is going to do justice to the city of Sudbury. We are going to return to them from the mines profits tax a fair amount that we collect from these companies, or—and it is a very important conjunctive that I use—we are going to rearrange things so that the two giant corporations in the basin will be required to pay what is equitable and fair and just, on the basis of need, for the adequate provision of municipal services and education, to the work force and their dependants that those companies have created.

That, in essence, is the whole story. It is a cry for justice to them, and the responsibility and the final result rests upon those who hold the reins of power on that side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I have listened with great interest to the member—ever since the days that he come to this Legislature—speak on this very subject, and he does not expect an answer from me. Therefore, I shall not prevail upon his good grace to give him an answer, because I do not have an answer for him at the present time, except to say this.

Mining revenue payments as developed in 1952 have been of a great deal of value to the municipalities providing services to employees of mines in this province, and we must not only think of the city of Sudbury, which has just one small mine within its boundaries. There are many other areas of the province where municipalities are providing services to mines and employees, where the mining industry is located in moose pasture many, many miles away. And so, he, the hon. member, has dealt with only one facet of this question of the municipal taxation of the mining industry.

Last night, during the course of a similar discussion during these estimates, the hon. Prime Minister made a statement with reference to the studies which are under way dealing with this matter of municipal taxation and other related matters, and in due course of time there is no doubt the government will act in this connection.

I might, for the benefit of those members of the Legislature who are not as critical of me in dealing with this particular matter, give them some statistical information which may be of some value. In the city of Sudbury at the present time, 31 per cent of the assessment of the municipality for taxation in the year 1965 was composed of assessment on commercial and industrial properties. It is considered that commercial and industrial properties bear a far larger share of the cost of municipal government than does residential and farm property.

In addition to the direct taxes on the lands assessed within the boundaries of the city of Sudbury, 22.7 per cent of the revenue of this municipality was represented by the mining revenue payments paid by the province of Ontario to the city of Sudbury. There are many municipalities in this province where they have industrial, commercial and residential and farm assessment, where the proportions are not as high of industrial and commercial assessment as are these figures in the city of Sudbury.

That does not mean to say I accept that the city of Sudbury has a fair division of tax revenue. I am not saying that at all. I am bringing these figures to the attention of the House to bring out in the open the fact that there are two sides to every medal. With very great respect, the hon. member has dealt with that which concerns him primarily, and I do not blame him for that.

He went to great lengths to discuss this question of regional government, and some time ago I appointed a firm of consultants in Sudbury, of Sawchuck and Peach—who no doubt are well and favourably known, I hope, to the hon. member—to undertake a survey of the municipalities and surrounding areas that are primarily oriented to the nickel basin, with a view to defining physical development problems that exist and are apparent. This report may lead to some further assistance in preparing municipal development policies.

I might say further that the cost of this work is being paid for through our office, and the municipalities have not been required to assist in paying the cost of this survey.

I think that this, in a very limited way, answers some of the comments made by the member.

He also gave a very interesting report on the situation with respect to the assessment of smelters in the Sudbury area, and this is a matter of legislation. Legislation amending The Assessment Act is not before the House at the present time. If and when amendments are proposed to The Assessment Act that will be the time to discuss this matter at greater length.

I appreciate the involvement there is in this and the member has ably advised the House that the matter of the assessment of smelters and concentrators as well as mining property is not a problem that is easy of solution. However, it is a matter which is receiving the full consideration of the government and in due course of time we will be in a position to report on this subject.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to make an additional comment for the purposes of the record in case anybody reads this.

It is a very interesting thing that—that this government has its view of the meaning of The Assessment Act and whether these installations are assessable at all. But every time the dispute comes up this government goes to court and spends thousands and thousands of dollars in employing the best legal talent in the province to fight the thing in the court. They appear to have a great liking for the courts, when, at any session, I say to my friend the hon. member for Grey South, they can amend the statute to make it say in clear words what they thought it said. If ambiguity exists in the statute, the place to correct that ambiguity is here in his Legislature.

They would win support from all corners of the House if they put their proposal, but The Department of Municipal Affairs will not do that. What is it? A lack of courage? They will not come in with an amendment. No, but they will go to the courts. Oh, boy, show me the way to the supreme court of Canada—and they are gone. The best legal talent in the province, paying them fat and handsome fees to fight their thesis out in the courts with no satisfactory solution at all, so the hon. Minister does not lie in his mouth and to say "We have our views of the meaning of these sections of The Assessment Act and whether concentrators are assessable or whether smelters are assessable." They have their views and the place to express their views is in the four corners of a bill to be presented to the House which would tell us their views in clear and precise terms. We would support it. We would support the bill if they want to assess concentrators and if they want to assess the iron ore plant in Waters township. Now, what do they do?

The township of Waters takes Inco to court to assess their iron ore plant and this department in a sinister fashion behind the scenes hires a lawyer for them on the q.t. with the public money—"We will help you; we will get you a lawyer." So they go downtown and get an able one. "This lawyer will be at your assistance to promote your thesis to the court that the iron ore plant is assessable." Now, is that a way to do it? Is it not a more courageous and forthright way if they believe that the iron ore plant in Waters township is assessable to bring it into the Legislature and say so? Or does the latter method that they adopt indicate the great consciousness of the power and influence of International Nickel Company? I rather think

that it attracts that explanation. It is not the first time they have been in the courts with Inco, sneaking around over the years before the municipal board and the court of appeal about the meaning of The Assessment Act.

Well, maybe I will be in the Legislature when full crystallization is given to the views of the Minister that we have our ideas on whether these concentrators are assessable. Maybe some day I will sit here and see a bill introduced which expresses his views in clear terms that are not capable of misunderstanding.

This is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman, for this year.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if consideration has been given in the extension of the time on winter works projects in communities where work stoppage has been as the result of some builders' strike and so on, and this has prevented the community from being able to work the full length of time on the project. My own community was struck quite badly with that last year when we had the—I think it was a 90-day—work stoppage and it came right at the time of the year when all of the winter works projects could have been undertaken.

It affected the board of education in two projects and it affected the municipality in several other projects. Would the hon. Minister kindly answer that, please?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The winter works programme was started for a definite purpose and that was to assist unemployment during the severe winter months we are blessed with—or otherwise—in this country. Where work stoppages occur as a result of factors that are beyond the control of the municipality, we have had to follow the federal government regulations. The federal government, as you know, pays a much larger share of the cost of the labour content of works conducted under this programme than does the province; as a matter of fact it pays twice as much, and it is the body which sets the rules and the regulations and we follow them.

There have been a number of instances where we have been asked to request an extension of the time because more severe winters had been experienced. However, in some areas of similar concern the federal people have accepted our recommendations and the time has been extended. We are strictly following the federal government regulations and that is about the situation with respect to the hon. member's problems.

Mr. Newman: Does the hon. Minister make suggestions to the federal people or does he ask the federal people to extend the time? Would he not consider asking them to extend the time limit for such a reason as this?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I think that the hon. member has to realize that the federal government is concerned nationally with perhaps something like 4,000 or 5,000 municipalities and if it happens that in one municipality such as the fine city that he is so proud of, there is a work stoppage following some disagreement, I doubt very much that the federal government would give too much attention to that. I would be very concerned with the problem which the hon. member has, but I think we have to realize that it has to legislate on a national basis and I would not go to the federal government and ask for that particular kind of an extension for a particular municipality. I do not think that the hon. member would expect me to do that.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister simply not ask the federal authorities to have an extension of time for all municipalities under certain conditions?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Then we are getting into a full year works programme, not a winter works programme which is designed definitely to assist certain unemployment problems in the country during the winter time.

Mr. Newman: That is true, but the municipality in the meantime, has budgeted for X number of dollars and because of this work stoppage may find itself with a deficit budget, whereas an extension of the time would have solved the problem very easily.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not see why the municipality would find itself in a deficit position. They have not spent the money. They have not had the work done so they have not spent the money. All they have done is to retard the work and they will probably hold it until the following winter. There is no problem there.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, they would not hold it until the following winter. The project has to go on.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Not necessarily.

Mr. Newman: They were going to receive X amount of dollars of assistance from both

the federal and provincial authorities, and because of this work stoppage this assistance is no longer coming in. So the project costs that much more to the municipality. So an extension in there is definitely merited in circumstances such as we were confronted with last year.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I want to ask the hon. Minister what is the difference now in the unconditional grants between the largest municipality per capita and the smallest in the province?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It varies from $2 to $5.50 per capita.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, in the past – eight or nine years ago – I remember, we had quite strong discussions about this matter in this Legislature. At that time it was pointed out by the then hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and by the Prime Minister, the reason that the great city of Toronto was getting $5.50 per capita as compared to $2.00 in many of the smaller municipalities, was the fact that the welfare costs of the cities was much higher than it is in rural municipalities. At that time the welfare was being paid for 50 per cent by the municipality and 50 per cent by the province. Now we find the province is paying 80 per cent of the costs of welfare, and the municipality only has to pay 20 per cent.

Taking this into consideration, and personally I would never want it felt that just because an individual lives in the city of Toronto he is worth over twice as much as far as grants are concerned than somebody living in rural Ontario or in a smaller city or town, but accepting the fact that there was some condition of welfare in connection with these unconditional grants, what about the situation now where 80 per cent is paid by the province? Does the hon. Minister not feel that those people who live in the hinterland and in the smaller towns and villages and municipalities of Ontario should not get an equal amount per capita as they do in the city of Toronto? I assure the hon. Minister the municipalities I am talking about definitely need the money just as much as they do in this huge area.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, Mr. Chairman, The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act was passed with the express purpose of assisting towards the cost of the administration of justice and the provision of welfare and social services including indigent and unemployment relief, hospitalization, institutional care costs and other services for inhabitants. Studies have proven that these services do cost more in the metropolitan areas than they do in the county or township areas of the province. For instance, there is no similarity in the cost of rent in the city of Toronto as against the cost of rent of perhaps similar accommodation in the townships of Huron county. At the time that the government's contribution towards the cost of welfare was increased as you mention, it might have been the time to reduce these unconditional grants. However, I am sure that we all realize it is very difficult for a government to remove grants, reduce grants–

Mr. Whicher: Bring them up, that is the point. Bring us up to Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: –and so it has brought everybody up in the same proportion by the fact that a greater portion of the cost of unemployment relief is dealt with at the provincial level than was formerly. The unconditional grants have remained the same. This, of course, is also an area that is mixed up in this study of taxation generally. Until such time as the government is in a position to assess the results of its investigation, I am sorry but this will have to stay as it is. That is another one of the areas involved in this.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the hon. Minister has said and I know that there are great studies about taxation now, but after the Minister has received the report I hope he will more than emphasize to his Cabinet colleagues that we in other parts of Ontario besides this great city of Toronto need assistance, too. In hundreds of municipalities we cannot afford even a town hall let alone a $27 million one. These are facts; this is a wonderful city, this is a wealthy city, and within reason the rest of the municipalities are poor. Therefore, Mr. Minister, I hope that when the time comes and you are studying this report on taxation and you look at such taxes as unconditional grants, you will realize the little boys and girls running around in rural Ontario need that $5 just as much as they do walking down Yonge street.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the Minister a local problem. It relates to the court of revision. In Bruce county last year, I understand that considerable hardship was borne by the county in relation to the activities of the court of revision, in that the Act provides for three appointees. I believe the court of revision is comprised of three people.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: May I make a suggestion to the hon. member? Would you mind very much waiting until The Assessment Act amendments come before the House; that would be the place to debate that? There is no vote here for court of revision.

Mr. Gaunt: I appreciate the point. I was just thinking I would get it under the item 2, The Assessment Act which deals with—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: These are subsidies, grants and payments to municipalities under the authority of The Assessment Act and there are no payments made to a court of revision by this vote.

Mr. Gaunt: As far as I am concerned it does not really matter. I just want a form in which to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: When the amendments to The Assessment Act are before the House, that will be the form.

Vote 1305 agreed to.

On vote 1306:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Vote 1306, Mr. Chairman, "the Ontario municipal board." In years past at both the municipal level and here, I have had rather severe criticism about the activities of the Ontario municipal board. But today I want to come to their defense and to bring before this House a situation, a comedy of errors I might call it, wherein this Minister and this government have seriously embarrassed the board and brought about a rather ludicrous situation in the province. I would like to have the hon. Minister's comments on it.

This is in connection with the order which was issued on April 27, 1964, the annexation order of the municipal board of part of the township of Sunnydale to the village of Wasaga Beach. Following certain disagreements among the people in these two areas, a letter was filed with the clerk of the executive council, and it reads:

> Under section 14, subsection 17B, The Ontario Municipal Act, an objection to the above order is hereby made. In support of this objection a petition of 304 names are attached, all signatures properly signed and witnessed. Affidavits before a commissioner of witnesses are enclosed. A certificate of the clerk of the township of Sunnydale certifying that these residents signing the objection are residents and qualified to vote on money bylaws is also attached, signed on behalf of the petitioner, R. Pogue.

Now, the date of this was May 19. It followed the order.

During the following days there is a period of correspondence; a letter from Mr. Young, the clerk of the executive council, acknowledging the receipt of the letter and petition. This letter says they have been forwarded to the proper officials for their consideration, and then a letter from Mr. Yates of The Department of Municipal Affairs which says that "the notice of objection appears to have been filed within the statutory time limits, and you will be further advised when the Lieutenant-Governor in council has made an order in respect to this matter."

The order came. There was a great deal of delay over this whole matter, I need not go into it, but finally the order was made by the Lieutenant-Governor in council on December 16, 1965.

This, of course, was almost a year after the order to amalgamate or to annex should have gone into effect. The annexation should have occurred on the 1st day of January, 1965. Now, we come to December 16, 1965, and the order from the Cabinet. They say that:

> Whereas it appears the board exercised its judgment properly after a public hearing and after hearing representations both for and against the application, and whereas it appears the board has not acted improperly in any way and whereas the decision of the board provided that the effective date of the annexation was January 1, 1965, which is not now possible, it is therefore desirable to vary the decision by changing the effective date to January 1, 1966.

So that order was handed down with the variants noted. When I raised this matter in the House and asked the Minister certain questions about it, he said that this order had to be given so as to change the situation—I guess the word was "So that the Lieutenant-Governor in council would not be ordering the impossible." In other words, you could not have implemented retroactively this order of the board.

But my feeling was at that time, and it still is, that what the Cabinet should have done at that point was not order this new date which was now just a few days ahead of the actual date of the order, but that it should have, as the Act provides, referred the whole matter back to the Ontario municipal board so it could have tidied up this package.

The problem was that not yet had the proper documents come and perhaps this was

the fault of the local people, that the proper documents had not yet been filed with the board. The year had already passed beyond which the order had been made.

The whole discussion revolving around the protest had taken time and it seemed that the proper order at this moment would have been to say that the Ontario municipal board should take another look at this, that they could then tie the matter together, that they could set a new date, and that they could make provision for an election to be held after the proper documents had been filed and certain details cleared away.

But instead of that, the Minister rushed in to order that the amalgamation take place or the annexation take place just about two weeks after the actual date of the order. That brought us to January 1, 1965—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: 1966.

Mr. Young: —1966, I am sorry, when the order was to go into effect. But at that time the problem was that there were certain documents which had not yet been filed. The chairman of the Ontario municipal board wrote to Mr. Weir, barrister and solicitor for the municipalities involved, asking how soon the board may expect a draft order and a proper description of this new area.

This finally came after some problems and the Minister during this period had certain troubles with the local people, Mr. Pogue and his group in particular. He wrote them on January 3 after their protest, saying: "You clearly are of the impression that the residents and property owners of Oakview Beach will be without representation for almost two years. This, of course, is not the case, as all such matters as these are settled not in the decision of the board or by the Lieutenant-Governor in council but by formal order of the board which follows the decision." But unfortunately the board was delayed and it was not until February 22 that the board order was handed down, tidying up the situation and providing for an election on April 30.

But, Mr. Chairman, the problem was that this election was, according to the local people—and it would seem according to the Act—an illegal election. The board could hardly say the Lieutenant-Governor in council had made a mistake and had rushed in to make an order contrary to the Act and certainly contrary to what seemed to be common sense, before these details had been tidied up and before provision was made for representation. And now two months have passed when the people of that particular area could not be represented on the council of Wasaga Beach.

I have a letter written to the hon. Minister signed again by R. Russell Pogue, dated February 23 and excerpts from this letter will put the case pretty clearly:

> The order of the OMB of February 22 for an election to be held not later than April 30, 1966, to elect four additional councillors from the annexed area, namely, Oakview Beach, is simply a farce and a travesty upon democracy. In our opinion it is not only illegal but wanting in the following respects:
>
> 1. The said order of the OMB of February 22 makes no provision for the voters of Oakview Beach to have any part in electing the reeve of the enlarged area of the village of Wasaga Beach—

He had already been elected.

> —who as proposed will sit until December 31, 1967, and who also sits as chairman of the advisory board on Wasaga Beach of The Department of Lands and Forests and who can thus control to a considerable extent the development of this area for good or ill.
>
> 2. The said order makes no provision for the electing of a deputy reeve, to which we are entitled according to the Act.
>
> 3. No recognition is given of the fact that the voters of the enlarged area will be deprived of the four votes to which they are entitled in county council as a result of having no deputy reeve. The reeve will have a single vote.
>
> 4. The said order ignored the fact that the annexed area, namely Oakview Beach, has approximately 3,000 voters to 1,100 in the village of Wasaga Beach and failed to provide means by which equitable representation according to population can be guaranteed.
>
> 5. The said order providing for four additional members of council is contrary to the Act. Chapter 249, section 31, subsection 1: "In a county, the council of a village and the council of a township shall consist of a reeve, a deputy reeve, where so entitled, and a sufficient number of councillors to make up five in all and they shall all be elected by general vote." It is our opinion that chapter 249, 14, 10(g) in no way gives the OMB authority to set the number of councillors for Wasaga Beach as nine in contravention of chapter 249, section 31, subsection 1, as quoted above.

Furthermore, even had the OMB such authority, a council of nine for the village

of Wasaga Beach would be unwieldy, cumbersome, unnecessary and place an utterly unreasonable expense upon the taxpayer.

We therefore request that you as the responsible Minister inform the executive council and inform the Ontario municipal board that we request an immediate election to conform with The Municipal Act, chapter 249, section 31, subsection 1, as quoted above.

In spite of these objections, the election plans went forward with the extra people to be elected by the annexed area without, of course, a chance to vote for the reeve and deputy reeve already elected, and so a great deal of protest resulted. Until finally, as reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* of April 29, the day before the election was to take place:

The Ontario municipal board yesterday cancelled the election scheduled Saturday for the newly annexed part of Wasaga Beach and ordered a full municipal election to be held June 25 instead. Nominations will be held on June 17.

This election, I gather, will be an election for a full council and will be on a basis of The Municipal Act.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this before the House, and the Minister may have some logical explanations of what has happened. It seems to me that in this action the Lieutenant-Governor in council last December did put the municipal board in a very awkward position, that the board then tried to recoup the situation, doing the best it could under the circumstances, but finally had to order the election postponed and a valid election to be called later in the year.

It just seems that this, as I called it, is a comedy of errors, the kind of thing which should never have occurred. But the other thing about it that I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, is that if there had not been a group of real fighters in the Oakview area of the annexed section, then the government may well have gotten away with the kind of action which it undertook. So I pay tribute to the tenacity of, and to the ingenuity of, the people who organized here, who fought the battle through, brought it to the place where they won against the Cabinet and the Ontario municipal board and have now evidently gotten through to them that the law should be followed, and that proper elections should be held in this instance.

Perhaps the hon. Minister has some explanation, if so we would like very much to hear what he has to say on this whole issue.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to arrive here, in this Legislature, with all of my files, and it is very difficult for me to remember, not being a lawyer, all of the details of this particular case, when I have no documentation with me at all. You have the great advantage, because you have copies of all the correspondence and, therefore, I would beg your indulgence.

But, I would say this, that the delay between the annexation order of April, 1964, and the appeal of 1964, and then the order of 1965, was not the fault of the Ontario municipal board, nor of the Lieutenant-Governor in council. I think we should make that very clear, that there was an appeal entered before the Ontario court of appeal, which in due course of time was dealt with, and until such time as that case was dealt with, we were in no position in the government to deal with the matter of the order and the appeal instituted by some of the local residents.

Insofar as designating the date of January 1, 1966, as against confirming the date that had been in the Ontario municipal board order, that was an impossibility and I have already explained that to the House, that it would not have been fair, it would not have been possible to retroactively set a date for the incorporation of a municipality—

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if I could interrupt here. Nobody ever suggested that you should order the impossible. The suggestion was that the Act said you should now refer it back to the municipal board, then it could have been tied up into a neat package at that point.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: That is one of the methods that could have been used, to refer it back to the municipal board. That was not done. The order was confirmed as of January 1, 1966. It was some time after then that the solicitors involved on both sides of this thing, and appellants, and your friend, Mr. Pogue, and a few more of them, who were all sitting back waiting on one another to make the next step, were finally forced by the municipal board to provide the necessary documentations so that the board could deal with this question of the incorporation of the municipality, its election and the size of the council and matters of that kind.

I have no way to argue at the moment with the statements made by your correspondent, Mr. Pogue that the board exceeded its authority. I think you would find that his legal knowledge in that respect is perhaps as limited as mine, but my lawyers tell me

that the board has certain broad powers that are not necessarily only those contained in The Municipal Act.

When this documentation was received—it was after that, as I remember the documentation in my office, that the board found there had been a very slight error in some legal manner that reopened the whole case again, with respect to the election, and that is why the election was postponed then until this month.

I would hope that for the benefit of the citizens of Oakview Beach, Sunnydale, Wasaga Beach, and all that, they would get to an end where they would quit fighting and proceed to operate the municipality for the benefit of the citizens.

I think, without having my file here and not having seen it for quite some time, that is about the only explanation I can give you at the present time. You have the advantage over me in that you have a complete file.

Mr. Young: I gather then that the postponed election was not because of the board becoming convinced they were perhaps actign outside The Municipal Act, but that there was some legal technicality here which caused the postponement. That may clear up that problem, but my whole point was in the argument that if the Lieutenant-Governor in council had referred the matter back in the first instance, last December, and waited until these details were cleared up and the proper descriptions were in, then the board could have issued its order and tidied the whole matter up and done a clean job of the thing in one bit.

It just seemed to me that the board was put in an untenable position by the Lieutenant-Governor in council, in their haste to issue this order and to leave the people of the annexed area without representation for what turned out to be some months ahead.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: But remember there had been a delay of many months and we were being pressed by the citizens who are in support of this amalgamation and this annexation, to have the job done, and someone had to reach a decision.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1306 carried?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, Mr. Chairman. Insofar as the general functioning of the board is concerned, has the hon. Minister given any further consideration to separating the functions that we have talked about over the years, the functions of assessment appeals, the function of determining values in expropriation proceedings, and that sort of thing? Because the contention has long been made, and I think with very substantial validity, that you need a very technically trained group of people to build up a series of precedents and a body of law in connection with these sort of matters, and that the board is overworked and has not the necessary background to deal with these things perhaps as well as they might be, and that you could well separate these functions, or government could well separate these functions, from the other functions of the board.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, that was a matter that was discussed, not at great length, but it was mentioned last evening.

The board membership at the present time is greater than it has ever been and there will be other persons appointed to the board within the next 12 months, bringing it up to probably a membership of 13, 14 or 15.

I have given consideration to the matter that you have mentioned of splitting the responsibilities of the board between one set of functions, the assessment functions, and all the others. Until such time as we have given closer attention and greater study to this, I am not in a position to state definitely what would be our opinion.

It would appear to me that it would be better to continue to enlarge the board in accordance with its responsibilities, and I might say I am not hearing complaints now about delays in hearings as I used to receive two or three years ago, because we have appointed several new members to the board.

I would think that until that time it would be preferable to have the board continue to deal with its responsibilities as they now exist, bearing in mind that it might be very difficult to obtain the services of people who would be restricted in their activities, on a board of this kind, where the work can become very onerous, as to one type of hearing.

In the judiciary, I do not suppose that a judge listens only to murder cases; they try to mix them up, because one would get pretty tired of listening just to one type of case the year round. And until that time, until we are able to see that there is a need for a board of this kind, dealing only with assessments, on a 12 months basis, I am afraid we will have to restrict ourselves to the board as it is now constituted.

But it is an interesting subject; the matter you have mentioned is an interesting subject, and I want to assure you that it had been given some consideration.

Mr. Singer: We will be having a debate when The Expropriation Procedures Act is given second reading, and reference undoubtedly will be made at that time to the report of the select committee on expropriations. One of their recommendations was, as you know, that there be a special tribunal set up to determine values.

As you know as well, Mr. Minister, one of the functions of the board is to sit in appeal on expropriations. If the person whose land has been taken is not satisfied with the decision of the county court judge, he can go on to appeal to the Ontario municipal board. It would seem to me that in that function they carry out they are making a pretty authoritative type of decision insofar as values are concerned, and this has bothered a lot of people, as to the method by which these values are arrived at.

Similarly in assessments, and as I listened to the hon. Minister last night, he is endeavouring, and I compliment him for this, he is moving substantially toward bringing about, and it is a laborious process, a uniform system of assessment in the province of Ontario based on—and even though he hesitates to say it at the moment—based on a manual that is eventually going to be made the bible for all assessors in the province of Ontario.

It would seem to me that hand in hand with these two principal functions, to be fair to the people of Ontario we have to have a trained body of adjudicators who know land values and who will apply the same criteria in Sudbury as they do in Metropolitan Toronto—if the two can ever come close together. The hon. member for Sudbury is not here at the moment—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There is some doubt about that!

Mr. Singer: I think the same fairness should apply even to the people from Sudbury as it does apply to the people from Metropolitan Toronto.

The other point along the same line—the hon. Minister says that he has added to the strength of the board, and that I know. I wonder if he could tell us the appointments that have been made, say, in the last 12 months and the qualifications of the gentlemen who were appointed?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not know if I can tell the member that, but I will give him the qualifications of one gentleman who comes to mind now—W. T. Schrive. This man is a bachelor of commerce, a graduate of one of the universities. I am not sure which one —I think it is probably Western. He had a very extensive, lengthy career in administration prior to his service in the Canadian armed forces and then from that time on was in management of a business enterprise in the field of finance.

He came on the board last year about the first of June or July. Mr. McGuire is another new member on the board. He is a solicitor from eastern Ontario and practised in Cornwall. He is a man of about 35 or 38 years of age with a good record of municipal legal experience, as far as I could find. I was advised by the chairman some time ago in a conversation that he was very pleased with the work these two gentlemen, who are the newer members on the board, were performing. We can only go by the chairman's recommendations in that respect.

Mr. Singer: Are there any particular criteria that the hon. Minister uses in making these appointments? Does he look for people who are legally trained, people who have served, say, on a municipal council or on some political aspect?

It would strike me that merely taking a man who has had experience in business, by itself, would be putting a gentleman like that perhaps in a difficult position to begin to wrestle on the field and adjudicate on the field on which he has had no practical experience.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I have added several members of the legal profession to the board since I became the Minister responsible. I agree with you that a goodly proportion of the members of the municipal board should be lawyers with considerable legal experience in litigation, and so on.

There are also members of the board who are professional engineers. Others have no particular professional standing but are people of experience in municipal administration. Others are—for instance, Mr. Blake who has been a member for some two-and-a-half or three years, is a chartered accountant or a bachelor of commerce graduate—I am not sure, but one is comparable to the other. Oh yes, he has his bachelor of arts and bachelor of commerce and chartered accountancy. He had no experience in adjudication or litigation work, admittedly, but because of broad experience in the field of business and municipal administration, I think he has made a very valuable addition to the board.

I think I have recommended the appointment of about four or five members to the board in the last three years.

Mr. Singer: What salaries are the board members being paid, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, the salary of the board members is $15,000 a year. The vice chairmen of the board—and there are three vice chairmen—their salary is slightly higher than that, and the chairman's salary is higher still. Does the hon. member insist on knowing?

Mr. Singer: Not specifically, but the hon. Minister did mention in passing that he tried to interest several lawyers in taking appointments and I gather that he has not had as much success as he would have liked to have had in that field, and the reason, I think, would be obvious. He is not able to offer them enough money; and this is not uncommon to this hon. Minister, it runs all through government. You are not going to get competent professional men to take civil service jobs unless you are prepared to pay them and it applies just as much to the municipal board as it does to the securities commission and to a dozen others, and I think the Minister and his colleague, the hon. Attorney General should hasten their attack on Treasury board and on the hon. Provincial Treasurer to do something about it.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: We charge each morning; we load the blunderbuss each morning. The hon. member might be interested in knowing that when I became Minister of Municipal Affairs the members of the Ontario muncipal board were paid a salary of $10,000 a year and at that time there were people who were looking for those positions—

Mr. Singer: They are not beating the door down today.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The market is different and I understand that members of the legal fraternity are not going to leave their offices now for the usual fee of $25; it should be about $150. I think the hon. member will agree with that. I have had some personal experience recently and I was rather surprised—and I say that with very great respect to my colleague, the House leader, the hon. Minister of Labour, that the lawyers have increased their fees.

Mr. Whicher: You mean that they overcharge?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I do not know if they overcharge; that is a matter of opinion, but the fees have been raised. Now, I do not know whether it is because they think I look wealthy or not—I cannot say.

Mr. Whicher: They know that you are a member of the Cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: They probably just found out. I think we have to bear in mind also that all of these persons drawing these salaries are eligible to receive the fringe benefits that are available to members of the civil service and these, I am told by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, amount to a cost of something like 32 per cent or 34 per cent of the payroll.

Mr. Singer: I cannot resist remarking, Mr. Chairman, that through it all, the hon. Provincial Treasurer is not only unbowed; he is not even bloody!

Votes 1306 and 1307 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

LEGAL AID

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 130, An Act respecting legal aid.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is the intention of the Attorney General to make a statement at the beginning of this debate or whether he wants to wait until the debate gets under way. If he wants to make a statement now, I would be glad to let him go ahead first.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I made a fairly comprehensive statement in introducing the bill and I think having done that I would prefer to hear the comments and discussions regarding this bill and then I shall make a statement at the end.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, this Bill 130 is a very important and outstanding bill in the legislative history of the province of

Ontario. I think there are few members in this House who will say that it is not an advance step over anything we have known before, and probably will result in the province of Ontario having a system of legal aid as good as anything that exists in the western world. For that, I think this government deserves some credit.

In bringing in this bill I think there are certain remarks that have to be noted along with it. I am sorry my good friend, the hon. Minister of Health, is not here but I think he would appreciate the contrast of the approach that the lawyers are taking to this kind of bill as compared with that which the doctors are taking to certain bills in which he has been interested. And I would imagine that lawyers could have made the same sort of objection that we heard from the Ontario medical association and various members of the medical profession, but there has not been a word or even a whisper of criticism along these lines. In fact, this approach is welcomed by the legal profession. We just want to make sure that it will work and that it will work well and it will do the job it is designed to do.

In setting up a system of legal aid along the lines suggested in this Act, I think there are several points that must be made in an effort to make the bill work better.

The first point that comes to my attention is the continuation of the idea of a panel. The voluntary system of free legal aid, which has existed heretofore in certain centres and is not applicable throughout the whole of the province, did work on a so-called panel system and to my mind it has not worked well.

One of the obvious answers to its not working well is the introduction of this bill. The panels which were set up for some reason or other have tended to attract a very small minority of the profession and seem to have concentrated this most important type of service in the hands of a very few people. I think this type of service should have been the responsibility of the whole profession. Be that as it may, the old system is on its way out so there is no point in beating that to death. It is dying now and the funeral will take place when this bill is given third reading.

But it would seem to me that the panel of lawyers available to make this system work should be all of the lawyers in the province of Ontario. I would think that you will find very little objection from the legal profession as a whole, from the whole 6,000 members of the legal profession here in the province of Ontario, if all of their names were put on the panel.

It may well be that certain specialists, certain gentlemen who deal with complicated problems of taxation law or certain gentlemen who deal with the intricacies of the law against perpetuities, or those gentlemen who deal with some of the fine language we have been discussing in the legal bills committee for many weeks in The Securities Act, perhaps would not be of value on a panel of this type because of their particular specialty.

It would seem to me that the Act should start off by putting everyone on the panel and then those who want to opt out can remove themselves voluntarily. And I would think you would start off with a big body, and very few lawyers would be anxious to remove themselves.

The whole scheme of the Act maintains, as it should maintain, the right of a client—and I think people who are going to get legal aid will have to be regarded as clients—to choose their lawyer, and the right of the lawyer to choose his client. That freedom and privilege has to be maintained.

The people who become the clients, by virtue of this legal aid Act, should be able, if they want, to choose any lawyer in the province of Ontario to act for them, and if that lawyer is prepared to act for them, then that is fine. If he is not, then they can try another one.

Or, if they have no idea who might act for them, then the local directors of the local committees can perhaps say, in our community there are 6 or 8 or 10 or 12 who provide this kind of service, who specialize in this type of law, are very good in magistrate's court or in division court or what-have-you, and then can be directed. But it would seem to me that we would save a lot of trouble and avoid a lot of potential criticism if we started first of all with the panel consisting of all of the practising lawyers in Ontario. I can see no logical objection to that at all and I think it would establish very firmly in the public's hands the bona fides of this scheme.

The second point that I think is worthy of comment is this one: I notice in the Act there is reserved a discretion as to whether or not legal aid will be given to a person with a criminal record. Now this concerns me very much. I recognize some of the thinking that perhaps lies behind this and that is, here we have "X" who is a reprobate and he has a criminal record a mile long and now he is in trouble again. Why should we be wasting public money, because it may well be public

money, why should we be wasting public money to defend him because he is in trouble again?

Unfortunately, even lawyers, some lawyers, think this way. But the fact of the case is that very probably the man who is in trouble again has more need of legal advice and legal aid in the courts before which he is due to appear than perhaps the man who has no criminal record at all.

In other words, I think you are writing into the Act an innate prejudice. I am sure the Attorney General can recall with me the recent conviction of two brothers here in the city of Toronto. Those gentlemen had a criminal record. They came before the courts, they were tried for an offence, they were convicted, and they were sent to jail. The particular police officer, his name has slipped my mind at the moment, but the particular police officer who had been in charge of the case was not satisfied that they had produced the right persons before the court who were guilty of that offence.

He carried on his investigations and later he turned up more evidence. As a result of the new evidence being brought before the court, the two gentlemen who had been convicted were released and sent on their way and the persons against whom the new evidence had been found were tried and they in due course were convicted.

Had the police worked on the assumption in that case that merely because people have a criminal record, had they stopped working at that point, then there would have been two gentlemen lodged in jail. And their sentences were quite heavy ones; I think something like ten years—lodged in jail for a very considerable period of time because they did not have an ability to properly defend themselves.

I am sure the Attorney General will remember another case; I think it was the Morland case. This is a case that is some years old in which a gentleman named Morland, I think, was tried and convicted. After many years of investigation it was found that merely because he was a suspicious character and there was a whole bunch of circumstantial evidence, he was the logical person to arrest and charge and bring before the court. But, in fact, he had been wrongly convicted.

These things do happen, and there is no gainsaying that they do not. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, as strongly as I can that if there is allowed to be a statutory discrimination against a man merely because he has a police record, one of the main objectives of a legal aid scheme in the province of Ontario could well be defeated. The man who has a criminal record, and who again finds himself before the courts, could be the man who needs legal aid and good legal aid the most, and I would hope that the Attorney General would remove that discretion.

The third point I want to make is the question of the use of law students in connection with this scheme.

The Act allows the use of lawyers as well as students, and law students certainly are important in the legal frame of affairs. But I would think that the use of law students should be very strictly limited so that their real use under the scheme would be as assistants to the lawyers. If we are going to allow students to become the defendants in magistrates' courts, division courts, and this sort of thing, then I think we are providing second-rate legal aid.

I think if this scheme is going to work at all we have to satisfy ourselves that we are providing good legal aid, and I think it should be as good as can be provided, and it should be provided by lawyers and not by students. The argument is going to be made that perhaps in minor cases, division court matters, magistrate matters, that are summarily tryable and that sort of thing, that perhaps students can handle it very well, but does anyone know when a case comes before a magistrate on a matter that can be handled by summary conviction that it is going to be dealt with in that way? Does the Crown tell in advance how he is going to proceed? No, he does not, and I think that the person who finds himself in a difficult position before the criminal courts of Ontario should be entitled to the advice of a trained lawyer. Even in the wildest imaginations of the hon. Minister of Health, no one was suggesting that first year medical students be allowed to give medical advice or medical treatment to the very limited categories of people who are going to be covered by OMSIP or its predecessor, or the Act before that. In other words, if you are going to provide legal aid, provide it with lawyers and not with law students.

Then, sir, I am concerned about the role of The Department of Public Welfare. And I am concerned for a reason that perhaps I am not going to be able to express as well as I might; but I am concerned about what I believe is sort of a welfare concept. Certain considerations are given by The Department of Public Welfare and by the municipal welfare administrators and they do a very good job in their various fields, to the problems of

Mrs. X who suddenly needs a food voucher or else there is not going to be enough food in the house. And this is the sort of thinking that directs itself to abject poverty.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that a person who needs legal aid is a person who owns his house, is a person who perhaps has an automobile, is a person who perhaps has a reasonable job, but who still needs legal assistance to enable him to prosecute a civil claim in the courts or to defend a civil claim in the courts, or to properly defend himself in a criminal court. It may be he is a sort of person who will need what might cost him $5,000, and even though he has a home, a car, a big mortgage, he has all the expenses that come with running a family, and it is my feeling, very strong feeling, Mr. Speaker, that if you introduce into the whole functioning of this legal aid system the welfare concept, the concept that a person must be almost without funds, almost in abject poverty before they are going to receive legal aid, then I think that you are setting up a road block that could well defeat the whole purpose of this Act.

I know the Attorney General is going to tell me that the opinion of the welfare officer is only an advisory one, that it seems logical that people trained in the welfare field, people trained in matters concerning The Department of Public Welfare, can best investigate this sort of thing. I know the Attorney General is going to tell me there are going to be different criteria which are going to apply and there are not going to be the same tests applied as to whether or not a food voucher should be given over the week.

But I suggest, sir, that if you take out of The Department of Public Welfare, either the proviincial department or the various municipal departments, people who by their training, by their job and by their sense of responsibility, have had the duty over many years to guard public money just as closely as they can to make sure that not a penny is wasted, or in fear those horrible municipal politicans are going to descend on their heads, then I say you are introducing a very wrong concept into the whole scheme of legal aid.

I say that we should have certainly a system of means testing, and I do not think it should all be free or should all be a gift, and I think where people are able to pay there should be a system of assessing this, there should be methods of recognizing it. The gentleman I was describing, with a home and a mortgage and a family and a car, needs immediately $4,000 or $5,000 worth of legal aid and he should be entitled to it without forcing him to sell his car or his home or that sort of thing; there should be a means of assessing this, but I think there should be within the legal aid scheme a new type of person set up to make this kind of investigation, to make it under the criteria that are established by the law society which is going to run the legal aid scheme, so that it will be completely separated from the welfare concept as we recognize it. Welfare is important, but I do not think the welfare concept belongs in this important new procedure that we are embarking upon. I think that people should be entitled to be assessed in light of a different set of circumstances as to whether or not they are entitled to legal aid, and a serious mistake would be made by introducing the welfare concept into the legal aid scheme.

I have been a little confused, Mr. Speaker, as to the schedule of payments. I remember when the bill was given first reading and I did remark and I think in conversation with the Attorney General or in a common conversation we were both having with members of the press, that in my opinion there should be established a tariff of fees or schedule of fees, which would relate to an hourly wage for work done, so much for an appearance in magistrates' court, so much for an appearance in county court, so much for division court, court of appeal, and that sort of thing.

I had at one time thought that the Attorney General was in substantial agreement with me. As I subsequently read some of the news reports of what he is alleged to have said, it seems to me that he was differentiating between various members of the profession, apparently on the basis of ability. Now, I do not know whether we are talking about the same thing or whether the reporters have confused us, but it would seem logical to me, sir, that there should be set out in the regulation, just as quickly as possible, a tariff of fees, and that the tariff of fees could be reasonably adjusted as the law society can determine, which would provide so much an hour for consultation and so much a day for work in magistrate's court and so much for preparation for an appeal to the court of appeal and that sort of thing.

I think those fees should be set down, and should be clearly set down, so there can be no doubt about what they are. And I think it should be implicit that once the

tariff of fees is established in the regulations that they apply to all lawyers who are called upon to serve, and those are all the fees that are payable, because there has been the suggestion that under the present system even though it is called free, it has not been as free as it might have been. It should perhaps be made clear that anyone derogating or attempting to, could get themselves into serious trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I have certain other comments here that I do want to make. Some of them perhaps will be more pertinent when the bill comes into committee of the whole. They deal specifically with various sections. Perhaps I will leave those until the bill does come into committee of the whole House.

With one more comment, in regard to a suggestion put forward some time ago by my hon. friend from Riverdale, he was concerned and I think he makes the point—he was concerned about the right to have legal aid. We listened to the recent decisions of the supreme court of the United States and their rather—well, the new departure they took not too long ago, when they upset a conviction because the gentleman who was convicted had been denied legal representation in the lowest court, and they established as part of the law in the United States, that anyone appearing before the court was entitled to have legal representation.

Now, there is no mandatory provision in here, there is no provision that as of right, people are entitled to have legal aid, and I can recognize that there can be certain difficulties. Somewhere between the absolute suggestion that the hon. member for Riverdale has put forward, and between what seems to be a very, very broad discretion that is at present being given to those persons who can issue the certificates, perhaps there is a middle line and it worries me somewhat that there will be, from time to time, cases arise when a person would appear to be entitled to legal aid but in fact has been denied the certificate that is needed.

I have no snap answer for that at the moment, and I suppose we are going to have to have a few months, or maybe a year or so experience to show some of the weaknesses which will obviously arise in connection with this Act. I think it is something which we should consider.

If I may revert just to this point about the students, I think the Act should clearly state that there should be no fees payable to students in any circumstances, and this would be one very effective way of law offices palming off these responsibilities on students, if there are going to be fees paid under the scheme, that there be no fees payable to students, that a lawyer has to participate in it and only the lawyer can charge the fund fees. I think this would quickly disabuse anyone's mind from the idea that students would be giving the sort of advice that is needed in this connection.

One very important distinction between this Act and the legislation in England is that we are effectively merging criminal and civil legal aid and placing them in the one statute, and we are requiring one set of rules to apply in both instances. In England it is the court that determines whether or not a certificate is granted, and this is done at a very early stage in the proceedings. In civil matters, a system similar to the general system provided for in this Act is followed.

It needs hardly be said that the need of counsel at the outset is much greater in criminal proceedings than in the vast majority of civil cases. Therefore, I think, and I am sure the hon. Attorney General is aware of this, the drafting of the regulations is so vital to the whole functioning of this Act, and the regulations must provide very strictly as to the speedy processing of applications insofar as criminal actions are concerned, Mr. Speaker, otherwise serious delays will result and they can be most damaging to the accused.

It is essential that an accused person have counsel at the earliest opportunity. Perhaps a system could and should be established almost immediately after the Act comes into effect to have duty counsel acting in all courts where criminal matters are dealt with, to fill a gap between the arrest of an accused and the issuance of the certificate. I think the Act could and should clearly stipulate this, because it is unnecessary, I am sure, to overemphasize the importance of making available to an accused legal assistance at the earliest possible opportunity after he has come in conflict with the criminal law.

I have a considerable number of criticisms to be directed to individual sections. I think I will hold my further remarks until that later time. In the meantime, by and large the Act fills a very important need in the province of Ontario, but it has to be very carefully watched. I would hope the hon. Attorney General will pay some attention to the criticisms which have been addressed to him. These are not just illusory criticisms; they are criticisms that have been carefully

examined and well thought out. I think immediate changes in the Act before it goes too much further, to remedy some of these difficulties, would be most helpful.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the second reading of the bill to provide for legal aid in the province of Ontario, I intend to restrict myself entirely to the persons who are going to be entitled to legal aid under this bill. I will reserve any other comments about the essentially administrative problems that will arise under the bill, for the time when it is dealt with in committee.

The point which concerned me, and to which my friend from Downsview referred at the closing of his remarks, is the fact that there is no recognition by the hon. Attorney General, and no recognition by the government, that we have come to the point in the administration of justice in Ontario that it is absolutely essential for the government to affirm the proposition that any person who is summonsed to appear in any court in the province of Ontario, and is required to appear to answer for any charge or claim that may be made against him, and any person who on competent technical legal advice is advised that he has a claim or matter which should be adjudicated in a court, that that person is entitled to be represented by a qualified person—in our society a member of the legal profession.

When we assert that proposition and compare it to the provisions of this bill, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will immediately realize why I was so disappointed in the terms of this bill when I first had the opportunity to read it after it was presented.

Last year, I complimented, and I repeat the compliment, those who prepared the report on legal aid, which was to form the basis of an adequate legal aid system in the province of Ontario, for the exhaustive, and in my opinion, brilliant exposition of the problems related to legal aid. I had assumed that on the basis of such a report the government would have brought in a bill which would have asserted the right of everyone to an equal representation in the courts of the province of Ontario, regardless of their financial position. Unfortunately, the bill does no such thing, Mr. Speaker.

The bill is so hedged in reservations of discretions to those who are going to decide whether or not a person is to have that kind of representation, that in a very proper sense the bill will depend, not on what we here say in the Legislature, but entirely on the way in which in substance the area director, in one of the areas established throughout the province, will make and pass his judgment.

It is this point I would like to emphasize to the hon. Attorney General: that if he does not amend this bill to make some kind of such affirmative statement of the right of a person to be represented in a court in the province of Ontario by a competent counsel, should he choose to do so, then this bill will fail in its purpose.

We have vast experience which would indicate that when you leave this kind of discretion to persons who are not connected with the government in the first place, and therefore are not responsible to this House or to this Legislature for any shortcomings which may take place, we are quite likely to find that you have placed the area director in such a conflicting position as to his determination of the need which a person may have for legal aid, the offence for which he is charged, the area director's own attitude toward the person who has applied for the certificate, that you are not going to get the kind of decision which will tilt the balance in favour of the protection of the person in the court.

Therefore, I think it is essential that a bill such as this should contain a specific statement of the policy of the government; that it is their policy and it is the purpose of this bill to make certain that any person in the province of Ontario who has been summonsed to appear to answer in a court in Ontario or who has a claim which, on proper advice, he has been advised is one which should go to adjudication, that such a person in every instance should be entitled to be represented by counsel.

I am not going to dwell at this particular point on the exclusions in the bill. I do not really think they are terribly material. I think one can adopt a principle and still have certain minor exclusions from the principle of the bill. But I would point out to the House that the bill simply provides, not that a person is entitled to the kind of representation to which I have referred, but provides only in section 19 of the bill

> —no person is entitled to legal aid in any matter unless he holds a certificate—respecting such matter that has been issued to him in accordance with this Act and the regulations.

I have dropped certain clauses which are not relevant to the point which is of concern to me. So that you can only be represented

in court if you do not have the financial means to provide your own representation if you can get a certificate, and to get a certificate under section 17 of the bill, you must make an application for such a certificate. Provision is then made for a welfare officer—and I can return to this point later—to make his assessment, and on the basis of that, report to the area director as to whether the applicant is eligible for the legal aid applied for and if so, the sum, if any, the applicant is able to contribute toward the cost thereof, his eligibility is determined. I assume that report for all practical purposes conclusively determines the financial need of the person who has made the application.

Further on in that section, however, we come to the point that even when such a report has been rendered, it is only discretionary in the hands of the area director to decide whether or not a certificate should be issued and the only guidance provided in this bill for the area director is whether, in his opinion, the issue of a certificate is justified.

The substance, Mr. Speaker, simply is that unless the area director is satisfied, no certificate is issued. If, in his opinion, the issue is justified, a certificate will be issued. The hon. Attorney General has not given either in his opening remarks or in any of his remarks which have been published, any indication as to the factors which the area director must take into account in deciding whether or not the issue of the certificate is justified.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible in this bill to spell out that if the financial need is determined, the area director must issue a certificate if, in fact, a person has been summonsed to appear before a court and to answer for a charge or claim made against him. I think also, Mr. Speaker, that it should be mandatory on the area director to issue a certificate if a member of the bar has advised a person that he has a claim which should be adjudicated in the court, or a claim which should be asserted in the court and I think it should be possible to so phrase the provisions of this bill to assert the very principle that I think is missing from the bill. It should be possible to do so by requiring and providing and specifying that an area director must, of necessity, in certain cases at least —and I think it would cover the vast majority of cases—must issue such a certificate. Then there may well be as exceptions to such a rule an area where it is wise and proper that he be granted a discretion, but it certainly is not wise nor proper if we continue to pay lip service to the so-called principles of British justice. If we continue to do that, it is not proper to leave this matter of equal representations before the court in the discretion of an area director so far removed from the responsiveness to this assembly or so far removed from any body which is responsible to elected people in the province.

I would ask the hon. Attorney General to again look at the provision of subsection 4 of section 17 which provides this strange wording that:

> —only where in the opinion of the area director the issue of a certificate is justified.

will a certificate be issued and to see whether it is not possible to frame a section which will affirm this principle of representation.

Mr. Speaker, there may be people in the Legislature who—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would permit, we might save some time by assuring him that I have looked at subsection 4 of section 17 and I have in mind some change of language that will be brought forth at the committee stage.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would be prepared to indicate what changes he has in mind?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, we are at second reading here and we are speaking on principle and I suppose this is principle but on this particular subsection 4 of section 17, a change of the language would bring about the meaning which the hon. member is contending for, that the discretion of the welfare officer would not be the criterion solely on which legal aid would be planned. It would not be an obstacle or bar. I am not saying here that we will go so far in that particular section at least, to make the wide assertion which he contended for in his earlier remarks, that every person, regardless of circumstances, shall be entitled to legal aid —if I may state it very succinctly.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, from the remarks of the hon. Attorney General—and I appreciate his desire that we should not deal at length with matters with which he is going to introduce amendments, but if my understanding of what he said is correct, he was speaking of the role played by the welfare officer. The point with which I am concerned is the role played by the area director

and the fact that once the welfare officer has submitted his report the person is only entitled to legal aid, under this bill, as a matter of privilege, and not as a matter of right. He is only entitled, if in the opinion of an area director it is justified.

Now the point which I want to reiterate and if the hon. Attorney General proposes to introduce amendments, I will not need to elaborate on it at any great length. If he is going to deal with that particular point, and not the welfare officer's function under this scheme, I assume from his remarks that he does not propose to deal with the discretion of the area director in the way in which I have suggested that it should be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to assert for the benefit of hon. members in the House that may not be aware of it, that there is no principle of British justice or justice in the province of Ontario, which as of right entitles a person to be represented by counsel. In the course of the history of English law as I understand it, and I stand to be corrected, there is no right of any person to be represented by counsel, it is entirely a discretionary matter in the hands of the judges of the courts. It they see fit to request some counsel in the court in a traditional English way, to stand up and represent someone because of the difficulty of the case, or because of the onerousness and the danger of the charge to the person before the court, then they will do so, and all that this bill is attempting to do apparently, is to perpetuate that system of the discretionary decision of someone else to decide whether a person, who is placed in jeopardy, or who has a claim to assert, will be represented by counsel.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the time has come, and here my reading of what has taken place in United States is similar to that of the hon. member for Downsview, but I disagree with him when he says that this is going to provide the best legal aid system on the continent or elsewhere. It is not going to do so, in the light of the decisions which have been made in the supreme court of the United States, not only in the Gideon case, but in many other cases that have followed from the establishment of that basic principle.

Mr. Singer: Surely the hon. member is not suggesting the Gideon case establishes legal aid, it establishes the principle. There has to be a system to go along with it. In states that have a public defender, that may be the lawyer you are talking about, and in states that have no system at all, that may be the system. Surely my friend is not suggesting the Gideon case establishes a system of legal aid.

Mr. Renwick: The hon. member for Downsview is perfectly right. I am not suggesting that the Gideon case establishes a legal aid system. What the Gideon case establishes, and what subsequent cases in the supreme court establish, is the fundamental and basic right to representation, regardless of whether or not you can pay for it; this is the point.

Therefore, by force of the decision in those cases, you are requiring, whether the state authorities or the federal authorities in the United States wish to do so or not, you are in fact enforcing the provision of a legal aid system, because otherwise any conviction which may be registered against a person, if taken to appeal it will be thrown out. In that way, the United States courts are asserting the principle of the right of a person to proper representation when he is before their courts.

I am asking the hon. Attorney General to part from this traditional paternalistic system, which is part of the British administration of justice. I am asking him to come a substantial part of the way to asserting in this statute the purpose of the bill, which is to establish —if it is something new in the province of Ontario—that anyone who is summonsed before a court, and anyone who has a claim which requires him to appear in a court, and anyone who has a claim which on proper advice he is advised is one which should be adjudicated upon, that that person, regardless of his financial needs, is entitled to be represented.

Mr. Singer: Criminal and civil claims as well?

Mr. Renwick: Yes, civil claims as well as a criminal claim, and once having asserted that proposition then the question becomes one of whether or not the person is in a position to pay all or any part of the cost of being represented in a court in such a case.

At this point, we move into the second area, as to how that need is established. My only comment in that area is substantially similar to the hon. member for Downsview and I do not think there is any great disagreement between us. I think, however, that the government could well adopt as the basic tests, the tests which they introduced in the OMSIP scheme, that a person who has no taxable income in the province of Ontario is entitled to the assumption that his need is such that if he has a legal right, he requires legal aid and assistance in paying for it.

You rule out by such a scheme—as in the OMSIP scheme, if we use those tests for the purposes of this bill—you rule out again the

labour of work which is required of the welfare officer, and you rule out those assessments. Then you leave the welfare officer in a position where he deals with the other types of persons who apply for legal aid, to determine whether in the circumstances their financial position is such that they require legal aid, either absolutely or on the basis that it would be repaid over a period of years.

I share the concern of the member for Downsview about the qualifications of welfare officers, who have been trained under a categorical aid system, to come to a proper decision of financial need in certain cases. I would think that with the guidelines which are laid out in subsection 3 of section 17 there would be some opportunity for the scheme to be operated on the proposition that the welfare officer would make a total assessment of a family's position or of a person's position, rather than a categorical assessment of it, to determine whether he was in need of legal aid.

But I think that these matters can and will be worked out. They can and will be worked out because, if the principle which I wish to see adopted in this bill is introduced into the bill, it will mean that convictions will be thrown out unless a person is, in fact, represented in the courts.

Mr. Singer: In civil litigation as well?

Mr. Renwick: In civil litigation as well. I will not burden my remarks with all the details of the other sections in the bill. I simply ask the hon. Attorney General with whatever proper exceptions he thinks should be placed in the bill, to remove this entirely complete discretion in the hands of the area director, and to substitute for it a statement that if a person is in financial need, which is demonstrably shown, and if he is summonsed before a court, and if he is charged in any way, or required to answer in a court, or if he has a claim which, on proper legal advice, proper technical advice, should be adjudicated in the court, that in those instances he is entitled to be represented.

Members can see the difficulty which this bill runs into immediately in the area of legal aid. Not only does the certificate require to be justified in the opinion of the area director, but if in fact it is a matter which is to come into one of the courts, which are of principal concern to most people who require legal aid, namely, the juvenile and family court, the magistrate's court, and the division court—and there are certain other provisions in here—but in those basic courts, where people who have the financial need for legal aid mainly come in contact with the administration of justice, you have reinforced the discretion of the area director by saying that first of all it must be justified in the opinion of the area director.

But you then open the section, by saying "subject to the discretion of the area director." Thus, doubly reinforcing the discretion, so that he is not even under the obligation if he determines that it is justified to issue the certificate. He can then look at section 13 and say, "Well, even if I feel it is justified in this case I still have a discretion to exercise."

And I think the very fact that the Attorney General has seen fit to qualify doubly the discretion in those cases of the courts which are of most concern to people requiring legal aid, simply shows that he views this whole matter of legal aid from the traditional viewpoint of the discretion of the English judges to provide legal aid in certain cases if they saw fit to grant it.

And he is now going to give this kind of discretion to the area director. He seems to be quite unaware of the proposition that he can get an adequate legal aid system if he will, as Attorney General, charged with the administration of justice, take the steps required to make certain that persons are entitled to representation in the courts as a matter of right. And this is the substance of my remarks. I hope I have communicated it to the Attorney General. I have some concern that I have not, because he was speaking about the welfare officer when I was trying to deal with this very wide discretion in the hands of the area director.

I urge the Attorney General, when he brings this bill into committee, to introduce some amendments to give the kind of basic premise that is necessary before an adequate legal aid scheme can be developed. If he chooses not to bring in such amendment, then I would like him to say that he in fact does not agree that a person in the province of Ontario has a right, as of right, to be represented in a court by counsel. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is as simple as that. Either a citizen has that right or he does not have it. And he does not have it, in my opinion, if it is subject to the discretion which is provided in this bill.

Now, I urge that point of view on the Attorney General because we in this party want to support this bill. We want it to be a good bill, we want it to be the very best

legal aid scheme, but we will find grave difficulty in doing so unless the Attorney General is prepared to eliminate these broad discretions which appear in this bill as he has presented it.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few remarks on the principle of the bill, but owing to the hour I wonder if I should move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Trotter moves the adjournment of the debate.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 29, by Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East).

> Resolution: That this House authorizes and instructs the standing committee on health and welfare to meet immediately to enquire into the operation and administration of the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton and to hear representations from the staff of the hospital and other interested persons.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Scarborough West, resolution No. 29 standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is one of the nicest kind of resolutions to debate but I feel it is one that is very necessary at this time. I might say that the reason for this resolution emerged because of a newspaper article about May 6 regarding the very serious deficiencies in the operations of the Ontario Hospitals across the province, and in particular the Ontario Hospital at Hamilton. I would refer the hon. members to the speech I made during the estimates of the Minister of Health on May 3 when I put on record the story by Peter Moon regarding the situation at the Ontario Hospital.

I would say to the House that I am not knowledgeable of the mental health problems in the province, not even as a layman, but I have found that the professional men and the laymen have shown a great degree of concern about the situation, and they feel that we must find a remedy for it. I refer to the first paragraph of the story by Peter Moon and I must commend him and others for the very thorough job they did in bringing to the public's attention a problem we have in our mental institutions in the province. I quote the first paragraph:

> Resignation, sickness and leave of absence has created a medical staff shortage at Hamilton's Ontario Hospital which authorities term critical. The situation has reached the point where this week the hospital had to operate with only one full-time staff psychiatrist available for 1,640 inpatients. The result, it is claimed, is overwork, limited treatment and a serious drop in staff morale.
>
> The first important staff problems began to appear four years ago when the hospital had its accredited psychiatric training period for students cut from two to one year. As of July 1 it will cease to be a training hospital for psychiatrists at all, according to a recent ruling by the Royal college of physicians and surgeons. Provincial government officials and the hospital's administrative staff are doing everything they can to combat the situation but they admit the staff position at the hospital is likely to become worse before they can do anything about it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to first make it abundantly clear that I myself have never attempted to make allegations about the situation at the hospital without ascertaining and substantiating my words. I want to make it quite clear that I at no time have ever blamed the staff at the hospital or the administration, and I have never heard anyone attempt to blame the staff or the administration at the hospital. Rather, I think, they should be commended for their dedication in carrying out the work under what has appeared to be at least the most frustrating conditions, and I can say that the responsibility must lie with the Minister of Health and with the government.

After I raised the question in the House I felt that my closing remarks might have had some validity and I would quote the last paragraph of my comments:

> I would think that the hon. Minister himself would ask for an adjournment of his estimates to take some time to look the situation over and come back to the House and assure us that these conditions are going to be cleared up just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so.

I will also quote the opening remarks of the hon. Minister of Health to the whole series of newspaper quotes that I placed on the record as ascertained by Peter Moon, the staff writer for the Hamilton *Spectator*. I quote the hon. Minister:

> Mr. Chairman, first of all I do not think that it is reasonable for this House or the public of Ontario to judge what is being

done for the patients on the basis of a feature article in a daily newspaper. First of all, this is why I ask that newspaper people would get the whole story from those who are capable of telling them the whole story and then print the whole story; not take parts out of the story, out of context, and put it together. After all, to hear the remarks read from this report one would think that our patients were worse than they were 50 years ago which, of course, is quite out of keeping with the facts.

I have often felt the same way on less important subjects dealt with by the press, but I realize that in a subject that is as important as mental health, and in my analysis of the press story since the Minister's estimates opened they have done a very precise and a creditable job. I recommend to the hon. members of the House the story on Thursday, June 2 in the Toronto *Daily Star* as written by Jim Leterman, who made his trip to the hospital at Hamilton. I am sure that he has made sure that he talked to the people in authority, and his story with as many words substantiate the story that had emanated previously.

From these stories, on May 5, the hon. member for Hamilton Centre showed her concern, and rightly so—I commend her for it—and said that she would bring the whole situation for a proper airing before the standing committee on health and welfare. Of course, it is history now as to what happened to that meeting. I was somewhat sceptical myself when I heard that she was going to have the committee deal with it, but I thought with her determination as expressed in the press that maybe there had been some understanding between herself and the Minister and at least we would get somewhere on the road to have the question opened.

But, of course, as you realize, on May 6, the day after the announcement by the hon. member for Hamilton Centre, I posed this question to the Minister as a supplementary question to a previous question and I quote:

> Does the Minister intend to hold a special meeting of the standing committee on health and welfare to deal with the situation in Hamilton as announced by the hon. member for Hamilton Centre in the Hamilton *Spectator* last night?
>
> *Hon. Mr. Dymond:* I have no authority to call special meetings of this committee. I believe the hon. member to whom you refer is chairman of the committee. This would be her privilege.

Evidently, we found it was not her privilege and I feel that the rules were lived up to. I felt the question was avoided at the meeting and it should have been advised when it opened that the committee had no right to deal with the question, and subsequently I had to come before the House and find the proper procedure to bring the question before the House and I was informed directly by the Speaker, and the Clerk of the House and subsequently by resolution.

I have found nothing since the whole question arose to substantiate the denials of the hon. Minister of Health in regard to the situation at the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton. He had said, of course, that we are doing all we can do to rectify the situation. This is a matter of opinion. One might have to agree that in regards to the professional staff —the psychiatrists—that we just cannot pick them up as we want them. This is a serious problem.

We have had some inkling of a crash programme of recruitment, and we have had some ideas of a revamping of The Mental Health Act. No one knows yet just what this means. But if we read the resolution which asks the House to have the committee meet to inquire into the operations and administration of the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton, and to hear representations from the staff of the hospital and other interested persons, I think that we could gain a lot of useful information.

We could maybe find out what we could do. The staff could likely tell us what we could do in a crash programme way to ease the situation regarding the facilities. If a building would help, they could maybe tell us. They could maybe tell us the exact problems of the staff, who are overworked and have not enough help. So I think we could get a lot of good out of that kind of a meeting.

I would like to enlarge on the reasons and the merit for such a hearing to the member and I would quote the statment by Rev. Leonard Medley, chaplain in the Ontario Hospital for the past two years, and I quote: "The deterioration in the staff situation has put the doctors' morale at rock bottom. Isolated rumours of brutality and occasional ones of cruel disciplining by attendants who should not be doing this job."

And I quote from Dr. Henderson, the executive director of the mental health division: "Naturally we are very concerned at the situation that has developed in Hamilton."

Again Dr. Bucke, the provincial director of the Ontario Hospital—this was a quote by

Mr. Moon: "Dr. Bucke, provincial director of the Ontario Hospital admits the infirmary is not up to standard and that it is not fair to expect part time and semi-retired doctors to run it."

I quote from Eric Saborin, the vice-president of the council of the civil service association. He says this: "There are isolated incidents in which attendants lost their temper under trying times and conditions, who were using unnecessary force."

Since this problem arose, Mr. Saborin has quit his job—he has found a job that pays him double the pay of $4,050. I spoke to him after he had quit last week and he said he had enjoyed his job very much. He liked working with the people. He had to accept that kind of a job; the rate that they were paying there because he had a serious health problem some years ago and could not find work in other industry because of his health. He was accepted there and he progressed very well in taking exams and in getting a little more money. But he did come to the point where he could not live on it any longer and he had to leave a job that I am sure, as he expressed to me and others, he liked. He liked working with the people and if he had been paid properly he would have stayed.

I think these are some specific reasons to justify the committee looking thoroughly into the whole situation at the Hamilton, Ontario Hospital.

Regarding the Grant boy's case: We know, we have read of it—the Grant boy was committed by the mental health clinic in Welland some 20 days ago to the Ontario Hospital. I made a visit last Thursday to the hospital and spoke to Dr. Snedden the superintendent. He was very co-operative and I understand that he realizes he has a problem. I went into what is called the committing assessment ward, where I found it hard to walk down the corridor without brushing shoulders with the 73 odd patients that were in there, and I met the Grant boy.

Even though the attendant and the psychologist assured me that the boy was safe there, they admitted and agreed with me that he should never have been there in the first place, and anyone who has any influence should be making every attempt to take him out.

When I came out of the hospital, it immediately came to mind—what about his future? And because of the statement of the hon. Minister of Health that he had no prerogative for interfering with the superintendent at the hospital, I immediately stated that I would write a letter to the Prime Minister, which I did on Friday afternoon and asked him to intervene in getting the boy out of that hospital immediately and into a suitable institution where he could be given the kind of treatment that he needed.

I understand that negotiations are taking place at the present time to have the boy transferred to Thistletown. I hope negotiations are fruitful and he is removed as soon as possible. And I think we should have the assurance from the Minister that this will never happen again and that we should have assurance that other boys under the age of 16 should also be taken out of that institution.

The substance of the resolution may be redundant at this point after all the controversy and the reports that have come out about the situation in the province and no investigation may be necessary. Because, of course, the hon. Minister of Health and the government have been defenceless till now regarding this most serious situation.

It has been said by some, including the hon. Minister of Health, that the unfavourable publicity would make it harder to find staff, and it well may. I know that Dr. Snedden, the superintendent, expressed this to me but he also agreed with me when I said to him that we must admit that the reflection will be minute compared to the situation we shall have if we drift along with the indifference of the Minister.

Certainly, we will have a calamity if we do not realize the situation now, if we do not take into regard the drastic projected increase in the population in the golden horseshoe and the Niagara peninsula in the next five years. If we do not do something now we will have a serious calamity on our hands and we will not know who to blame. So I urge the members of this House to support the resolution and let us do everything we possibly can to take a real enlightened approach to the problem of the mentally ill in this province. If it is money we need, let us find it; if it is other things we need, let us find them. Dr. Snedden said to me, "I can't build buildings and I can't raise wages."

So I ask for the endorsation of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I particularly ask for the support of the hon. members in the Hamilton area.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the resolution for the following reason:

> The usual role and function of standing committees of the Legislature is to deal with certain things which are almost automatically referred to them, such as the particular consideration of legislation to be brought before the House. It is possible for a committee to initiate certain programmes on its own but this is not usual, nor is it official and they cannot report on it. It would not be appropriate to refer a matter of this kind to a standing committee of the Legislature.

Due to the publicity given the Ontario Hospital, Hamilton, I deemed it necessary in the public interest that the matter be fully aired at the committee level. This was done—I did not think it advisable, nor had I the authority, to invite the staff to appear at this time. Furthermore, the regulations clearly show the line of authority.

The superintendent, under the direction of the Deputy Minister, has the power to operate his hospital and to locate patients on admission, after the necessary tests, to the area best suited to their needs. The regulations also provide under the mental health director, mental health officers who are empowered and competent to inspect mental health hospitals at any time.

The reports made recently on the Ontario Hospital discredit a hospital and staff which have been doing a creditable job under difficult circumstances, and ignore the contribution which they have made to the families and communities which they serve.

The attitudes expressed also suggest that there is little understanding of the magnitude of the task which is being undertaken and little tolerance of unavoidable deficiencies and problems which will show up from time to time until we come closer to the realization of the goals which have been set.

Speaking of staff, it is worthwhile to note that the instant experts who pounce on any situation they can, for political gain, seem to lose sight of the fact that their irresponsible and unresearched pronouncements can have the effect of driving potential staff away.

Every thinking person must realize that it is difficult enough without that, to attract people to service occupations and professions in a boom economy — particularly as the shortage is world-wide.

One of the statements made was that the hospital is overcrowded. This is not correct, as the official records show. The Hamilton Hospital, in January of this year, did show three per cent occupancy above rated capacity. This has been reduced steadily, and for the past two months, April and May, there were vacant beds. On occasion, the admitting wards could be overcrowded, but these are more or less "holding wards" for the patients until the problem is diagnosed.

I would not, under any circumstances, claim to be very knowledgeable in the field of mental health care per se. Consequently, my comments relate largely to organizational problems rather than to the patient care aspects of mental health operation.

It is my feeling that much of the difficulty in the operation of our mental hospitals is related to the fact that the control of the mental hospitals is over-centralized. This is not said in the light of any criticism of members of the staff of the mental hospitals branch of The Department of Health, but rather in the firm opinion that wherever the control of human activities is over-centralized the following bad side effects result:

1. There is a tendency to rigidity of thinking because policies must be formulated which apply equally in a great variety of situations, and a central body finds it almost impossible to make one decision for one situation and not have that decision applied throughout.

2. The human sciences tend to depend very much upon creativity amongst the professionals. This is really the foundation upon which our progress is based. This creativity depends very much upon an environment which allows ideas to be put into practice or to be tried out fairly quickly or else there is a great loss of morale and a sense of frustration amongst staff which militates against new ideas being developed and applied in the field. Because of the common need for proposals to be approved centrally in an organization such as the mental hospitals branch, there is an obvious time lag between ideas coming forward and action being taken.

3. Where over-centralization exists, it generally pertains not only to policy decisions, but generally there is an over-centralization of terms of employment where perhaps a better description is an over-standardization. I believe as a result of this there is an attempt to pay comparable wage rates, to establish comparable working conditions regardless of the obvious differences in economic conditions in various areas of the province. This does not occur, for example, in the hydro-electric system where regionalization has occurred and where variable pay scales and conditions of employment are established for Hydro employees, depending upon the eco-

nomic conditions in the areas in which they are employed. It is, for instance, ridiculous to assume that the labour market in St. Thomas, Ontario, is the same labour market as in highly-industrialized Hamilton, Ontario. Any attempt to over standardize in this situation will result in the penalizing of the employees in one area and perhaps the overpayment of employees in another. This results in labour unrest and again, negative morale factors. But, as the Provincial Treasurer has just told us, the civil service association insists upon standard pay rates across the province.

Having listed some of the bad side-effects, as I see them, I personally would recommend the following course of action:

(a) That immediately steps be taken to create local boards of governors and hospital organizations to whom mental hospitals would be turned over for operation;

(b) the ownership of the buildings could continue to be vested in the province but the local hospital organizations, by law, could be given the responsibility and authority for the general management, operation and maintenance of all of the hospitals now owned or hereafter acquired by the province of Ontario and the local boards could be authorized to exercise all the powers hitherto exercised by the mental hospitals branch of the department including the power to enact bylaws for the general management, operation and maintenance of the hospitals, to appoint, to suspend or remove employees, to establish terms and conditions of employment and the like. I must say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is in complete accord with this statement;

(c) the relationship between the locally operated hospital and the mental hospitals branch of The Department of Health could be established on a basis comparable to the relationship between a public general hospital and the Ontario hospital services commission;

(d) consideration should be given to the creation of medical staffs for the local hospitals, not necessarily on a full-time or part-time employment basis, but perhaps on a sessional payment basis so that the reservoir of privately practising psychiatrists in the larger communities in Ontario could be tapped as an immediate source of additional psychiatric professional help in the Ontario Hospitals.

In making these recommendations to you, I believe it is important to note that this is not really a radical precedent being established. Far from it—this is similar to the mechanism under which the TB hospitals of Ontario operated for many years, notwithstanding their relationship to the TB prevention branch of The Department of Health.

In other words, the TB hospitals had the bulk of their operating cost, if not all of their operating cost, provided to them by The Department of Health of Ontario but notwithstanding this, the hospitals were locally owned and locally operated. Similarly, the public general hospitals in Ontario are locally owned and locally operated and operating costs are to all intents and purposes provided by the senior levels of government. This is again similar to the fact that our educational facilities in Ontario are owned and operated by the local boards of education which continue to involve the community and therefore place themselves in the way of obtaining community support.

Finally, I believe that there have been experiments carried out involving the creation of mental hospitals at the Royal Ottawa, the Essex and the Sudbury sanitaria, and the C. K. Clarke institute of Toronto, whose operating costs were paid by The Department of Health but which hospitals remained locally owned and operated and the largest of which was dealt with by the Ontario hospital services commission on a basis similar to that of the public general hospitals.

Obviously, the health department believes in this plan. I trust and hope it will be greatly expanded.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What about the issue now before us?

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): After having had an opportunity of seeing some of the conditions in our mental hospitals over the last few years, it is hard for me to understand how someone like the hon. member for Hamilton Centre could get up and give the speech she has. To say that the committee on health and welfare, for technical reasons, cannot look into the problem of the Hamilton Ontario Hospital is ridiculous.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hear, hear.

Mr. Trotter: The time is come to do away with technicalities and if, for some reason, there can be some technicality about a committee there is nothing to stop this House from empowering that committee, or any other committee, to go in and take a look at the Hamilton Ontario Hospital.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trotter: What the entire system of the way we treat our mentally ill in this province needs is the shock treatment. Let our committees go and take a good look. Let the press get in and take a good look at how we actually treat our mentally ill. This problem of Hamilton is typical of the system, and basically it is this: we have no fundamental policy—no fundamental policy of taking care of those who are mentally ill, whether they are children, teenagers, or whether they are older people or of middle-age. We lack a policy. We lack a system. And because undisturbed children were found in that Hamilton hospital, we now have a cause célèbre.

A few years ago there was the hospital at Orillia. But the problem has not been solved there, it is still crammed full. And then we had the problem at Smiths Falls, when a child died, but the problem is still there. The province, the government, has not come to grips with the problem. We remember discussing last year when the new training bill for The Department of Reform Institutions came in—we pointed out that there were disturbed children being sent to training schools, who should not be sent there, but were sent there simply because there was no other place to send them. You go down to Queen street. There are about nine children down there, 16 and under. I think the youngest is 13.

It is not just at Hamilton, but it is right here in this city. This city is supposed to have the best facility for treating the disturbed children in Ontario, but this is what is going on. So I and this party most certainly support the resolution, because certainly the province should do something. It should do a great deal. It is a shocking thing that year in and year out, despite the fact that you might bring up the speeches of various individuals, despite the fact that you might bring up the cases of the hospitals, where they are overcrowded and quite frankly, it is not the mismanagement of the staffs at the hospital, it is simply the lack of funds being provided, the lack of drive being provided here in the province of Ontario.

The hon. member from Hamilton Centre might say these hospitals, mental hospitals, should be turned over to a local board. This might be a good idea. It is quite true that these hospitals should be close to the area which they serve. But to come along in such a debate as this at such a late date, this is nothing more than an excuse.

Why does not the government make it a policy that they are going to put up good, small, community hospitals; not these massive bastiles where they crowd people in of all ages and of all conditions. In Hamilton, they cram 2,000 people into an ancient building. If you want community hospitals, by all means have them. But why is not the government giving us a programme? If you send a committee, be it the health and welfare committee, which should be the obvious committee from this House, if you send them to go to the Hamilton Ontario Hospital, they should shed more light on the situation and let the members of the House see the actual, shocking conditions that exist in the mental hospitals and in the hospitals for retarded children here in the province of Ontario.

During this session I pointed out how the mentally retarded adults were kept at Aurora; a shocking state of affairs. It is the same all over in the hospitals operated by this province. And, nobody knows better than the government. The hon. member for Hamilton centre can say that the director of mental health can manage things well. There is no doubt about it; he is a dedicated civil servant. But it is not the fault of the director of mental health, it is the fault of the government; it is the fault of the Treasury board; it is the fault of the Tory government who have been sitting there for a quarter of a century and just letting things drift from crisis to crisis. It is Aurora, it is Orillia, it is Smiths Falls—it is crisis to crisis and yet they have done nothing.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Slow down.

Mr. Trotter: The member for Simcoe East says slow down. The trouble with you people is you have been crawling for years. Your emblem, your flag, should be a snail rampant on a field of red tape.

There is no point, Mr. Speaker, in going into all the statistics of how many people are there; of the lack of aftercare services. If a teenager is released from a hospital in Hamilton, there are no aftercare services. They are not much better in Queen street. They are slightly better, but not much. And there is no point of going into it—of all the statistics of the revolving-door policy and of the people who are released and because of lack of proper care are back in the hospital a short time later; nearly 55 per cent of them.

But, again, it is the story across Ontario. How enlightening it would be to each of the members of this House, to the people of the province of Ontario, if a committee em-

powered by this Legislature went and talked to the staff members, talked to the people that have worked there in Hamilton in the past; how enlightening it would be to see how shoddily, how shockingly we have been treating the mentally ill. It is adding fantastically to the cost of governments simply because these people do not get the proper treatment. They are in longer than they need be—they are returned more often than they need be, simply because of the lack of proper care. For the member for Hamilton Centre to say, "Well, we have a salary problem because the civil service association likes a certain level of pay," is nonsense. Who would ever think that the civil service association wants to keep pay down? What a stupid and silly argument to give us, when we are facing such a problem of shocking magnitude as we have here, in the cause of the mentally ill.

So I support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I wish that the Tory members of this House could overcome their prejudices and support it.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, obviously I too support the resolution advanced by my colleague. I think it is an important and obvious step to take at this point and I frankly fault the member for Hamilton Centre for suggesting that this kind of inquiry could not be held. I suggest to her, and I suggest to her strongly, that she should be the first member in this Legislature, as chairman of the health and welfare committee, to advocate such an inquiry and to launch such an inquiry. There is no possible sense whatsoever in the proposition that there has been some facility for airing this situation in front of a standing committee of the House, which in fact had none of the major personnel before it at the time.

There are others who wish to speak, and I want therefore to get to the substance of my remarks. My observations will be brief, but considered. Nothing I am about to say is the product of impulse, it is the product of conviction.

The case for an inquiry, I suggest, is irrefutable. Seldom have arguments been more compelling. Hamilton Ontario Hospital bears lengthy and close investigation for two reasons. First, because the institution itself resembles the decline and fall of a mental hospital. Second, because the crisis at Hamilton reflects the crisis of our entire mental health system, a faltering, inappropriately structured deficient edifice.

And yet, in The Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, faced with the chaos around them, minds and politicians merge in a conspiracy of silence. An inquiry, I suggest, must deal with the following facts arising out of Hamilton Ontario Hospital, cast, if one may, in the tradition of J'Accuse.

I charge that the incarceration of a ten-year-old boy in a packed ward in an adult mental hospital, for however short a time, is an act of recklessness and folly. Whatever the sense of desperation, this Legislature, in its acquiescence permits a grievous wrong and grievously shall we pay for it.

I charge that exposing a 14-year-old boy, to the possibility of homosexual advance or assault, destroys the very concept of treatment for the mentally ill.

I charge that a system which permits these conditions to prevail is therapeutically and morally bankrupt, and that any pretensions which The Department of Health may have about its facilities for disturbed children are reduced to a state of travesty.

I, therefore, charge that thousands of children in Ontario, lacking even a diagnostic facility, are denied the minimal resources of a civilized society, and are consigned to lives of endless anguish.

I further charge that a per diem expenditure of $7.55 for the mentally ill at Hamilton Ontario Hospital, is a cynical violation of the principle that the mind shall be treated as the body. Four times that amount is required before mental health can be achieved.

I charge that any hospital operating on 30 per cent of its professional staff requirement, is no hospital at all, but essentially a custodial institution, forced to control patient disruption, rather than to provide an adequate treatment process.

I charge that ministerial cries of universal staff shortage are no answer for the neglect of the past, the absence of programmes for the present, or the serious misutilization of current personnel.

I charge that wages to attendants and nurses are so pitifully low as to jeopardize every Ontario Hospital complement, and that the so-called shift of responsibility to the civil service commission is an act which verges on conscious deception.

I charge finally, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario Hospital apparatus has been fatally compromised by the chaotic mental health framework, pitting mental hospitals against psychiatric wings, against community psychiatric units, against outpatient facilities of uncertain definition and permanency. Indeed,

the medical model, as a model, has failed in the provision of total services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the full responsibility for all of the foregoing lies with the hon. Minister of Health. I suggest that he has abdicated that responsibility, and with all due consideration, I suggest that he should resign.

I wish to emphasize Mr. Speaker, that it is not a suggestion that is inspired by any hint of animus or hostility. The hon. Minister, I think, knows my regard for him as an effective and able politician, but he is the wrong Minister in the wrong portfolio, at the wrong time. Somehow, Mr. Speaker, an impasse has developed in the fields of health, mental health in particular, of which the Hamilton Ontario Hospital is the most recent manifestation, and a terrifying manifestation it is, Mr. Speaker.

There is no evidence of breakthrough in the fields of staff, salaries or funding, there is no evidence even now of an interdepartmental committee on emotionally disturbed children. There is only inaction paralysis. I frankly do not comprehend it. The whole situation is inexplicable to me. The government appears to have evolved its own particular neurosis where mental health is concerned. That neurosis has immobilized the government, the Cabinet and the hon. Minister.

A new attitude of mind, a new thrust of leadership is apparently required before a solution is found—and a solution, Mr. Speaker, must be found before we lose yet another generation of the mentally ill. We have already lost such a generation.

In that spirit, more with regret than with anger, I repeat my suggestion, that the hon. Minister should resign, that this inquiry should take place, and that this resolution be supported.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this resolution for the following reasons.

If there were, or had been shown, any serious or sound reason for an investigation of the operation of the Ontario Hospital at Hamilton, I would be only too anxious and willing to support this resolution. In fact, I would not have waited for this action, but would rather have bombarded the government with the evidence to prove the need for such action so that an inquiry would have already been made, and any trouble eliminated.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no such reason for an investigation. There has been no evidence that the operation of the administration of the hospital has been anything but good.

This is one of the older hospitals in the Ontario system. It was established for the treatment of alcoholics, but got a little busy in this and began to treat mentally ill patients and over the years it has been treating young and old, men and women, and in recent years more people than any other hospital in the province. And it has been treating them well, because I am told there is a good discharge rate and the lowest readmission of all Ontario Hospitals.

I am a layman in these things, and I do not profess to have the knowledge to talk about them as glibly as my friends to the right, although they are far out in left field in this, as in so many other things.

Although it is an old hospital, Mr. Speaker, Hamilton has not stood still. Three years ago, a beautiful new hospital was added, and a large outpatient centre; all of this to improve the care provided for the patients and it continues, just as all hospitals in Hamilton, to admit and treat young and old alike. This is one place where there is no discrimination. I believe the doctors and all the staff are just concerned about and interested in getting their patients cured, if possible, or helped to return to their homes.

Now all the criticism we have heard here would seem to me to make much more difficult, the job government has to try to recruit staff. A doctor, a psychiatrist, a social worker or a staff member does not have to put up with this sort of thing in these days.

I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us how many of them have given, as a reason for leaving the service or for not joining it, the public criticism directed at them. There is to me, however, something more serious. In the short time that I have been in this House, I have been concerned to notice how often there is talk of patients in government-operated hospitals. I have always thought that any information about patients was supposed to be confidential, yet it seems that to the NDP group all this sort of thing falls into the public domain and can be discussed and debated openly. There was a sham as to preserving the boy's identity.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that his name was well-known within an hour of the matter being raised in this House. Do these hon. members not think that they could do very great harm to some of those whom they are professing to help—dragging into the public forum their misfortunes and robbing them of the little dignity and privacy they have left

to them? This is a very serious matter to me and I feel that the government should take vigorous steps to see that some of these confidences could be guaranteed to the people who have to be admitted to government-operated institutions.

If we members were to pry into general hospitals and their patients, I am sure that there would be very loud protests, and rightly so.

You may say that even the parents did not know that this boy was sent to the mental hospital. As a parent I ask, "Why not? Where were they?" If their 10-year-old boy was sick or well, why did they not know all about him? Reading such reports, Mr. Speaker, leaves me with the feeling that this boy was just picked up and packed off to the hospital. Is this not so? I want to say here, and say it loudly, that there is such a thing as parental responsibility and if it were my child—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ewen: —I would consider it my duty to know all about him.

So, Mr. Speaker, since I can see no sound reason for this resolution, I have to look deeper into it and try to find what prompted it. In this House we have heard a great volume of words from the hon. member for Scarborough West about mental illness and retardation and about the emotionally disturbed. To listen to him you would think that he is a well-trained psychiatrist, but he has not had such training any more than I have. This alone, I think is dangerous and damaging. To those who do not know him as well as we do here, he is the voice of authority; but the voice is just wind and opinions which he cannot prove.

And now we have the hon. member for Wentworth East setting himself up as an authority. I did not think that there was anything wrong with the boy when he saw him. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to let the public believe these opinions and we are of any value whatsoever, I think the Prime Minister should forget about spending $300 million on these new health training facilities. We will not need them; we can just call on the NDP members.

It might be well to refer to the government policy in respect of the care of mentally disturbed people. For more than 40 years there has been an increased tendency on the North American continent to dump people who were creating problems for their families, or for their communities, into mental hospitals. The result was an increasing demand for institutional care, regardless of whether it offered an appropriate solution, and the tendency for the hospitals to stagnate due to load which overwhelmed their resources.

Incidentally, the staffs of these institutions never seem to have the option of refusing admission to people whom they feel they cannot treat adequately, nor to discharge persons for whom they could do nothing further. More and more, larger, mental hospitals were built and staffs and budgets increased without apparent progress being made toward an adequate provision of services. All togther over these years it was considered that treatment methods were greatly improved; resident population of mental hospitals increased disproportionately to the increase in the general population. In Ontario, for example, from 1929, to 1956, the number of patients in mental institutions based on 100,000 for the general population, increased from 301 to 432—an increase of 43 per cent.

In 1950 it was clearly recognized by the people associated with medical health services in many countries that the development of larger and larger pools of persons rejected by society for various reasons would lead to further deterioration of the institutions, the staffing situation and the patients themselves. This led to such a statement as: "Mental hospitals should be abolished." It also led to an attempt to popularize concepts of wider distribution of services, of community participation and responsibility.

In 1959 the Minister outlined some of the measures to be undertaken to attempt to reduce the need for admission to mental hospitals, to provide alternative methods of care, and to limit the extent of social dislocation and social disability. It was a statement of the interior government policy for the mentally disturbed. It was emphasized at that time that success with the programme would deepen the local participation and co-operation, and that rather a long period of development would require and preserve a pattern which was an ingrained pattern in society.

Some difficulties were anticipated in implementing the plans due to the limitations of valuable personnel. In gaining acceptance of the programme, the local communities, in co-operation with other services, would necessarily be involved in this new programme. One example of lack of understanding is provided by the criticism of the Opposition, and even by some of the staff of the psychiatric units in general hospitals. The Opposition has objected that the programme is entirely oriented toward hospital care. The development of psychiatric units in general hospitals

is only one aspect of the total programme, but it is an aspect which has high priority and has given an order of achievement to the widespread distribution of services.

The staff who have objected have done so on the grounds that the staff psychiatrists and psychiatric units drain off staff from mental hospitals. This is true to some degree, but that is a hazard which has been accepted for a long time in order to reach the objective. We do not expect or intend to abolish mental hospitals; we hope only to establish a new pattern of a more appropriate type which will be an essential element of comprehensive medical health service. However, we recognize the transition period is difficult, painful; it may continue to be so for some time.

The hon. Minister has frequently listed detailed accomplishments since 1959 but I would like to give one or two indications of the progress made: Distribution of psychiatric services and local participation—in 1959 there were 11 psychiatric units in general hospitals; in 1966, five community psychiatric hospitals, and 32 psychiatric services in general hospitals which will increase to 47 by 1969; six locally operated hospitals for severely handicapped children; and nursing homes providing care for more than 2,000 patients transformed from mental hospitals.

Much has already been said about the need for more widely spread facilities, but nothing is said by the Opposition about the provincial government's substantial maintenance grants to the charitable, children's institutions, and community psychiatric hospital legislation. This directly supports the community effort.

The Ontario Hospital in Hamilton serves five counties and the city of Hamilton and at the present time accommodates 1,652 patients. It is too large, and the area served is too large for one hospital to service. Ideally, it should be reduced to 600 beds provided in the new unit. At the present time there is little other accommodation in the area. There is a psychiatry unit in St. Catharines, there is one being developed at the general hospital in Niagara Falls and one is planned at the general hospital in Welland.

Incidentally, developments under way will provide for a 100-bed unit for the children in Chedoke hospital. It is admitted that there is a serious deficiency in the hospital, particularly in the numbers of professional staff. However, both official statements such as that of the grand jury, and the numerous private communications from relatives of patients, indicate that there is at least some appreciation of the care that is being given.

In 1965, 1,946 patients were admitted to the hospital and there is no indication that families or family physicians or private psychiatrists believe that it is a bad thing to do. Fifty per cent of the admissions were informal; that is the patients were not admitted under compulsion but went of their own free will. A considerable number of families, when requested to remove relatives to other accommodations, objected. In brief, there is little evidence that the people of the community feel that conditions are so deplorable. There is also not much evidence or sufficient community concern to utilize other existing facilities to provide care that could be given elsewhere, for example, in the drying out of alcoholics.

Shortage of professional staff is characteristic of most mental health services but perhaps is more acute in Hamilton at the present time because of recent changes. Discussions are presently going on with the Royal college of physicians and surgeons concerning the constituted use of Hamilton hospital for postgraduate training. It is hoped this hospital will be part of the new medical centre of McMaster University. It is strange too that in spite of the dire woeful things said by the Opposition about this hospital, the psychiatrists who had part of their training here, have a higher rate of certificate examination than in any other group. The care and treatment of the individual patient is a professional matter which is the responsibility of the attending physicians.

Mr. Speaker: Could I interrupt the member for a moment? I would draw to his attention that it is after six o'clock, so would he come perhaps to the concluding remarks of his address?

Mr. Bryden: If he had to summarize what was written for him, he would not know what to say.

Mr. Ewen: Well, it is obvious that ignorance is bliss. The member for Woodbine is—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Ewen: Mr. Speaker, I would have to vote against the proposal for an investigation because it would not serve any useful purpose in pointing out the deficiencies. We already know the problems and are working towards the solution. To be useful, an investigation would have to be done by people who might not be able to show and accept this shortcut to the solution of the problem.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 133

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 7, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

Price per session $3.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 7, 1966

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis 4393

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 4425

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to welcome visitors to the Legislature, and tonight we have in the Speaker's gallery west, a group of young Conservatives from the Waterloo South riding. I would ask the member for Armourdale if he would introduce his guests in the west gallery.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House would join me in welcoming the gathering in the west gallery. We have two things in common; we are all lawyers and we live in Armourdale riding. Beyond that I will not go any further. But knowing the humanitarian qualities of the lawyers, and knowing that we do like to help everyone, I am sure that all parties have some supporters in that distinguished group.

Clerk of the House: The 28th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, it is with a particular sense of privilege that I rise to present the estimates of The Department of Education for the fiscal year of 1966-67. It will, I am sure, be of great interest to the members of this assembly to be reminded that this is the 150th consecutive occasion on which this House has considered provincial expenditures for education in a public school system. In fact, only one or two of the Maritime provinces have a better record in this country, and a few of the States to the south, but I think it may be asserted with some pride that very few other jurisdictions in the world, actually have a longer record of support for public education.

It was on April 1, 1816, that Royal assent was given to a bill entitled: An Act granting to His Majesty a sum of money to be applied to the use of common schools throughout the province, and to provide for the regulation of said common schools.

The passage of this Act, Mr. Chairman, was the culmination of a long campaign by the then citizens of the province of Upper Canada, which began with memorials presented to the first seven-man Legislature, which met in 1792 in Niagara-on-the-Lake. At that time, although some the United Empire Loyalists from New England had had experience with public schools, in Massachusetts particularly, there was far from a consensus that the government had any business in education. For most citizens of the time, the home and the church were responsible for elementary education. Schools as such were privately operated, and, of course, could only be attended by those whose parents could afford the fees.

In 1797, the Legislature did send a petition to King George III, asking that he set aside some 500,000 acres of Crown land for the support of grammar schools and a university. The King made the grant, but the Legislature dallied for ten years before it passed an Act setting up four grammar schools. These were only partly supported by grants, and depended on fees for the balance. They were unsatisfactory schools from the beginning, and were the source of continuous controversy for several decades.

Another nine years passed—24 after the first petition—before the Legislature of Upper Canada was persuaded that it had a duty to support elementary education in a public school system of the sort we have today, and passed the first Common Schools Act. The Act was drawn with such skill and wisdom that in spite of the enormous increase in the size and complexity of the Ontario school system a century and one-half later, the fundamental ideas are still the basis of Ontario's school organization and educational responsibility.

Hon. members will not be surprised to hear that provincial grants have undergirded public education in this province from the very beginning. The Act provided for an annual grant of $6,000—I am sure this would be good news to the Provincial Treasurer in this day and age—to aid schools in the various districts, later called counties, of which there were then ten. The salaries of teachers were set at £100—the first provincial salary schedule—to be paid from the government

grant. They thus envisaged not more than 60 teachers, to serve a general population of approximately 100,000. When the legislation was reviewed four years later, the grant total was cut to £2,000, so it is apparent that then, as now, some people were against progress.

The Act gave the people of any "town, township, village or place" the right to assemble and make arrangements to establish a school. You will note that the language did not include cities, because there were none, but you will also note that townships have been legal school areas in this province since its first public school legislation.

Having decided to do something about a school, the Act said that a competent number of citizens "shall unite and build or provide" a schoolhouse, provide at least 20 "scholars" and some of the money which they intended to pay the teacher—as evidence of good faith.

With eight days' notice these householders were directed to call a meeting in their neighbourhood, and they, or a majority of them, were to appoint three "fit and discreet" persons as trustees of the common school. The trustees, in turn, were given the power and authority to examine into the "moral character and capacity" of any person willing to become teacher of the common school, and having found one to "nominate and appoint" that person.

Another feature of the Act was the establishment of district boards of education, which were composed of five citizens in each district or county, appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor. Their function was to receive and distribute the grants, to supervise textbooks and other books used in the schools and to set forth rules and regulations for the operation of the schools themselves. Trustees had to give the boards of education adequate reasons for dismissing a teacher before this could occur. This was educational job security, 1816-style.

There were no school taxes, of course, but fees were imposed for part of the cost not covered by the government grant. Trustees could also take action to enforce the payment of pledges made toward the cost of building a physical plant.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, we look back today on this long perspective of 150 years of Ontario education. We may note that the partnership of government and local representatives of the citizens for education has gone back to the beginning. Boards of school trustees have always been separate from municipal councils. Government aid to education has existed from the beginning. Even the title "board of education" has always been in Ontario school terminology, although now with a slightly different meaning, and today's government is again encouraging the formation of larger units of administration as the best means of providing good education.

This year's Education estimates are noteworthy for another reason, in that for the first time in our history they will exceed half a billion dollars. What an inconceivable sum that would have seemed in 1816! Hon. members may be interested to know that this is more than the government of United States and the whole western world was spending for all purposes in that year.

This large sum indicates the importance attached by this province to the education of its people—not simply of the boys and girls and of our youth, but of our adult population as well. Someone has said that mightier than an army with banners is an idea whose time has come. The belief that education today is of urgent concern not only to the life of an individual but to the economic health of the nation as well, is assuredly such an idea. Governments all over the world are giving schooling at all levels a high priority. Ontario with its swiftly expanding population and its varied pattern of industry can be no exception to this rule.

During the past year I have discussed common problems in education with administrators in a number of jurisdictions. The economic factor I have mentioned is undoubtedly receiving increased attention wherever one turns. These questions keep recurring: What jobs will need to be filled in the years ahead? What skills and abilities should be established? What provision should be made for further education, for retraining, for in-service updating? What changes in school programmes should be made in the light of automation, of data processing and computers, of the explosion in scientific knowledge? What new courses and what new institutions are required? All of these, and a hundred like questions, are of importance to us all, since it is obvious that a livelihood must be gained before we can live a full and satisfying life.

But at the outset of these remarks I would emphasize that education is a matter of people as well as jobs. It concerns things of the mind and spirit as well as the work bench and the office desk. The civilization of which we are a part has come to greatness and wealth on account of its material growth and because of its command of energy in its various forms, but in the long run it will be remembered for its intellectual and cultural achievements. Its marvellous machines will

impress posterity less than the quality of the minds and talents which its educational systems developed.

Education has its present duties, but it has as great a responsibility in handing on the traditions and intellectual heritage of the past to the bright young people of this new age. As one English philosopher has observed:

> What more important service can schools or universities do for their pupils than show them the best things that have been done, thought and written in the world, and fix these in their minds as a standard and test to guide them in life?

Against this background, then, of a changing education and a changing economic pattern in a technological age, we must keep well in front of our thinking the varied needs of the individual child, youth, and adult—needs that relate not only to his role as a worker, important as that is, but also to his life as a member of a family, a community, and the human race.

In reviewing the current activities of The Department of Education on this occasion, I propose to organize my comments under four headings: 1. Programmes and courses; 2. Extension of educational opportunities; 3. Progress in reorganization; 4. Studies and research.

During the past year, a distinguished jurist, the Hon. Mr. Justice Emmett M. Hall, a justice of the supreme court of Canada, has chaired a provincial committee on aims and objectives in the schools of Ontario. This committee of 21 broadly representative members, of whom only six are professional educators, is seeking to establish what the citizens of Ontario should ask of their schools.

Its terms of reference relate to the needs of the child as a person and a member of society, the aims of the school system, and the objectives in particular for the curriculum for children from kindergarten to grade 6, but also beyond that to encompass the whole programme in all the grades.

The significance of this survey cannot be exaggerated. In an age of rapid and far-reaching change, which will undoubtedly surround the children of today for the later decades of their lives, it is essential that we try as best we can to give them the educational foundation which will enable them to live successfully on into the 21st century.

The committee has at this date received 27 submissions from organizations and 20 from individuals. It has held sittings covering a total of 16 days in Ottawa, London, Toronto and Sudbury. Its work is proceeding, and it is anticipated that its report will be ready in the spring of 1967. I am confident that the product of the committee's research and deliberations will provide useful guidelines for the future development of the curriculum in our school system.

As an interim measure, pending the receipt of the Hall committee report, some updating of the courses of study for the kindergarten and up to grade 6 is being undertaken by the staff of the curriculum division of the department, in consultation with inspectors, teachers' college staffs, teachers and the Ontario teachers' federation. The principal purposes of the interim revision are to draw to the attention of the teachers recent curriculum changes, to introduce some new content, and to suggest new approaches. It is not expected that the revision will be of such scope as to require extensive teacher retraining, or the development of new textbooks at this time.

It will be remembered that the grade 13 study committee, among a considerable number of recommendations, most of which have been implemented, suggested that the feasibility of providing advanced and general levels of instruction in grade 13 be explored. The department agreed, and a committee in each major subject was appointed to prepare during the latter part of the past year tentative course outlines, for examination by schools and universities, as an indication of what sort of programme was in mind.

In addition, a representative committee was set up, including department officials and representatives of the teaching profession, administrators, the universities and others, to give consideration to the proposal on a general basis. This committee received representations from various quarters, and the fairly unanimous decision was that the general and advanced course proposal would not be feasible, either from the standpoint of the schools, or, more particularly, of the universities. The idea has therefore been abandoned.

Another suggestion of the grade 13 study committee was the eventual reorganization of the curriculum in Ontario schools so as to cover in 12 years the courses of study now being taught in 13 years. As every member of this House knows, there has been considerable discussion of this idea among the public, chiefly because most of the other provinces handle their elementary and secondary education in this 12-year period. Actually, the proposal has been under discussion for much longer than the last two

years. In 1960, the university matriculation board, which consists of the presidents of Ontario universities and certain officials of The Department of Education, appointed a committee which comprised representatives of the universities, the department and the secondary schools to examine the system of grade 13 examinations, with reference to (a) the difficulty of marking increasing numbers of papers, and (b) the belief that the nature of the examinations and the type of education they foster in grade 13 and preceding years leave room for improvement.

The committee in the course of its investigations found it desirable to explore academic opinion on a number of additional questions. As a result of opinions received from a broadly representative group of school and university people, the committee recommended that serious consideration be given to the reduction of the 13-year programme to cover approximately the same material in 12 years.

It may be noted that the heads of universities were not at that time able to make definite comparisons of the preparation and achievement of students who had come from the 12-year senior matriculation programmes as compared with Ontario's 13-year programme. The main reason for this inability was the relatively small number of such students and their wide dispersal over many faculties and courses. The recommendation for reorganization of the 13-year programme to a 12-year programme was made by the grade 13 study committee in 1964 as part of its "ideal solution" for the problems of grade 13. Later the university matriculation board urged that this change can be made more speedily than was envisaged by the study committee.

However, Mr. Chairman, I should like to sound a note of caution at this point, lest hon. members and the public form too hasty an impression. I am sure that members of this House will readily understand the extreme complexity of reorganizing a 13-grade system into a 12-grade system without serious disruption in the schools and without sacrificing present standards. In any change it is important that curriculum builders should be able to make ample provision for individual differences and the varying rates of growth in students, and to take advantage of the new technological aids in education. The timing of a change of this magnitude is most important. You are all aware that we are now beginning to establish the colleges of applied arts and technology in several centres across the province. And, as I mentioned a moment ago, the Hall committee on aims and objectives is proceeding with its inquiry, and it will almost inevitably have some views on this question. These two factors alone, not to mention the interests of the universities in this serious matter, add many difficulties to immediate implementation of the change being discussed.

In any matter as important as this, where careful planning is necessary, and where the support of the whole teaching profession is vital, considerable time is required both to organize the project and to see that it is, in fact, properly implemented. I might note before concluding this section of my comments that a great many informed educators, including the grade 13 study committee itself, do believe that the Ontario grade 13 classes are an educational asset which has great merit. Any reforms which may be undertaken will not be simply to lop off the subject matter taught in the 13th year, which would be a grave disservice to our young people. It is to be assumed that the 12-year programme —if it is undertaken—will be devised so that our students will have a standing at approximately the same point as they are at the end of grade 13, as it presently exists.

Mr. Chairman, members of this House will recall, of course, that about the end of March, I announced that it had been decided to discontinue the grade 13 external examination, the policy to be effective in 1968. It has been increasingly felt that the pressure of preparation for the examination has so altered the purpose of the fifth year that fundamental, and quite frankly, even drastic, measures were justified. It is hoped that in future our senior students will be able to deal with their studies in depth and breadth, so that they will be better prepared for the methods of university study, or, if they do not intend to take up university work, will still enrich and strengthen the quality of their later life. The function of the examination will be fulfilled by the use of the whole school record of the student, supplemented by scholastic aptitude and achievement tests, which are being developed by the newly-formed Canadian service for admission to college and university. The tests will be similar to ones which have been used in the United States for more than 30 years. It is hoped that by taking the emphasis off the mere passing of the examination and replacing it on the opportunity for learning, we shall best aid our students to reach their educational fulfilment.

I should like to turn now to other aspects of the Ontario school programme. The de-

velopment of new courses at the secondary school level continues. Among these are courses in data processing and electronics for students in the science, technology and trades branch. An example of an experimental course which is planned for introduction on a voluntary basis this coming September is one in computer science for senior students in the five-year programme.

This course is intended to familiarize students with the relationships among mathematics, computers and problem solving. It is being developed by university computer scientists, teachers of mathematics and science, and departmental staff.

In the reorganization of the secondary school programme several years ago, provision was made for the establishment of occupational classes of one or two years' duration for students whose interests or aptitudes did not warrant their pursuit of the four- or five-year courses. Classes of this type are filling a distinct need, and two or more of them have been established in some 300 composite or vocational schools in the past four years. In addition, 38 special vocational schools specifically designed to meet the needs of these students have been constructed or are in the planning stage. Twenty-one thousand boys and girls are at present enrolled in occupational classes and special vocational schools.

In view of the rapid expansion of this phase of the secondary school curriculum, a consultative committee to study the entire occupations programme and to identify the specific needs of its students was set up last December. The committee includes in its membership representatives of the school of social work of the University of Toronto, the adult training counselling centre of the Toronto board of education, the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto, and members of The Department of Education's youth branch and supervision and curriculum divisions.

I note the composition of this committee, Mr. Chairman, with special interest because it is indicative of a developing trend towards an inter-disciplinary approach towards solving problems affecting our children and young people. For too long the teacher, the social worker, and the medical doctor has each laboured earnestly in his own field in the best interests of the same child or youth. Today, these professions upon their own volition are more and more frequently coming together for a combined approach to common problems.

The committee on the occupations programme is an example of educators and social workers combining forces. The development of our courses in health and of the reorganization of classes in hospital schools are examples of the medical and teaching professions working together.

The teaching of French to English-speaking pupils in the elementary schools has continued to grow on the experimental basis upon which it began. In fact, it has now gone past the experimental phase, and this September it will become a recognized option for English-speaking students in grades 7 and 8 with defined courses of study. Outlines for these courses have been prepared and will be distributed to the schools well in advance of the opening of the new school year.

Instruction in grades below grade 7 will continue to be approved in centres where this practice is desired and where the service of competent staff is available.

In connection with the recruiting and training of staff in this subject field, I am pleased to report that summer courses will again be held in Ottawa and Toronto this summer, and that the pilot course involving a group of students with facility in French at the Ottawa teachers' college in 1964 was so successful that it has not only continued, but its work is now supplemented by similar courses operated for selected groups in the teachers' colleges in Toronto, New Toronto and Windsor.

Members of the Legislature will also be interested to learn that a six-week "immersion" course in conversational French is being offered at the Elliot Lake centre for continuing education this summer for which at this date 91 elementary and 69 secondary teachers have applied. By "immersion" course in this case is meant a programme characterized by the use of "French only," from morning to night in classes, in the dining hall, and in recreational and cultural activities. The new residential centre in Elliot Lake should provide an excellent setting for this course which will be attended by teachers who will actually be teaching French in the elementary and secondary schools of the province in the next school year.

At a time when many adults are pursuing the study of conversational French, it will interest you to know that secondary school instruction in the subject is giving special emphasis to oral use of the language. For a number of years a dictation exercise on a record has been a successful part of the grade

13 French examination. Two years ago, the use of the record was extended to provide a listening comprehension test. This year a pilot project in administering an oral French test by travelling examiners is being tried out with the co-operation of principals and teachers in part of northwestern Ontario and in the county of Simcoe. The results of this experiment will receive careful study in the department.

Keeping ahead of changes in curriculum, due to the rapidly increasing fund of new knowledge, is probably no more difficult than keeping ahead of the growing numbers of children coming to school age. In our elementary and secondary schools, the total of pupils in attendance is approximately 1,750,000. More pupils mean more buildings and in 1965 there were 480 elementary and 69 secondary school projects completed, at a cost of $84.5 million and $59.5 million, respectively. This investment provided some 84,000 additional elementary school places, and about 17,000 additional secondary school places, and about 17,000 additional secondary school places.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members would be interested in a brief report on some of the changes which followed the passing of Bill 54, which made the township the smallest public school administrative area, except in the unorganized parts of the north country.

In September of last year, the enrolment of pupils in public and separate schools in Ontario was 1,320,000. Of this total, and I think it is of some significance, 97.1 per cent were being educated in graded schools of two or more classrooms, and 93.2 per cent in graded schools of four or more classrooms.

When the provisions of Bill 54 came into operation on January 1, 1965, the number of administrative units for public schools was drastically reduced. These larger units were encouraged to provide centrally located graded schools to replace many of the small schools. In September, 1964, there were 1,931 one-roomed schools in operation. By September 1965, after the provisions of Bill 54 had been in operation for only eight months, this number had been reduced by 30 per cent to 1,346.

The total number of public schools with two, three or four rooms was also reduced, and the number of public schools with six or more classrooms was increased during the one-year period from September 1964 to September 1965 from 1,873 to 1,968.

The new policy provided for the merging of two or more townships or parts of townships into county public school areas and district public school areas, neither of which, however, had to cover the whole area of the county or district to use the name. During 1964 and 1965, 11 county school areas and two district school areas were formed. This action brought 438 former school sections under the jurisdiction of 13 new boards.

To mitigate the expense of implementing the new policy, the department makes a special grant to each board of a larger unit of administration of up to $500 for each former school section or separate school zone included in the larger unit.

The continuing expansion of the enrolment and the continuing change and modernization of the curriculum both affect the teaching staff of the Ontario school system very directly. It is one thing to introduce new courses; it is quite another thing to assure that competent instruction can be provided, unless steps are taken to arrange for the updating and in-service training of teachers.

To assist teachers in keeping themselves abreast of new approaches in curricula, a variety of means has been used. Some 1,600 secondary school teachers, for example, have taken updating courses in physics, biology and mathematics, thanks to the opportunity to do so being offered by the universities.

The Department of Education, through its staff and with the co-operation of the Ontario secondary school teachers federation, has organized workshops in new courses in many centres across the province. These have involved some 600 teachers.

With respect to the supply of teachers for our schools, Mr. Chairman, it is fully expected that the number available for public schools generally meets the need, but the demand in the separate schools is still greater than the supply. Special summer courses continue to be necessary to maintain the required number of instructors in the secondary schools. Action is being taken to meet these problems.

Enrolment in the one-year courses at the teachers' colleges increased from 3,868 in 1964 to 4,558 in 1965, thereby making more teachers available for our elementary schools in 1966 than last year. Among the student-teachers enrolled, I am pleased to say that there are approximately 300 more potential separate school teachers than in 1965.

An increasing number of university graduates continue to enrol in the summer courses leading to qualification for secondary school teaching, and in 1965 more than 2,200 can-

didates took their initial summer course at Kingston, London or Toronto.

The opening of the Althouse college of education in London in September, 1965, coupled with an increase in enrolment at the college of education in Toronto has made more teachers from the regular winter course available for the secondary schools this year. Plans are proceeding for the establishment of a third college of education—the McArthur College at Kingston, which will operate in affiliation with Queen's University.

A new flexibility has also been introduced in the preparation and certification of teachers in the past year. The movement of teachers holding BA degrees from positions in elementary schools to employment in secondary schools, or vice versa, has been facilitated by a ruling permitting a teacher of experience and holding a permanent certificate in either panel of the school system to apply for an interim certificate in the other panel if he or she obtains a contract requiring it. It is expected that most of these transfers will take place within the intermediate division—that is from grades 7 to 10, inclusive.

Another change has been a reduction in the number of options required for a high school assistant's certificate, type B, from three to two. This step was taken since experience has shown that relatively few secondary school teachers are instructing in more than two subject fields.

It has been traditional in our province for student-teachers holding a minimum of grade 13 standing to take the same course at the teachers' colleges whether they have been high-school graduates or graduates of a university. A change in this practice was introduced last September when two new experimental courses for student-teachers with Bachelor of Arts degrees were established.

At the Toronto teachers' college, 71 such students were enrolled in a course specifically designed for them and leading to an elementary school teacher's certificate, standard 4. At the London teachers' college, in co-operation with the Althouse college of education, 14 university graduates enrolled in a course leading to the same certificate, except that it is endorsed for the teaching of one option at the secondary school level as well.

Experience with these courses will determine whether they will be extended to other teachers' colleges in future. Such an extension is being made in regard to the primary specialist course which prepares kindergarten teachers and which has been offered only in Toronto since its inception in 1939. In September, 1966, it is planned to offer it at the teachers' colleges in Hamilton and Ottawa as well.

The last example of new flexibility in teacher training which I shall mention is the internship course which is to begin this spring. In brief, this course will permit boards of trustees in large centres to select and train as elementary school teachers mature persons holding a university degree and one further year of postgraduate work or special standing in music.

The internship will consist of practice teaching in May and June, a summer course provided by The Department of Education, internship in the sponsoring school system from September to December and regular duty as a teacher from December to June. A second summer course provided by The Department of Education will complete the training required for an elementary school teacher's certificate, standard 4.

Not many teachers will be prepared under this plan but it does open the door to the qualification as teachers of mature persons, with backgrounds of exceptional value, who might otherwise never become available as staff members for our schools.

A significant report on the training of elementary school teachers became available in March of this year. Several of the innovations I have just described have been inspired by suggestions of the report. I should like again to express my thanks to Mr. C. R. MacLeod, superintendent of public schools in the city of Windsor, and his associates on the committee which produced this report, for their excellent work.

Members will recall that I made an extended statement on the report when it was tabled in the House on March 29. At the time, I noted that while the report recommended that certification of teachers should remain the responsibility of the Minister of Education, it also urged that programmes for teacher education should eventually be provided by the universities, which should, where feasible, offer both elementary and secondary teacher education within the same faculty.

At that time, Mr. Chairman, I said I was completely in agreement with this suggestion, and this remains my view. I believe, as I then said, that:

> If all Ontario schools can be staffed by university graduates, we shall have teachers who are more mature, better educated and better equipped to meet the challenge of preparing our children to take their place in our rapidly changing society.

To be sure, there is no magic wand which would bring about this desirable reform overnight, but the groundwork for this objective is being laid at this time, and our teacher-training policy is being built upon it.

The education of teachers for elementary schools attended by French-speaking pupils received special attention in this report, and its recommendation that a two-year training course be established at the University of Ottawa teachers' college for candidates entering the college from grade 12 will be implemented in September, 1966.

Before I leave this question of teacher training, I should like to refer to a little known service which the province of Ontario has been performing, and which very directly reflects the opinion which outsiders have of the quality of our programme of teacher preparation.

Members of this House might be interested to know of the close relationship which has existed for many years between Ontario and Bermuda in the field of education. Since 1941, we have had the pleasure of having more than 300 Bermuda teachers-in-training in attendance at the Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa teachers' colleges; this year we had 13 at Ottawa. I am informed that these young people have made a fine contribution to Commonwealth understanding during their stay in our province.

Some of these teachers return for additional training—for example, to take the primary specialist course—and a number will attend summer courses in 1966 and 1967 for special training in primary methods in junior education, and as elementary school principals.

Our co-operation with Bermuda has increased during the past year. A teacher from the Ontario school for the deaf at Belleville is now on loan to The Bermuda Department of Education to give advice and help in the teaching of language, speech, and regular school subjects for deaf children. In addition, a blind child from Bermuda is now in attendance at the Ontario school for the blind at Brantford.

The director of education for Bermuda visited our province earlier this year, met with senior officials of The Department of Education and visited Ontario educational institutions. I am proud to think that Ontario has been able in this small manner to be of service to another member of our Commonwealth family and I am looking forward to increasing friendly and co-operative relations with our sister member in the future.

I must point out that it is very difficult to cover all the various facets of The Department of Education in the relatively brief period of time, and I have taken these four rather general areas and I fully appreciate that the members opposite will wish to deal with specific items in great detail when we get into the estimates.

Among activities in the extension of educational opportunities, sir, the provision for post-secondary education apart from the universities continues to be a major concern of the government. A year ago, in fact, just a little less than a year ago, this Legislature passed a bill providing enabling legislation for the establishment and operation of a system of colleges of applied arts and technology In the intervening period regulations have been established and the provincial council of regents for these institutions under the chairmanship of Dr. Howard Kerr, the first principal of Ryerson polytechnical institute, has been appointed and has begun its work.

Many communities have expressed interest in having one of the colleges located within their boundaries. As I have previously indicated, it is obvious that a provincewide system cannot be developed overnight, but I can assure you that the intention is to get at least eight of the colleges into operation as soon as possible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister permit a question? He refers to these eight colleges that he wants to get into operation as soon as possible. Will these, in every case, be entirely new institutions, or will they be developments of the older ones?

Mr. Davis: I will get to this a little later.

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry.

Mr. Davis: From time to time I gain the impression that there is uncertainty among some people regarding the educational role of these proposed institutions. While there will be a diversity from college to college, the fundamental objectives remain those which I outlined in the statement I made to the Legislature on May 21, 1965, and which seem to require no repetition at this time.

In the year since the legislation was introduced, the plans for the colleges have made considerable progress.

Basing their choice of boundaries on the ten areas of the province already outlined for economic development, the provincial council of regents has divided the province into 18 college districts, with priority for im-

mediate implementation being given to eight: to the five in which facilities already exist—Windsor, London, Hamilton, Kirkland Lake and Ottawa—and to Scarborough, North York and York county and the Lambton-Sarnia area.

Because of special problems, the city of Toronto and Forest Hill village have been excluded. At the present moment, the council of regents is studying the possibility of combining the present provincial institutes of trades, the provincial institute of trades and occupations and the provincial institute of automotive and allied trades with the proposed city of Toronto adult education centre, into a Toronto city college with its own board of governors.

Boards of governors for many of the college districts have already been appointed, with further appointments expected momentarily; consequently we can reasonably expect a number of college courses, some of which are already being developed by the department, to be in operation this coming fall.

The department's chief concern at the moment is a two-year course that may satisfy two demands: Occupational needs to meet the need for trained manpower within the province, and the general education studies made necessary by an age of rapid and unpredictable change; the two-year technician courses already in operation in the institutes of trades and vocational centres, and the two-year courses in the applied arts; preschool teacher training; journalism, hotel, restaurant and resort management and so on. Further expansion of the three-year courses now well established in the institutes of technology is also to be expected, along with the introduction, into the new colleges, of a great variety of shorter courses of both the day and evening school types.

So much for the immediate future. It is intended that existing post-secondary technical and vocational institutions will in almost all cases be integrated with the colleges of applied arts and technology. In the meantime, I think I should draw the hon. members' attention to their continuing record.

As many of the members know, institutes of technology operated by the department are located in Haileybury, Hamilton, Kirkland Lake, Ottawa and Windsor. These are in addition to the Ryerson polytechnical institute which is administered by its own board of governors, and the technological programme of the Lakehead University.

Including those students enrolled in first year institute of technology courses offered in certain secondary schools, well over 7,000 full-time students are at present engaged in technology level programmes. Enrolments continue to increase, and an addition to the provincial institute of mining and new quarters for institutes of technology in Kirkland Lake and Windsor have been approved for planning. Tenders have been called for a technical centre to include new accommodation for the institute of technology in Hamilton, eventually this to be a complete college of applied arts and technology.

Extension classes for adults are a second function of the institutes. Since the advanced technical evening class programme was reorganized a year ago on a three-certificate pattern to parallel the three-year course in engineering technology, its enrolment in the institutes and certain secondary schools has increased by some 70 per cent.

Programme 5 deals with the education of the unemployed; the federal-provincial programme deals with the education of managers, supervisors and general employees. And, in this connection, the department works closely with business and industry. A substantial number of courses are in operation and more are being planned. Three types of courses are provided: academic and skill upgrading for employees in service, courses in supervision for supervisory personnel, and management courses for owners and managers of small and medium-sized businesses. These training courses steadily grow in popularity.

The vocational centres opened in London and Ottawa two years ago, and in Sault Ste. Marie this past September, have extended another type of post-secondary to students in those general areas. These centres offer technician and equivalent commercial courses which emphasize the "know why" as well as the "know how" with respect to technical processes and business procedures.

Under the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreements, programme 5 continues to operate for the training of the unemployed. Present enrolment in its courses is up sharply over that of last year. An additional building has been opened in Toronto which will accommodate 1,200 trainees, and new quarters have been provided in Port Arthur and Windsor, and the London centre will soon be moved into a fine new building. In Toronto, a site, as I mentioned earlier, for a new adult education centre has been obtained, and planning is proceeding actively.

In several areas, special courses under this

programme are now being given for newcomers to Canada. The success of the adult counselling centre in Toronto has led to the encouragement of an expanded counselling service in other communities where programme 5 courses are offered.

By this time, hon. members need scarcely be reminded that practically all of the facilities, including the colleges of applied arts and technology, have been and will be built and operated under the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreements, which have done so much to stimulate the development of all forms of technical and vocational education. I might say that in view of the heavy and very natural interest which the federal government has in the provision of adequate trained manpower, that there should be a continual review of the cost-sharing aspects of manpower training. Although, at the moment, we must allow for a certain confusion attendant on the reorganization of the vocational training branch and its integration into the new Department of Manpower at Ottawa, it must be said that attention to suggestions made by the provinces, and fully supported by Ontario, has been less than dynamic in the last three years.

It might be of value to the members if I took a moment to review this question, as it has been developing. Hon. members will recall that, although on a much larger scale, the present technical and vocational agreements are an extension of similar agreements originally drawn up in 1919, and which had strongly encouraged our early technical school development, after World War I. The present scheme, as most of you know, is divided into programmes beginning with the building of secondary school facilities in technical and vocational education, and continuing through programmes for training and retraining adults unemployed or displaced by changing occupational patterns, to programme 10, which was added during the last year, and provided for a federal-provincial sharing of the cost of research into matters relevant to technical and vocational education.

The Ontario government immediately recognized the opportunity provided by the 1961 agreements, and undertook a far-reaching programme of construction of technical and vocational schools of various types. In the early stages, the federal government offered to reimburse provinces for 75 per cent of these expenditures, on schools completed before April 30, 1963. When it was realized that a considerable proportion of the projects undertaken would not be finished before the deadline, due to planning and construction delays, the ten Ministers of Education requested the federal government to extend the deadline. This was done on February 14, 1963, the new date being October 1, 1963, and the 75-25 per cent partnership continued on contracts awarded after April 1, 1963. The cost-sharing ratios, as they affect Ontario have been altered, and are now on a 50-50 basis.

At the annual convention of the Canadian education association, held in Quebec in September, 1963, the standing committee of Ministers of Education discussed the technical and vocational training agreements and came to two conclusions, expressed in the form of resolutions.

The first of these noted that federal grants and subsidies to the provinces for specific educational projects and purposes, which were by law under provincial jurisdiction, in some degree imposed federal policies upon education in the provinces. The complex arrangements by which such grants and subsidies were administered were, moreover, costly and duplicative. The Ministers, of whom I was one, then asked the federal government to adopt an adequate system for financing these projects, either through fiscal arrangements for sharing revenues, or through grants and subsidies of a more general nature than the closely controlled types in existence. The other resolution noted that although the original provision for building and equipping facilities under the vocational high school training programme, that is, programme 1, was general as to capital costs, there was little or no assistance for current expenditures on this expensive form of education. The Ministers then asked for a substantially increased federal contribution toward operating costs.

Nothing having happened, the Ministers, meeting in Winnipeg in 1964, again asked for assistance in the operating costs of secondary vocational and technical schools, suggesting a rate of 50 per cent. They also asked for increased grants toward the training of technical and vocational teachers.

Again in Fredericton, in 1965 the standing committee found it necessary to repeat the same request for aid in the operating costs of running technical schools. Although there was a most agreeable response from the then federal Minister of Labour, no action was taken by the federal government.

The federal government did announce early this year, in a communication to the stand-

ing committee of Ministers of Education, that the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreements would be extended until 1970, but still withheld a decision on the request for additional aid with operating costs of secondary technical schools.

I want to point out some of the magnitude of this problem, Mr. Chairman, in case some of the hon. members think that we are spending too much time on this particular aspect. The operating costs of secondary vocational and technical schools in Ontario amount currently to $180 million a year. To this huge sum, the federal government contributes to the relief of school taxpayers the sum of $870,000. There does not seem to be any need to labour the point further.

A further and very intensive discussion of the whole question of education and manpower is to be held at the forthcoming invitational conference on education and development in Montreal this coming September. It may be recalled that I mentioned this conference on March 29, in this House. It is hoped that the respective roles of the federal and provincial governments in the fields of education related to development will be clarified. Discussions will be held on the relationship of education to economic and social goals; the relationship between education and industry; education and the development of public and community services; on the retraining of manpower and continuing education; on training and the new educational technology; on educational research and development needs and opportunities, and finally, on the adaptation of post-secondary and higher education to the needs of professional manpower development. Although the conference will be sponsored by the standing committee of Ministers of Education, it is anticipated that there will be active federal co-operation through appropriate channels.

I should now like to return, Mr. Chairman, after this digression, to our consideration of the extension of educational opportunities in the province. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with legislation, every part of southern Ontario is now included in a high school district. The same cannot be said of northern Ontario, where some great areas are sparsely populated, and where the nearest secondary school may be quite a distance from a family's home. Last year, legislation was passed permitting elementary school boards in territorial districts to pay $3 a day for room and board to assist pupils from local school sections who are not resident in a high school district to attend a publicly supported secondary school 15 miles or more from their homes.

Where a school board pays such assistance, the department pays its grant percentage on the amount so disbursed. Study is now being given to the possibility of helping in a similar way students who are not resident in a high school district, who live in unorganized townships in the north, and who are not resident in a school section. The province already pays the tuition fees of non-resident students from the territorial districts when they attend secondary school. At the post-secondary level, students in northern Ontario are assisted by the province in meeting the cost of travel to university or technical institute centres.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the study that I indicated earlier was under way has ben finalized and the legislation introduced this afternoon paves the way for these students in the territorial districts to receive this financial assistance.

Another promising experiment is the northern corps of teachers, which was started this spring. This experimental programme will provide qualified teachers for isolated one-room schools in the more remote parts of our province. To date, 16 teachers have been recommended for schools which have had a history of unqualified teachers, or in one or two cases where a school just did not operate because a teacher was not available.

A special programme of assistance to these boards in isolated areas and to the teachers involved has been instituted. In the latter part of August, the teachers selected will be offered a special course at North Bay to orient them to their task and to provide information and materials to make them more effective in the special work which they have undertaken.

What may well become one of the most significant and far-reaching programmes for the extension of educational opportunities is the now actively operating unit for educational television. Of course, the department has long been involved in educational radio and television, in collaboration with the Canadian broadcasting corporation and private stations, but we are planning to go much further than ever before.

In addition to the regularly scheduled school programmes, which have been continued for so many years, we have recently been trying some special experiments with television. To help teachers and students with the new physics course in grade 13, a series of seventeen educational television broadcasts have been provided, sir, by The Department of Education on Saturday

mornings, begining last January. In the elementary school field, television broadcasts on Monday mornings have been provided in the new mathematics in Grade 7. The question of in-service training of teachers by the use of television is under serious study.

At present, we are actively exploring educational television in the general field of instruction, not only in introducing new courses, but across the whole range of preschool, elementary, secondary, technical, university and adult education. We are in process of developing plans for our own production and transmitting facilities, but meanwhile are appreciative of the kind of co-operation of the CBC and CFTO-TV whose studios have been available for production purposes.

I am pleased to say the grade 7 mathematics and grade 13 physics series, broadcast in 1965-66, have been well received by teachers and pupils. Plans are underway for broadcasting approximately 150 programmes in 1966-67.

At the elementary level, these will include two series in the kindergarten to grade 6 area, one in mathematics, and one in social studies, and a grade 8 mathematics series.

For secondary school students, there will be programmes dealing with English and technical subjects of the four-year programme and grade 13 biology. The grade 13 physics series presented last year will be revised and extended. A series in social studies for bilingual schools is also in preparation.

In addition, programmes are being developed to assist teachers in updating in several courses and will be broadcast in English and in French to reach as many teachers as possible.

To meet our current commitments and to plan future projects, the educational television section has been greatly expanded in personnel and facilities. ETV production units have been formed to carry out our programme plans. These units are comprised of curriculum specialists, television producers, and programme writers.

Programme development and research within the curriculum division is now completed for the next school year. Production is underway, and it is expected that recording and filming of programme lessons will start this month.

Technical studies of UHF Channel 19 having been completed, an application for a broadcast licence has been filed with The Department of Transport for referral to the board of broadcast governors. We have received acknowledgment of the application from The Department of Transport and now await notification of the date when the application will be heard by the board of broadcast governors.

In an age when rapid communication of important ideas and events is so essential in daily living and towards better national and international understanding, the contribution of television in the education of our children is certain to grow and expand.

In connection with these plans, it was my privilege to lead an Ontario group on a 22-day fact-finding mission to Europe, last June. The most positive purpose was to study European educational television, in countries where it was most fully developed. We took the opportunity of looking into new developments in other fields as well in Italy, West Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark and Great Britain.

Italy has a specially well-developed programme of educational television. Its primary purpose is to seek to eliminate illiteracy in both children and adults, mainly in the poverty-stricken south.

Courses are handled by a combination of television and correspondence. The reception by children is supervised in local areas by the best person available. Broadcasting is done several hours each day. Special textbooks have been written for the use of the supervising co-ordinators, who are somewhat less than teachers in their local function.

Once a year, the students are taken to Rome to meet their television teachers in person, and their co-ordinators also go for a sort of in-service training.

Italy also offers a TV course for adult illiterates, which aims to teach adults to read and write at the primary school level, but is also used as a refresher course, and for bringing older persons up to date. These two programmes really constitute the primary school function in some Italian regions. They cover all of the course. There are 15,000 viewing centres, and about 40,000 pupils, in the three grades.

In Britain, more ambitious proposals were in motion. There, the British government is planning a university of the air, to be carried over a national educational broadcasting system, for adults wishing to further their education, and leading to the possibility of graduation at the BA level.

The British broadcasting corporation has been conducting TV educational programmes for many years, but is planning a substantial increase.

All officials interviewed were in agreement

that more and more schools were using the ETV broadcasts, and that the teaching aids prepared for teachers were in increasing demand.

Curriculum and television producing officials on the trip benefited from the new points of view, and returned with broadened ideas on the potentialities of television education.

Back in our own province, I am pleased to report that opportunities continue to improve for the education of pupils with handicaps of various kinds. Each year more and more school boards are providing special educational classes and are expanding the services for exceptional pupils. The number of special classes in operation in elementary schools and approved for auxiliary grants during the present school year totals 1,450, more than double the number in existence only six years ago.

More special education classes have created an increased demand for teachers trained to instruct in them. Last summer some 1,255 teachers attended the summer school training programme in auxiliary education. The recently introduced courses for teachers working with emotionally disturbed children and for those instructing neurologically impaired pupils have been successful and will be offered again this summer.

The department is also co-operating with the parents association for children with learning disabilities in the provision of a special one-week training programme for teachers and parents of neurologically impaired children. The course thus co-sponsored proved so valuable last year that a similar experience is being arranged this summer.

A different kind of handicap from those previously provided for by auxiliary class units is the linguistic one in the case of pupils who are newcomers to Canada and who lack sufficient acquaintance with the English language to profit, or to profit fully, from their attendance in a regular class.

This year for the first time school boards will be given financial assistance to operate smaller classes for such pupils in charge of a teacher with special interest, experience or training in the teaching of English as a second language. It is expected that pupils will move from these special classes to the mainstream of instruction as soon as they have mastered sufficient English to pursue their studies in the regular way.

For some years The Department of Education and The Department of Citizenship have co-sponsored a summer course for training teachers of English as a second language. Most of the teachers so trained have taught English to adult newcomers to Canada in night school classes or in special summer courses operated by The Department of Citizenship, but now the new education units for teaching English to elementary school pupils who require such help will provide a new field for the exercise of the skills of these specially prepared teachers.

In speaking of special education, I want to mention the three residential schools operated by The Department of Education. The school for the blind at Brantford serves some 200 pupils for whom it provides a carefully designed programme. The facilities of this institution continue to improve; a modern dormitory unit for senior boys has been recently added to the campus and is in use this year for the first time.

A new vocational building has been added to the plant of the Ontario school for the deaf at Belleville, while the second and final stage of construction of the new school for the deaf at Milton is nearing completion.

The preschool education of deaf children is such an important phase of their learning experience that home-visiting teachers have recently been added to the staffs of both our schools for the deaf. These persons are skilled and experienced teachers of the deaf who have taken additional training to prepare them to assist parents in the home training of preschool deaf children. They travel across the province visiting homes that are distant from Brantford or Milton. Weekly clinics are held at each of the schools for the deaf for parents who are within commuting distance of these centres.

Mention was made, Mr. Chairman, in the speech from the Throne of improved educational opportunities for Indian children and youth. The joint project of the federal and provincial governments at Moosonee, whereby an education and community centre is being provided in conjunction with the existing public and separate schools, is being pressed forward. The building to be provided will be joined by covered walkways to both of the elementary schools, and will provide educational services for the Indian and non-Indian population of the area.

Plans for the building and programme are being worked out in consultation with the residents of Moosonee with a view to providing facilities for occupational training, preschool classes, adult programmes and recreation. Since instruction in the elementary schools is in English, emphasis will be placed

in the preschool classes upon developing in the young children acquaintance with English in preparation for the instruction they will receive upon entering regular school.

Education can no longer be considered at an end upon graduation from school or university. Agencies for adult education are, therefore, faced with heavier and heavier demands on their resources for the academic, recreational and cultural development of our mature citizens. In this field, I would remind you of the expanding activities of the library, correspondence courses and community programmes divisions of The Department of Education, as well as of the youth branch and two self-governing bodies, the Ontario council for the arts and the Elliot Lake centre for continuing education.

A new day is dawning, I hope, for the library service of Ontario. A thorough study has been made of the situation at present existing in this field, and the steps required to meet the growing needs. This survey was conducted under the auspices of the Ontario library association with support from a grant from The Department of Education, and was carried out by Mr. Francis R. St. John, a distinguished library expert from the United States. The report has had a distinct influence on the drafting of the revised Public Libraries Act, which will be considered by the Legislature and which was introduced this afternoon, and may also be expected to have increasing influence on the whole field of library services in the years immediately ahead. It was received with much favourable editorial comment and, I believe, general public approval.

The estimates before you provide for $5 million for grants to public library boards to further a library programme which will place particular emphasis on county and regional library services. The financial assistance is an increase of more than 50 per cent over that of last year. When I point out that more than 42 million books were circulated by Ontario public libraries in 1964, the role of the library service in the life of the province is significantly underlined.

More than 25,000 persons, the greater number of them employed adults, are enrolled in provincially provided correspondence courses. Begun some 40 years ago to provide instruction for elementary school pupils living out of reach of a school, these courses now are predominantly at the secondary school level and the enrollees are people who are upgrading their education to fit them for better jobs. The academic courses are free and textbooks are lent to students without charge up to the grade 12 level.

The department also offers theoretical courses which are useful to practising tradesmen in automotive mechanics, carpentry, machine shop practice and radio theory. A nominal charge of $10 per subject is made for these particular courses.

Our community programmes division is a service agency whose function is to assist municipalities to provide programmes of recreation and adult education. Among its responsibilities are: the training of directors for local recreation departments; the provision of consultants in the fields of art, crafts, drama and rural leadership; the organization of conferences such as the first Ontario craft conference which it held a year ago in cooperation with the Ontario council for the arts; and the oversight of the two Ontario leadership camps at Longford Mills and Irondale, and of the fitness and amateur sport programme.

It is apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the function of the community programmes division is likely to expand if the current trends evident in our society continue. The increase in leisure time in the present era is an obvious fact. To understand the significance of leisure in the fabric of society is most timely; to consider the implications of increased leisure to all the citizens of this province is most important; and to provide an opportunity to analyze the whole dimension of leisure and its use is critical.

To this end I will convene the Minister's conference on recreation in Toronto on November 10, 11 and 12, 1966. The theme of the conference will be: The significance of leisure in our society—today and tomorrow. The conference will provide a vehicle by which community leaders and elected officials will have the opportunity of listening to and analyzing the views of outstanding international authorities in the fields of recreation, education, sociology, planning and economics.

It is expected that this conference will result in greater public knowledge and, I hope, appreciation of the values and importance of the creative use of leisure time, and of the opportunities which are available for the pursuit of meaningful programmes. The administrative staff of the community programmes division and members of the society of municipal directors of recreation in Ontario are acting as the planning committee for this conference.

Under our youth branch, investigations on

behalf of youth, in co-operation with Ontario communities, will be accelerated. Based on the assumption that many agencies share the problems of youth as well as the solutions to the problems, the formation of study teams will be encouraged. These study teams will include representatives from education, industry, labour, police, recreation, welfare, and youth itself.

The budget of the youth branch provides funds for a special feature this year—an action research on behalf of unreached youth in Metro Toronto. The project which has been initiated is based upon recommendations made at the conference of unreached youth co-sponsored by The Department of Education and the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto two years ago. The resulting activity will be watched with keen interest since it may well be a prototype of a desirable approach to the problem of keeping pace with rapid technological and social change in many of our communities.

I am sure that members will also be interested in a two-year, five-phase project which the youth branch is planning for northwestern Ontario. Steps have been taken to invite eight communities in that general area to form community study teams. In the first phase, visits are being made to these centres for interviews with key persons in education, industry, labour, recreation, police, welfare and youth work, to discuss problems and invite participation in the project.

Phase two, scheduled for the fall of 1966, will consist of a five-day seminar at the Quetico conference and training centre to give the study team members opportunity to gain understanding of economic and social trends in the society of which youth is a part.

Phase three will require a period of three months during which the study teams will collect data with respect to their particular communities.

Phase four will take the form of another seminar at Quetico centre, when the study teams will interpret the data collected, and will consider the extension, expansion and innovation of programmes of education, recreation and employment. At the same time the resources of the local, the provincial and the federal governments in relation to the needs and problems of youth will be explained and their relevancy determined.

The fifth and final phase will consist of follow-up visits to the communities, with seminars arranged where necessary to evaluate progress and to continue planning. A similar project for northern Ontario, working in co-operation with the Elliot Lake centre, is about to begin.

I have given the outline of this proposed activity in some detail as projects similar to it may be initiated in other parts of the province if requests are received and if the investigations give promise of being productive of worthwhile results.

Any summary of educational activities in relation to our communities would be incomplete without reference to the province of Ontario council for the arts. Since its establishment three years ago, the council has developed a broad programme to extend cultural activities throughout the province and to expand community interest and participation in, and appreciation of the arts. To date this body has awarded $1 million in grants for the realization of its purposes. Assistance, for example, to major performing arts groups has made possible nearly 550 performances of music, ballet, opera, and drama in 160 Ontario centres during the season just closing.

A grant to the art institute of Ontario has enabled it to circulate outstanding exhibitions of painting, print-making, ceramics, weaving and photography to some 450 art centres, schools and libraries throughout Ontario.

Skilled dramatic consultants have been made available to a number of amateur dramatic groups across the province to enable them to achieve higher production and performance standards in a pilot project undertaken by the council this year in co-operation with the authorities of the Dominion drama festival.

Mr. Chairman, these are only a few of the activities of the arts council whose ten members, under the chairmanship of the Hon. J. Keiller Mackay, continue to give generously of their time and effort in furthering projects related to this province's cultural life. They are people singularly aware of the responsibilities that are theirs, and I express thanks to them for the imagination they are showing and the success they are achieving in carrying out their work.

A still more recent effort in the adult education field is the establishment of the Elliot Lake centre for continuing education. This centre was founded in February, 1965, through co-operative action of the federal government and the government of Ontario. It is jointly financed by the two governments and operates under a board of governors comprised of representatives from business, finance, the arts and education.

During the past year three groups, each of 100 unemployed men, took three-month

courses to upgrade their basic skills at this centre. The CBC made a very informative and, I think, moving television programme of this project, which I hope all the members have seen. The programme for the centre is being expanded to provide educational and training courses of direct interest to particular industries and trades. Among these are data processing and business administration.

The arts are not being neglected either. A summer school of arts, including music—instrumental, opera and voice—ballet, painting and crafts is to be run this year from July 1 to August 13, a very promising opportunity for those interested in such pursuits.

The centre itself is a residential adult education institution. Its facilities can be made available to any social organization and to groups from any business, industry, union, profession or association. Accommodation is being expanded from the present 150 beds to facilities to house about 600, by this summer. It is expected that by the end of the year, several thousand people from all walks of life will have taken part in some educational programme in Elliot Lake.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is the Centennial centre of science and technology. Plans for the development of this much-needed cultural and educational asset are proceeding, but they are not as far advanced as I would have hoped, due to circumstances which were not anticipated.

The orientation of the science centre will be educational in its fullest aspect. The citizen on every level will be able to find light and guidance in a world of scientific development and technological change. The children, to be brought from all parts of the province, will see demonstrated the principles of science and industry in many forms and methods. Someone has dubbed museums the universities of the people. It is a perfect concept for the science centre.

Before we leave this theme of the extension of educational opportunity, I am going to impose on the time of the House to relate a somewhat happy story of how Ontario people helped to extend the educational opportunities of children of the Commonwealth allegiance in the West Indies. We call this, Mr. Chairman, "Operation school supplies."

Lying off the coast of Florida is an archipelago comprising roughly 400 islands and cays known as the Bahamas. To most of us these islands represent all that is beautiful in a tropical setting, with beaches of pink sand, lush undergrowth and waving coconut palms.

There is, however, another side of the picture, like most of the developing countries of the world, the native population of the Bahamas is expanding rapidly. Employment opportunities have increased on many of the large islands and large numbers travel from island to island seeking employment.

Together with these events, like every other country in the world, including Canada, and more particularly the province of Ontario, the Bahamas are encountering an education explosion. Native and government leaders agree that all progress, whether it be economic, political or cultural, depends primarily on education.

Over the past few years the Bahamian Ministry of Education has embarked upon an ambitious programme of school building. Unfortunately this programme, I understand, was upset by the devastation of Hurricane Betsy in 1965. As a result, the budget, originally set aside for school furnishings, was diverted to rebuilding many of the schools that were damaged.

In response to an appeal received from the Bahamas Minister of Education for 9,000 classroom desks and a considerable supply of books suitable for school library purposes, an organization called "Operation school supplies" was set up for the purpose of coordinating the many facets of this undertaking.

An appeal was directed to the school boards of southwestern and eastern Ontario for discarded classroom furnishings and textbooks. The response was overwhelming and the people of Ontario came through in a generous manner by offering a helping hand to a Commonwealth partner. Books were received from as far away as Port Arthur and a large number of desks were received from the Ottawa board of education.

Through the courtesy of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) and Mr. L. C. Powell, general manager of the Canadian national exhibition, storage space was provided to temporarily store the large volume of school supplies which has since been shipped to the Bahamas. Arrangements are also being made to ship a quantity of desks to the schools of St. Vincent and St. Lucia in the Windward Islands of the Caribbean.

Almost daily, since February 15 last, trucks have been hauling classroom supplies from Toronto to Fort Lauderdale, Florida, where the trailers are driven on to landing barges and transported to Freeport, Grand Bahama.

During the Easter vacation, 40 Grade 12 students from Michael Power high school and New Toronto secondary school volunteered their services to pack more than 50 tons of

textbooks. To date more than 125 tons of school supplies have been delivered.

Transportation and shipping costs in the neighbourhood of $25,000 have been accumulated to date. In keeping with the concept that "Operation school supplies" is a people-to-people project between Ontario and an island member of the Commonwealth, an appeal has been directed to the service clubs and fraternal organizations of the province for the funds necessary to make "Operation school supplies" a total success. I am very confident there will be a widespread and generous response to our appeal.

Several days ago I received the following letter from the Grand Bahama citizens committee, composed entirely of native members of that community. Although addressed to me, its contents are directed to the people of the province:

> We gratefully acknowledge the receipt of your wonderful gifts of school supplies, desks, chairs, etc., which at the time of this writing is about nine trailer loads.
>
> These supplies have now come under the direct supervision of our education department and the Grand Bahama citizens committee and although this island of Grand Bahama, which is so near to your hearts, shall be sufficiently supplied, some of these materials will probably go to all of the major islands of the Bahamas.
>
> We want to especially take this opportunity to sincerely thank you and ask you to kindly convey the same to all the many others in your domain who have so gratefully contributed to our chidren's future.

Just a year ago, Mr. Chairman, at this time, in presenting my departmental estimates I said:

> We live in a world in which military weapons are still necessary to our security and require massive expenditures, but these have now reached a stage of such frightening and destructive power that civilized people the world over can only hope that the exercise and triumph of reason, restraint and common sense will make it unnecessary to employ them. Such, however, is not the case with weapons of the mind. There is now available to us a vast new knowledge which, if fully applied to the needs of our own society and of all mankind can bring us close to the realization of that abundant life of which the ancient prophets dreamed.

I recalled these words, Mr. Chairman, when today I received a most welcome telephone call from the office of the Hon. Paul Hellyer, Minister of National Defence, advising me that he has arranged for two Hercules aircraft to be made available to "Operation school supplies" for the purpose of transporting approximately 1,000 desks and three tons of textbooks, all weapons of the mind, to the Leeward and Windward Islands of the Commonwealth.

This outstanding display of federal-provincial co-operation has come about through the efforts of many individuals, most notably the hon. member of this Legislature for Brant. At a time when it appeared that we might be required to dispose of the desks on hand, he followed up on the initial appeal for help which I directed to Mr. Hellyer.

This is far from being solely a furniture-moving operation. School supplies are desperately needed by the schools of these island members of the Commonwealth. The support received from the RCAF will ensure the success of "Operation school supplies" and I feel it is unique in the annals of federal-provincial relations.

I want to make one further comment on this. I want to make a special note of paying tribute to a certain gentleman, the Rev. Father John McGoey with the Scarborough foreign missions on Harbour Island, who was the person who originally interested me, and as a result I hope others, in this very worthwhile project.

The activities I have mentioned indicate that there is indeed these days extension of educational opportunity in a variety of ways. I want now to report on the progress made in the reorganization of the department.

Members will recall in the reorganization that took place early last year, one of the key intentions was decentralization. Last August five administrative areas were established in the province with offices at Port Arthur, Sudbury, North Bay, London and Waterloo.

In March, I announced the establishment of five more areas in the central and eastern areas of the province. The area superintendents in the existing offices have assumed responsibility for a portion of the administrative correspondence formerly dealt with by the main office in Toronto. So will the new appointees, when they get organized. In due course, business officials will be added to the area offices, to increase the share of the administrative load which may be carried there, and to ensure prompt and knowledgeable service to school boards and their officials.

I am encouraged by the active part of the area superintendents and their staffs are

taking in advising trustees on school district organization and on school operation itself. Their efforts are appreciated at both the local and central levels.

But if decentralization was one objective of the new planning, a second purpose was the closer articulation of the elementary and secondary school panels. Elementary and secondary school inspectors now report to the same superintendent in the department and to the same area superintendents in the field offices. I have previously mentioned the new ease with which teachers holding university degrees may transfer from employment from one panel of schools to the other.

This summer training of elementary school and secondary school principals is being integrated in the same summer courses. These courses are being offered at three university centres — Kingston, London, and Waterloo — with enrollment limited to eighty elementary and eighty secondary candidates in each of the centres. In the interest of integration, the two panels of potential principals will have a number of joint sessions on suitable topics and the personnel will share joint facilities.

The movement across the province towards larger units of administration is proceeding well. A year ago last January the smallest unit for public schools in organized territory became the township. In addition, there has been growing acceptance of the idea of, and hence the institution of, county school areas, district school areas and district boards of education.

Apart from the mandatory nature of the bill which created the township units in 1965, all other changes in school section boundaries have taken place only after study, recommendation, and action at the local level. In this process I would express appreciation of the important part being played by consultative committees in the formation of larger units of administration. The lay members of these committees and the school inspectors have spent many hours in studying local conditions and in formulating thoughtful recommendations.

While these have chiefly related to the public schools, it is possible where high school district boundaries are made co-terminous with county school areas to establish boards of education. The first of these to be established under those conditions is the board of education of Southeast Grey which became operative last January 1.

The importance of keeping people well informed regarding new trends in provincial education has been recognized by the establishment of an information branch within the department. During its first 18 months of existence it has built up a firm organization and effective procedures for carrying out its task of providing two-way channels of communication between the public, the teaching profession, the boards of school trustees on the one hand, and The Department of Education on the other. A steadily rising volume of business in the branch, coupled with continuing press, television and radio coverage, have testified to the high level of public interest in our school system and its activities.

A project to which we are looking forward with some anticipation is the publication of a Department of Education official magazine. This province is believed to be the only one without such a publication. It is expected it will be a quarterly, and will carry articles of a general and authoritative educational nature, and news and comment related to the educational system and department policies. Publication will be handled through the information branch.

Exhibitions have been used also as a convenient method of familiarizing the public with educational developments, opportunities, and problems. Displays for these purposes have been arranged at Western fair in London, the central Canada exhibition in Ottawa, and in Toronto at the Canadian national exhibition and, of course, the adult education association's convention. At the CNE a non-competitive student talent festival was held for the first time in the department's history, in which 258 students from 66 elementary and secondary schools took part.

Somewhat akin to this type of popular approach in informing the public about their educational system are the plans for involving the schools in the centennial celebrations next year.

In order to keep the teachers of the province informed on centennial matters, Mr. Robert A. L. Thomas, administrator of centennial school projects in The Department of Education, will publish a series of some six newsletters. These newsletters will contain information about centennial projects which are under way in various parts of the province as well as suggestions and motivation concerning projects encouraged by the department. In addition, the newsletters will contain information regarding centennial activities being undertaken by other government agencies at the provincial and federal levels, such as the centennial commission and Expo 67.

Each Ontario teacher will receive a Canadian historical calendar for 1967, which will focus attention upon significant events in Canada's past. Ontario schools, both elemen-

tary and secondary, will receive folders containing individual portraits of the Fathers of Confederation, with a biography of each.

Folders of coloured plates of various flags which have flown over Canada, with an historical explanation of each, are being prepared. Immediately before July 1, 1967, each school will receive a long-playing record of the story of Confederation from the birth of the idea to the entrance of each province. This record will include narrative, excerpts of speeches and music, and special background material for the teacher will, of course, be supplied.

Hon. members are well aware of my interest in history, which, thanks to our forthcoming centennial year, has become the growing interest of a great many other citizens as well. It has been a curious fact that throughout the Canadian school system there has been no generally accepted treatment of the facts of our history. My department officials and I have, therefore, been much interested in a proposed national history project, to be conducted under the leadership of Mr. Bernard Hodgetts, of Trinity College school, at Port Hope.

It is the hope of the sponsors of this project that it will be able to conduct a thorough investigation of history teaching in Canadian schools, and from that effort it will seek to develop the basic approaches which might be adopted by all departments of education to the general advantage of our citizens. Other efforts along this line have been attempted in the past, but we strongly support this well-conceived study, and wish it ultimate success.

Before leaving this general area, may I advise the House that in connection with the 150th anniversary of Sir John A. Macdonald last year, we awarded 400 copies of the two volume biography of that great statesman by Professor Donald G. Creighton to students who excelled in the study of Canadian history during their high school careers. We have already made plans to present Professor Careless's "Life of George Brown" to a similar group of students during the 150th anniversary of the great publisher's birth which occurs in 1968.

One of the busiest divisions of The Department of Education's central office deals with the responsible task of calculating general and legislative grants to school boards. In order to expedite the preparation of the information required in the grant calculation by the computer, equipment is being installed in the grants division to prepare punch tape from an adding machine. The practice of paying the grants in four instalments is being continued, and it appears likely that the final payment in the 1966 calendar year will be paid earlier in 1965.

Our statistical services division has now become an education data centre, and a computer formerly used by the Treasury department has now been turned over to the centre for its use. With the new facilities available, a total information system is being developed with reference to pupils, teachers, finance, and buildings. The data centre has already established data processing services for the Ontario teachers' superannuation commission, and has completed a major study of all retirements of pupils from the secondary schools of the province, a study of particular interest at this time in the consideration of manpower needs.

The final section, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that hon. members are delighted that this is the final section, is research and investigation.

Mention of that study brings me to the fourth field I proposed to mention in this preliminary statement: that relating to educational investigations, inquiries and formal research, on issues of importance to The Department of Education.

The division of school planning and building research has continued its investigation of school facilities and is now completing material for brochures on library materials centres, business and commerce facilities, science laboratories and vocational shops. The division is also assisting trustees, educators, architects and engineers by providing an advisory service in matters pertaining to the planning of schools and new teaching areas.

The school design workshop programme has been continued, with conferences being held in a number of centres across the province. These have been well attended and have served the double purpose of acquainting local school people, architects and builders with the experience of other communities, and of alerting officials of the department to local problems in the field of school planning and construction.

I have already had occasion to mention the committee on aims and objectives, which is now deep into a broad inquiry into the nature and needs of curricular reform.

Another committee of exceptional public interest, if one can go by letters to the editor, is the new committee on the teaching of religious education in public schools, which has been named and has begun its work under its distinguished chairman, the Hon. J. Keiller Mackay. A number of briefs have

already been submitted to the committee, and encouragement and opportunity will be given to individuals, groups and organizations, to place their views before the committee in regard to this aspect of the school programme.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that a year ago the Ontario institute for studies in education was inaugurated by an Act of this Legislature. In the months since then, substantial progress has been made in the organization of this highly significant institution of learning and research. It is composed of two former elements of the Ontario college of education in Toronto—the department of educational research and the graduate school of education. Next September, arrangements will be completed to merge the Ontario curriculum institute into the new structure.

Under the overall direction of Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, the new institute is already deeply involved in several research projects, some relating to school finance, units of administration and time-tabling by computer. In its planning function, it is continuing to conduct population studies, and is studying educational television, computer-assisted teaching and programmed learning. Its expanded graduate school is working in the field of special education and the educational needs of exceptional children.

I am more than happy to announce that Dr. J. Roby Kidd, one of the most respected adult educationists in the world, has been appointed head of the adult or continuing education division, and will take a high place among a staff of exceptional quality and distinction. It is anticipated that the new institute will not only provide a programme of educational research which is needed intensely in all aspects of this important human endeavour, but will remain closely related to the everyday problems of an expanding school system under constant challenge from the public.

In this survey I have now touched upon the four areas I mentioned in beginning my comments — programmes and courses, extension of educational opportunities, progress in reorganization, and studies and research. There may be further details and additional topics in which hon. members of this House may be interested, and if so it is my hope that they will raise questions and give me the benefit of their counsel.

In concluding these initial remarks, however, I would be remiss if I did not thank the hon. members for the continued interest they have shown in eduactional matters generally and the help they have given officials of the department and myself in interpreting local situations to us and in assisting in the solution of difficulties that are bound to arise in any educational system the size of our own.

And while expressing this appreciation I should like also to extend appreciation to the many persons and organizations across the province who have gone far beyond the ordinary call of duty in furthering the best interests of education during the past year—such groups as the school trustees; the municipal councils; the teachers; the parents; the students themselves; and the representatives of the press, radio and television.

Among organizations to which public education is indebted I would name in particular the Ontario school trustees council, the Ontario teachers federation, the Ontario educational association, l'association Canadienne-Française d'education d'Ontario, and its English-speaking counterpart, the Ontario federation of home and school associations, the parent-teachers association and the Ontario association for retarded children. Finally I would acknowledge with gratitude the unfailing assistance of senior officials and supporting staff members in The Department of Education itself.

May we now, Mr. Chairman, turn to the detailed consideration of the estimates.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I must first congratulate the hon. Minister of Education on the extremely well prepared résumé of the work of his department during this past year and of his plans for the months and years that lie ahead. I hope he does not feel in any way that it was too lengthy. I know we have been sitting for some hours already today, but I, for one, am quite prepared to take my time in further consideration of the estimates, and I am certainly among the first to grant him any time that he wishes to take in this chamber, particularly dealing with this important topic.

Mr. Chairman, I want first to make some comments about the general conduct of the affairs of education, through the eyes of not so much a citizen of Ontario, but a member of this Legislature.

My own view is that we do not have sufficient opportunity to discuss the plans and programmes for education, in fact it has been taken away from us to the extent that we do not feel that we are in the mainstream of the development of this important aspect of community life.

These estimates call for the Legislature to vote about $85 million towards the educational requirements of the province. This

includes, of course, the money that is spent at the university level and the capital grants made to universities. The overwhelming size of the amount and the agreement among us all on the importance of the work, makes the hon. Minister's handling of the matter very strange. Since the session began last January, there have been only three minor bills introduced by the hon. Minister until this afternoon, when he introduced his regular yearly amendments to the basic legislation controlling education in the province.

These took the form of five lengthy, ponderous series of amendments. The amendments to The Public School Act was about three-quarters of an inch thick and will take some careful scrutiny.

Except for a flurry of announcements by the hon. Minister to coincide with the Easter meeting of the OEA, and this is certainly acceptable, since the stimulation of educational discussion is well placed at that time, and the report of the teacher training committee, nothing has come from the hon. Minister to the Legislature for our consideration.

The hon. Minister chooses to appoint his own committees to investigate issues in education. In the last two years, these have included the subjects of teacher training at both levels, grade 13, I think we are into our fourth committee on that, the committee regarding teaching religion in the schools, and of course, the important Hall committee on the aims of education.

The hon. Minister saw fit to do his own inquiry into the important matter of instituting community colleges, although there were certain submissions made to him from this House and certain other interested groups and individuals.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that all these matters and many others that are not being adequately investigated and assessed, should be put before standing or select committees of this Legislature. Among the 108 members here assembled, are those with recognized abilities as trustees, and I direct your attention to the hon. member for Scarborough North as one of the outstanding ones in this field, and all of us bear the confidence of the people of Ontario, until such time as this may be proved otherwise.

The crowning miscarriage of the responsibility of the hon. Minister, I would submit, is that he has not seen fit to activate the standing committee on education at all this session. Before there is any outcry from the hon. Minister or his supporters that this is surely the responsibility of the Legislature as a whole, I would recall to your mind, Mr. Chairman, that in some years past in my own experience, this committee has had an opportunity to interview and question at length the representatives of the department, who were brought before us for this very purpose.

As I remember it, this was under the administration of this hon. Minister's predecessor, who was at the same time Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Robarts). The chairman of the committee was the present Whip of the Conservative Party, and I feel that he did good work at that time—perhaps he has slipped a bit since—but the education committee functioned effectively, and dealt with much more than legislation.

Naturally, our concern with legislation must be primary, but we must remember that we have been here for five months without any legislation in education to consider. The House has seen fit to appoint as chairman, an able member, the hon. member for Russell, who has a perception and an intellect that would well lead the hon. members of the House in some more informal deliberations on education matters.

It is true that he made an attempt to do this some weeks ago, but I feel that it is the responsibility of the hon. Minister, much more so than anybody else in this House, to encourage the members, particularly of the government majority, to make investigations that would assist all of us in our deliberations. I recall to your mind, Mr. Chairman, that a four-minute meeting last February of this education committee, elected a chairman, who as I have said is interested and capable of organizing great work for the hon. Minister and for this Legislature, if the government gave him encouragement to do so.

The attitude of the hon. Minister that the committee exists only to rubber stamp his legislation when he finally gets it ready, is retrograde and conservative in the most unprogressive way.

Now I would say, Mr. Chairman, that a similar complaint is expressed by members of school boards across Ontario. The department must approve almost all their decisions and so the tendency is to follow the departmental lead in the evolution of education in the community. Real autonomy is small and vanishing. The teachers presented with new courses, that in some instances I submit have not been properly thought out, and who are faced with students and parents worried about changing grade 13 requirements and college admissions at the same time as they are trying to interpret the department's requirements for the new grade 13 sciences,

must wonder where the Minister does get his advice.

So do we all. No one questions the excellence of his staff to carry on the administration of his department. He has been able to acquire the services of a battery of thinkers who have been removed from the important field of public discussion on education matters. He himself is so busy meeting delegations and opening buildings around the province that it is extremely difficult for him to spend more than a few minutes at a time in the House. And may I say at this point that I am saying this without criticizing him in this particular connection, he is administering by far the largest department of government, a budget some 80 to 100 times larger than some others of his colleagues in the Cabinet and this, of course, requires all of his energies as an administrator. He has forgotten, however, the real importance of the democratic process, and in so doing he is killing the enthusiasm and support for the progressive development of education in Ontario.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have had little or no legislation, no committee meetings and now we are presented with the Minister's elaborate report of his department and called upon to comment on it without his annual report being available to us.

You know, Mr. Chairman, as do the other members, that these reports concern the affairs of the department for the fiscal year preceding the one that we are entering at the present time. Surely it would be possible with a large and able staff to report on the expenditure of the funds and also of the progress of the programmes in the department since it would only go up to the last day of the previous fiscal year, which in this case would be March 31, 1965. Of course, the Minister's presentation tonight almost takes the place of such a report because it was very full and ample in many respects. Nevertheless, it would be of great service if an effort could be made so that the familiar neatly bound volume characteristic of The Department of Education could be made available to this House and to the people of Ontario in time for these estimates.

Just a little digression at this point; it is strange that in so many cases, in estimate after estimate, the report of the department is brought down a day or two just before the estimates are considered. For a while I thought that this was simply by virtue of an extended effort of the staff of the department, but perhaps it is by design. I do not suppose the government in any way wants to hinder intelligent discussion of their responsibilities, and yet when this occurs in department after department, it does seem strange indeed.

I know that a good many people, including the hon. Minister, must surely agree that at this stage in the deliberations of the Legislature, the report of the most important department of government should be available and we will look forward to some explanation on the part of the hon. Minister.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that the combined financial responsibility in Education and University Affairs amounts to $850 million. The Education estimates themselves, $595 million, University Affairs, $102 million and the capital grants to universities, made available through the Provincial Treasurer's department, $150 million. The total of $848 million, I, like C. D. Howe, would round off to $850 and, of course, this is characteristic of the fastest growing department of the government. It will surely break a billion dollars some time during the next two years, particularly if the government finally increases its share of the local education costs to a reasonable level.

All of us are concerned with a fair balance among the three levels of taxation that we are familiar with in this country. It is a shame that the committees having to do with taxation at the federal and provincial levels have been unable to report at this point, but as is so often the case, we become frustrated and impatient as the months drag on into years, and we wait for the report which we hope would solve our problems, and we would look forward to receiving these reports some time during 1966.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the same Minister as is presently the case, should have the overall responsibility for all of education in this province, including university affairs. The hon. Prime Minister of the province is no doubt mulling over in his mind some serious Cabinet changes that would, we expect, take place in the weeks immediately following the adjournment of this House. It has been suggested in some areas that this heavy responsibility of education should be divided so that at least two people responsible to this House will share the onerous jobs.

I personally feel that Education should not be fragmented in its responsibility, and there should be some overall jurisdiction. There is surely within the fertile minds of the government and particularly the hon. leader of the government, a solution to the problem as it is growing more and more to crisis proportions. This is a very onerous responsibility, particularly with the many duties that are bound to devolve upon a popular Minister

who is in demand in communities from one end of the province to the other.

I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister, when he is considering some Cabinet changes —I would leave the names to be listed by my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury, who has a penchant for that—that the overall responsibility should then stay with one Minister, but that some way be found to relieve him of the endless round of soothing irate delegations and opening schools. There are already four Ministers who administer departments spending less than $10 million, so I do not for a moment recommend enlarging the Ministry. The Prime Minister should make some real administrative departures. He has a good example to follow. We have seen the Prime Minister of Canada improving the efficiency of his administration, branching out into the formation of whole new departments, new groupings, and when this does pass the Parliament of Canada and comes into full operation we can certainly look for an improvement that has been predicted by the Prime Minister himself.

So the Prime Minister of Ontario has this example—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): It just depends on how long they are going to hold on.

Mr. Nixon: It depends on how long the Tory Opposition is going to obstruct his proposals.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): If you want us to name them, we will.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What proposals?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Prime Minister should make some real administrative departures, and my suggestion is that he appoint two legislative secretaries or assistants, whatever they might be called, from among the ranks of able supporters of the government who are aching to get their fingers into the administration in some way. An alternative might be to promote the Minister without Portfolio to some special responsibilities in the Education department. As you, Mr. Chairman, know, there is a sum of $400 million to be administered in direct grants to the school systems of Ontario, and the Minister without Portfolio with his ability to discuss complex situations with citizens across the province, might very well serve this purpose while he is waiting for an even more important responsibility to devolve upon him.

At the same time, The Department of University Affairs could revert to The Department of Education and be made a branch responsible for post-secondary education. I understand that this was the decision made by the government of Quebec in some months gone by, and for this reason the Prime Minister and his advisors might shy away from it. Nevertheless, it does not seem reasonable to separate one section of education, that of higher learning in the universities, away from the main responsibility as we see it in this House. I feel that it could be reincorporated with the general education responsibility without in any way interfering with the autonomy we and the academic community value so highly.

I suppose some of these things will be considered by the government in the days that lie ahead and we, of course, when the next estimate, that dealing with university affairs, comes along, will be able to talk about it more fully.

I suppose the hon. Minister might even welcome a chance to administer another department himself. His enthusiasm for education is well known. He has had the responsibility for four years now. I was going to suggest that his enthusiasm was waning a bit until one of the pages handed me the bulky volume of his remarks this evening, and I realized that I was in error in this connection.

This reorganization would then permit the activation of the standing committee on education so that the committee members could hear the department officials explain the various programmes and problems of education in this province. I believe that the important matter of education warrants more work by select committees of this House. The organization of a House committee should give members the continuing opportunity to build up and maintain information concerning education. It would also give us an opportunity to hear the officials of the department talk in their own right about matters that do not touch on policy.

We have seen the various estimates come before the House in the last few weeks. We have been able to observe the high officials of the department sitting at the table before the Minister, but bound by the rules to do nothing but whisper to the Minister and pass notes to him. We have seen them glower at the Opposition on occasion when they have been outraged at our lack of understanding. They too, would be glad of the opportunity to meet in committee and be able to speak their own views, or at least the official view of the department, I suppose, with regard to

the day-to-day administration of this responsibility.

And, I propose that the proposed legislative assistants—if this is the proper terminology—could sit with these committees accepting the policy responsibilities of the Minister, and allow the Legislature to once again enter the mainstream of participation in advising the government on such matters as community colleges, technical training, education finance, post-secondary tuition, and a long list of matters that should be to our interest.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some remarks about the situation at the grade 13 level of the secondary system, and also about some proposals for a change. The 1965 results of the grade 13 examinations completely destroyed public confidence in the external examination system which has been the mainstay of academic excellence in Ontario.

The Minister and his assistants have maintained, during the difficult days of late August and early September, 1965, that nothing was wrong. Yet, there can be no doubt the 1965 grade 13 fiasco led the hon. Minister to announce the abolition of the examination system last Easter.

The confidence of the universities was lost as shown by the announcement, without consultation with the department, that many would grant admission on criteria other than the grade 13 results. The department has been quick to blame publicity for exaggerating the situation, but when the Ontario secondary school headmasters association called for an investigation of the disparity between predicted marks and actual marks received by students, this indicates real root trouble.

Education directors in many centres publically criticized the administration which resulted in bad examinations, unfair computation of results, and the severe treatment of students whose previously proved ability was not borne out by the final mark received, and 15,000 appeals resulted in an improvement of the averages in the final statistics. But no statistics can ever total the number of students who accepted their failure or their low mark without complaint and proceeded to change the course of their life because of this.

I am personally aware of several cases where the students put aside the possibility of university because of their marks—because their marks, though not failures—were not good enough to admit them. Other cases missed the coveted Ontario scholarship award for the same reason. The original regulation was that no appeals were available under these circumstances unless a failure had occurred. I suppose that in a good many instances this regulation was simply ignored as the results of the grade 13 examinations last year proved to be so disrupting. But, surely, many of us in this House know of our friends and neighbours, and perhaps young people in our own families, who were not the type to complain about a low mark, but assumed only that their work had been not sufficient or their ability insufficient, and had gone on either to repeat their year or to redirect their lives away from some important and long-held goals. As I say, I know of some of these cases; I know the son of a Rhodes scholar—if the hon. member for Sudbury will permit the allusion—who had been counting on entering medicine and who, it is hoped, may yet achieve this goal.

I myself am convinced that the results of the examinations in this case and many others were unfair and that in fact there was a fiasco, the responsibility for which lies at the door of this hon. Minister. During these very days, these hot days of late spring, there are thousands of grade 13 students who are writing the examinations. I believe Monday or Tuesday of this week it was English, and I understand that the exam this year has not caused any great outburst as it did last year. It may be that the department has become—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think the exam caused the outburst last year, it was the results.

Mr. Nixon: Yes. Well, we are hoping that the hon. Minister in his responsibility will be able to indicate to the House before his estimates are completed what steps he has taken to see that there will not be a repeat of this, and we will listen to this with great interest.

Confidence in the system was then further undermined by the general disorder and informal conduct of the whole appeal procedure. The decision to abolish the external examination series completely means that academic standards will no longer be set centrally, but will become a patchwork depending on the local outlook and conditions. A similar situation followed the elimination years ago of provincial control of the grade 12 examinations. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the grade 12 certificates used to be called the junior matriculation—I do not know what the correct terminology is at the present time—but this was for many years established by an external examination similar to the departmentals that we have at the present time in grade 13.

When this was done away with—and it was a sensible move surely because it is impossible to mark these thousands of exam papers centrally—it was found within a few years that the standard of the junior matriculation became variable indeed. It lost much of its value because of this. Certainly university entrance will depend in the future on tests other than the grade 13 exams, but for those who do not continue formal education beyond the secondary level, the school leaving certificate will decline in value. I believe that the examination and marking procedure should still be set by The Department of Education with local marking under the supervision of inspectors. It might even be possible to call in those who would have the responsibility at the local level for the marking of these examinations to some sort of an instructional course so that they would be able to evolve some uniformity.

The standards of the grade 12 level grew to such proportions of disarray that the department reintroduced certain types of short-answer tests on examinations; I believe they were actually checked by machines, so that some return to a level of uniformity has been achieved at the grade 12 level. I hope we do not abandon the grade 13 uniformity completely. Surely there is some alternative to the plan as we presently understand it from the hon. Minister's statement of a few weeks ago.

It may be that grade 13 itself will become a special year beyond the standard matriculation level. It has been suggested by one of the Minister's committee. It seems that other jurisdictions can prepare students in 12 years who compare favourably with ours in Ontario universities. As the Minister has already said in his comments, there really are not enough students who come from these other 12-grade jurisdictions to see whether or not they do live up to the standards that we set in this province. The suggestion of making the 13th year a special educational experience, involving general and advanced levels, simply moves the student's point of decision down from second year university, to the grade 12 level, and I am delighted to hear the hon. Minister's firm statement a few moments ago, that he is rejecting this proposal.

I believe this is a wise decision, because already there is sufficient pressure on our young people to make their vocational decisions and their educational decisions at a stage that is too early. I submit that the general and advance level proposal would not be in the interests of our young people. Their academic preparation must be kept as broad and liberal as possible, postponing the specialization to a more mature opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Would you not use the term, general as possible?

Mr. Nixon: Well, I think liberal adds something to the term you use.

Mr. Singer: We have a hard job getting that through to some of you fellows.

Mr. Nixon: Departmental statistics indicate that at the present time, 40 per cent of our young people achieve university entrance in 12 years now through the combination of grades, usually in the first six years of schooling. I see the hon. Minister is nodding. I had thought perhaps the statistic may have changed since I had inquired about it some time ago.

There is no doubt that the average student can achieve matriculation with no decrease in the level of learning in 12 years. A clear path should be available for him to keep up with his abilities by emphasizing the need for gradeless sections in the elementary school. In a good many schools at the present time, there is no smooth way of eliminating the grade somewhere between kindergarten and grade 13. In a school of which I have some knowledge, there is simply a jump from grade four to grade six, and of course the teachers have the special responsibility to see that nothing of importance is left out.

I think that the board of the city of Toronto —I thought I saw one of the board members here a few moments ago—has led the way in experimenting with a gradeless situation, particularly in the first six years of primary education, so that the student does have a chance to make up this year, allowing him to achieve matriculation in 12 years.

The special means, combined with the unit system of administration would greatly decrease the wasted years in the early grades, retain interest in education and develop the better work habits necessary for continued academic achievement.

I noticed in the hon. Minister's statement in this connection, he came down rather heavily first on the proposal that he had received advice that such a change might be effected, then went over to the other side of the fence, emphasizing the advice that he had had to the contrary, saying that the flexibility that the grade 13 gives is of great importance. I know that he is considering this, it is the second time that he has mentioned it in the House, and I would say to him that I, for

one, feel that this clear academic path should be established for the best interests of our good students.

A few remarks, Mr. Chairman, about curriculum. One of the growing difficulties with the grade 13 course has been the addition of new material without the thoughtful withdrawal of outdated, or useless sections. This increase of pressure has been an important reason for the growing complaint about this heavy year. I suppose if the hon. Minister were to look back to his own grade 13 year, and compare it with the requirements, let us say, up to about three years ago, he would agree that it is harder, or has been more difficult in the last few years, to achieve the upper school standard of matriculation than it was in days of yore.

The introduction of entirely new physics and biology at the grade 13 level, has worked a real hardship to all concerned, however. I feel that it is a mistake to withdraw a whole unit section from the grade 13 level, throw it away, and introduce something entirely new. It does not seem right for me on this side to tell the Conservatives to make haste a little more deliberately, but in this case the introduction of the new physics and the new biology is causing heartrending difficulties in many of the areas of the province.

The teachers, many of whom graduated at a time before this new material was emphasized, are having a difficult time covering it and presenting it adequately. The students, faced with the pressure of getting high marks so that they can achieve university entrance, are in the bad situation where, perhaps in some cases, they are not confident that the teachers are presenting what will be required when the great seals are broken on examination day. So there is a lot of difficulty during the introduction of these entirely new courses.

The teachers have not had an opportunity to prepare themselves. The hon. Minister cited the statistics of those who had had an opportunity to take special courses leading up to the new biology, physics, and to a lesser extent, the mathematics course. The numbers look impressive in absolute terms, but not enough of the teachers availed themselves of it. They did not have a chance to avail themselves of it, and unless some changes are made, there are going to be three or four years of severe dislocation, until the teachers find their feet again.

Because the revolutionary changes have caught many of the teachers without adequate academic background, too few have been able to take summer courses in preparation, and the courses themselves have been severely criticized by teachers, students and parents directly exposed to the problem.

Results this August may well be another headache for the hon. Minister, because of the severe difficulty his decisions have imposed on the system. A series of evolutionary changes would surely serve the purpose better, and I know that the hon. Minister will be prepared to watch the results in grade 13 physics and biology very carefully, because the circumstances have been strange, and in some cases outlandish. The hon. Minister does not, and no one in this House wants to penalize the students because they have been the guinea pigs in this connection.

The real objective of curriculum change should be to improve the efficiency of the whole system, particularly in the lower grades. Since 1962 we have heard admissions of the need for improvement in the first six grades, and now there will be a long wait while the Hall committee consults with grade school students in Sudbury and others, to come up with a recommendation.

The hon. Minister, of course, said tonight that he was not waiting for the report of the committee, he realizes the need for some change and once again—I believe this is the third time in a row he has said that improvements will be in operation in the near future for grades 1 to 6.

I believe that we can achieve a higher level in 12 grades, if the curriculum were modernized and updated in a practical fashion. I, with the hon. Minister, want to emphasize to any who might have the time to read these remarks, that there is no thought of lopping off grade 13 and with it this extra level of achievement. I sympathize with the hon. Minister in the difficulty of making this clear, because too often a person who is proposing this change is accused of simply lowering the standards of our system, and this is an inadmissible suggestion.

Two of the most glaring inadequacies in our curriculum involve the subjects of history and French. Both have been discussed here, and across the province. Still the hon. Minister makes no move to correct the root difficulties in the situation.

In history, particularly, the repetitive and boring details of the early exploration of America are emphasized as the introduction to the subject in grades 5, 6, and 7, depending upon the school system. As the children ponder the dots and dashes representing Champlain, Hudson and Père Marquette's great journeys, the decision is no doubt subconsciously made to avoid history later, if

possible. The real development of our nation is presented only as an optional topic in grade 13, after a superficial approach in grade 10. This means that most of our matriculants have no knowledge or appreciation of Canadian history, and the political development of our nation. They cannot list the Prime Ministers of Canada, let alone Ontario, and only know about John A. Macdonald from the centennial comic strips and of course the books presented by the government from time to time.

I was delighted to see that the hon. Minister added to his formal text the comment that he had not forgotten his promise to make available "The Life of George Brown" to outstanding students. I believe the books are called "Brown of the Globe" by Dr. Careless. I would also suggest to the hon. Minister that before the 150th anniversary of J. S. Woodsworth's birth comes along that there are at least two excellent volumes dealing with this great Canadian which should also be made readily available to the school libraries of the province.

I would also suggest that the Minister might find the funds to present this book along with the other two sets of volumes to the outstanding students in the schools of Ontario. I am not suggesting this because of equality of representation; I doubt very much that Mr. Woodsworth would identify himself with the present NDP—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: —but I am ready to submit to you, sir, that here, indeed, was a great Canadian, and a man who fought as strongly for the development of our society as did either Macdonald or Brown.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You might get the Minister to influence the committee in charge of historical plaques to commemorate his place of birth, instead of a lot of other odds and ends across the province.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Tourism and Information decides on that.

Mr. MacDonald: I said you might get the Minister to work on the historical plaques committee.

Mr. Nixon: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the need for a compulsory course in Canadian development, with emphasis on the years since 1840, is great. New texts, modern study assistance with television, tapes and film, and an opportunity to discuss responsible government and its responsibilities are all included.

Very briefly, as for French, our five-year top course still graduates students who achieve success only by laborious memorization of Coles' notes and other cribs. Surely time can be assigned to give an integrated course leading to the conversational use of the language and a beginning of the appreciation of French literature and culture. It is ridiculous to start after the most receptive eight years have passed to teach a new language.

The hon. Minister has already commented that the experimental course in French at the grade 7 level will continue and is, in fact, leaving the experimental stage. The problem in many areas is one of finding the money and the teachers who can provide this instruction. I doubt if there are many rural areas across the province where this is even being seriously considered, although I understand that the Coldwater board of education is moving in this direction.

Mr. Chairman, to point out one of the serious difficulties with the present division of education into primary and secondary levels, I know of at least one case and there must be more in the province, where the high school French department is dealing with most of their students from their own urban area who have had the advantage of French instruction at the public school level. Yet from rural communities outside that jurisdiction which must buy their secondary education from the urban areas, the students are going in there without any French background at all and it simply means that after a year and a half of struggling with the language, they are lost and simply must revert to one of the less excellent streams.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): May I be brought up to date on that Coldwater situation?

Mr. Nixon: I may be wrong in that regard—

Mr. Letherby: But what did you say about it? I am interested.

Mr. Nixon: I think the instruction in the French language should begin in a grade that is far lower than grade 9—probably grade 3. If we are going to give the young people of the province an opportunity to learn the language, then we have to provide the funds and we have to provide the facilities so that this can be carried out. If there are not enough teachers, I believe — and the hon. Minister after his trip to Italy should believe as well—that we can teach this by television. It can be done effectively and cheaply and I cannot understand why we are so slow in inaugurating a service of this nature in the

province of Ontario. Maybe the federal Minister of Transport knows.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, there is one other section of the curriculum that I want to deal with in my general remarks and that has to do with the teaching of agriculture in the schools of Ontario. Now this has gone up and down in its importance in the various schools across the province and at the present time, I submit, it is down. There is very little, if any, serious attempt to teach a working, technical agriculture course in our high schools.

I know that when the community colleges of applied arts and technology are formed the local committees will surely, in appropriate areas, bring in good technical agricultural courses, but even if this does take place, we should be emphasizing the need for agricultural training in the technical wings of our schools wherever they occur in rural areas. I would be very interested to hear the view of the hon. Minister of Education on this later, and perhaps that would be the time to raise it.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks on teacher training and supply. The Minister's decision to maintain the artificial barrier separating primary and secondary education when he set up separate committees to investigate teacher training in these fields, has held up meaningful advances in teacher training for two years. I am sure that he himself regrets that decision. The secondary report—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I did not set up the committee on secondary teacher training—just to keep the record straight.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps the former Minister who did have the responsibility would—of course, he is reading the want ads, so maybe—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I am reading the editorial page of the London *Free Press* and listening at the same time.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the secondary report, now three years old recommending more of the status quo was of limited usefulness and resulted in no important advances. The elementary report chaired by Mr. C. R. McLeod of Windsor is a major achievement in that it can be the guide for extremely useful advances in teacher education at both the elementary and secondary levels. The McLeod committee obviously realized the Ministers' — that is a plural apostrophe — mistake, in separating the two levels of teaching and often refers to teacher training in general, instead of the more limited scope set out in its terms of reference.

There is every reason to support its basic recommendation that teacher training be incorporated as a function of the universities and not retained in the present special institutions. I do not want to be unfair to the history of the teachers' colleges but I feel that the paternalistic atmosphere that has over the years been maintained in them has offended all but the most unsophisticated students from the earliest times. The most obvious advantage to incorporating the colleges into the general university community must be to uplift their academic atmosphere so that the students can sense the essential freedom of their university experience and get away from the rigid lock-step programmes characteristic of the present system.

The direct responsibility of the hon. Minister in teacher training tends to reduce this desired academic freedom. The pressure to conform and not to offend supervision under threat of missing ministerial certification has been the result of direct government control of the teaching profession. I personally believe that the report should have included plans to take the detailed responsibility for the certification of teachers under categories from the Minister and lodge it with the teachers' professional organization, in this case the Ontario teachers federation, in co-operation with the universities.

The committee calls for university degrees for all teachers but does not emphasize the need for teachers in specialist classification for the teaching of the senior grades and for special responsibilities at any grade. This is of great importance if the level of instruction is to be raised by attracting students with honour standing and advanced study.

It is possible that the imposition of higher standards for teachers will reduce the supply when it is already dangerously low. A powerful programme of recruitment is described by the committee report and certainly called for as well as a look at the tuition system. I believe that it is the responsibility of this Legislature to provide incentives to attract our best people to teaching; tuition should be abolished and a more attractive system of assistance introduced if we would raise the required standards as we should.

Mr. Chairman, there is still a pool of competent academic people who can be drawn into community services as teachers. These are the housewives with university degrees or other special education whose

home and family responsibilities are decreasing as their children enter the school system. I believe their responsibility to the community should bring them to teaching or other community service and that the Minister is not doing enough to bring this about. His internship programme is a good idea but it requires too much formal instruction to be really attractive to these mature women. The programme has a veritable fence around it, barbed with two summer courses, a spring observation period in the schools, close and prolonged scrutiny by troops of inspectors. I feel that it can be a good programme. The Minister should improve it, acknowledging that the experience of the mature university graduates counts for more than he at present realizes. He should improve it and then get out and sell it. I do not know what the final statistics are for those who have registered in the internship plan for the coming year, but I feel that it could be improved considerably and the numbers increased.

Another source of teacher supply that has been flagrantly misused for years includes the large group of highly educated and trained people who immigrate to Ontario from overseas, from the United States and even from our sister provinces, who find the Minister's certification requirements impossible to fulfil, not because they are high, but because they are inflexible. Most of these people have been driven to other work and are lost to education. Realization of the problem can still produce changes that will work to our advantage.

One recent development that I found most interesting—and I am sure the Minister is aware of it—is the fact that the school board at Bracebridge has experienced great difficulty in filling the vacancies on their staff. They have advertised in the *Globe and Mail* and according to one report they finally used one of the larger type ads, a display ad, that cost them $600 for one insertion, and got no answers at all. Now, the chairman of the board, who is a bright man surely with a lot of initiative, said: "Well, that is just the cost of a return trip with expenses to England" and he is arranging for the principal of the school at the board's expense and the chairman of the board, at his own expense, to go to England, put an ad in *The Times* of London and perhaps the Manchester *Guardian* and attract qualified teachers from England to go down to London and interview these Canadians. It is hoped they will be able to bring some of these qualified English teachers to Canada to improve the education system here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The separate school, I should say, has done this—

Mr. Nixon: That is correct, particularly in the Ottawa area, I understand.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And in Metro!

Mr. Nixon: And in Metro. Well, together with this, there has been an announcement recently that the civil service department is sending a group of people to England to hire competent people for our own staff. It may well be that the Minister could embark on a programme of bringing qualified teachers to this country, but naturally this would mean removing some of the inflexibility in the certification standards that have been set up in this province. I am sure with the co-operation of the teachers federation something can be worked out so that the short supply that we are still experiencing, particularly at the secondary level, can be alleviated.

Mr. Chairman, a survey carried out by the Lake Erie regional development association—they now call themselves the council—revealed the serious inequality of educational opportunity in the LERDA region of Ontario. While excellence in education cannot be tied directly to dollars spent, this is one definite way to rate the various community efforts. The study carried out with competent advice from the University of Western Ontario, dramatically points out that high assessment urban areas can still provide far greater education support per capita than small urban and rural areas. Specifically, it shows London able to spend $400 per student in the elementary schools, while Port Dover, which is in the same economic area, must provide its education with only $234 per student—and this is moneys from all sources.

The difference shows up in several ways, the most important being the money available to pay teachers. Frankly, I do not understand it. A good many qualified teachers would prefer to work in cities like London than out in the rural areas like, say, Port Dover and South Dumfries. Nevertheless, this is a fact and the further fact the board cannot compete on a salary basis, makes the discrepancies even more severe. The areas with low assessment often must accept more inadequately trained teachers and lose them as soon as they achieve sufficient competence to qualify in the higher paying urban areas.

Another serious inequality still exists in the separate school system where most recent figures available to me show the separate school revenue per pupil to be $254, compared to public school per pupil revenue of $354, the average across the province. The

$100 per pupil differential has a telling effect on the separate system, particularly in teacher recruitment. In his remarks the Minister said the only area at the elementary level where the teacher supply is still severely short is in the separate school system, and this may account for a large amount of it.

The provincial foundation grant plan must surely be able to correct these discrepancies if the formula for grants is properly adjusted. Increased separate school grants must not be made at the expense of the public system as has been pointed out in this House many times. But the hon. Prime Minister's announcement of February 21, 1963, concerning this matter should surely have produced near equality, an approach to equality, by now. More than three years have passed. It is not apparent that true equality will be reached even in the five-year interval that is a part of the introduction of the plan.

There is even less progress in giving urban-rural equality of opportunity, as I have pointed out in the comparison of London and Port Dover. The foundation plan is then failing in its purpose as we evaluate it by the statistics presently available. Its complexity makes it difficult to understand or apply with or without expert advice. It is not giving sufficient relief for the municipal property owner, it is not providing true equality of opportunity, and it is not stimulating sufficiently new types of training service programmes. A lot more can be done with $400 million provided for grants. And maybe the Minister without Portfolio is the man who can help the Minister of Education do this. This is the suggestion I made to the government earlier, for the benefit of those who arrived late.

The formula deals with ordinary and extraordinary costs with a basic tax relief grant—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the hon. member had provided me with a copy I would not have had to come at all.

Mr. Singer: That is why we do not give copies any more.

Mr. Nixon: Wait until a week from Thursday and you can read it all in *Hansard*.

The formula deals with ordinary and extraordinary costs with a basic tax relief grant, and an equalization grant based on arbitrary foundation levels, local assessments and arbitrary equalization factors. Manipulation of the arbitrary terms in the formula can easily be made to change the emphasis. It can be manipulated to provide greater assistance to metropolitan boards, as I submit at the present time it is. It can be adjusted to assist the middle-income urban boards, or it could be adjusted to provide more assistance for the fiscally poor districts across Ontario. In the areas with high assessment, it is possible for the formula, as I understand it, to show a negative grant which means that that fortunate assessment area will have an advantage over others. The formula is a good one if government policy applies it with a desire to remove these regional inequalities, but much remains to be done before this is accomplished.

Looking at what the grants—supposedly equalizing—are accomplishing, we see that the board of education for Toronto has recently raised the salaries of its top executives —I suppose its top executive—to $30,000 per annum. It is able to provide limousine chauffeur service for the trustees, which my hon. friend from Downsview tells me cost $68 per trip, plus cleaning expenses for fur coats in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They did not pay that.

Mr. Nixon: And to the trustees in Port Dover, and even London, this may seem a surprisingly wasteful use of the taxpayers' dollar. I am not prepared to join the bandwagon that is presently in such motion, under the influence of my hon. friend from Sudbury, against Metro—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Full voice!

Mr. Nixon: But I would like to submit to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that if his grant formula is supposed to provide equality of opportunity, it is failing in this regard. There are blatant cases that must be known to him of this failure and if his present formula will not do the job, it should be adjusted so that in the two years before the five-year limit runs out, we can have the equality of opportunity that everybody desires.

Now, one way to achieve more equality is to make the administrative unit for education larger. The hon. Minister has taken steps in this connection. The township boards have been assimilated with little difficulty by the ratepayers, and we must certainly prepare for further changes. The best way to make the industrial assessment of urban areas available for support of education rurally, is to encourage the extension of these areas to include both. At the same time, I believe that we should eliminate appointed secondary school boards, and set up elected boards of education to serve the extended areas. The arbitrary division between elementary and secondary education is useless and outdated,

and the sooner we leave it behind the better.

The Minister, of course, is waiting for the local people to all agree that this is the course we should take. He points with pride to an area in Grey county which has already been able to achieve this, and, believe me, they are to be congratulated. I think the hon. Minister's system of grants and his public pronouncements could go much further towards bringing this greatly-to-be-desired goal to the minds of those with the responsibility for education in these areas across the province.

There are many consultative committees set up to look into this, but which are inactive. They have been set up, many of them, for months and years and are no nearer to a decision than they were when they first began their operation. More leadership is required if we are to extend these areas for the benefit of students, for the taxpayers, and for the province as a whole.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this would extend the funds into the rural areas and would only be successful if the government saw fit to adjust the grant formula for the new circumstances. It would improve local representation, since many rural areas under present circumstances buy their secondary education from nearby cities and have no say whatsoever in its conduct. It would allow more efficient placement of new schools and do away with the dislocation caused by non-uniform curricula in adjoining areas.

Many incidents occur across Ontario where students from different rural township school areas go to secondary school, only to find their preparation does not dovetail with the high school's requirement. Introduction of new mathematics and oral French are the worst offenders, since some rural areas are unable to pay teachers able to present the new work, although it is later required at the secondary level.

The years since the war have spawned many new varieties of educational institutions. The vocational schools, technical institutes, trade schools, and so on, are familiar in their development to all of us. Other alternatives for post-secondary education, teachers' colleges, nursing schools, agricultural schools, only attract seven per cent of Canada's college age group of people. About eight per cent, I understand, presently attend universities across the nation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This can be twelve point six or point seven in Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: In Ontario, right. It is eight per cent across the nation. We are more favoured in this province. But the rest of the group in this age join the work force in one stage or another. The Minister's colleges of applied arts and technology are designed by his own pronouncements to fill a real need by offering the occupational, technical and semi-professional training for students planning to enter a vocational line of work. But I submit to you again, Mr. Chairman, and as strongly and as sincerely as I can, that these colleges should also provide the first two years of academic work for students planning to transfer to four years college courses or universities.

I feel sure that the first two years of the new teacher education degree course that is envisaged by the hon. Minister's committee would fit in well with this type of institution. Our university population already shows that those with well-to-do background are found in the institutions of higher learning, particularly the universities, in proportions far greater than they are found in the province as a whole. A modern community college programme should remove the financial and geographic barriers to higher education. These colleges should admit all high school graduates, not just those with 60 per cent or more, for this college transfer course. It would then remove the artificial academic barriers that have been set up by the university system as we know it in this province.

We have hundreds, probably thousands, of university graduates who do successfully matriculate, but find they are not acceptable in our formal university system because their percentages fall beneath the flexible magic number that happens to apply for that particular course and for that particular year.

These community colleges are going to be nothing but technical schools if the hon. Minister persists in his view that they must be operated without these college transfer courses. If he would change his mind we could remove this artificial academic barrier for hundreds of our students who are now prevented from going on to further academic work. We could remove, and should remove, fees so that the students can live at home and work in their own community, and thus more effectively remove the financial barrier from advanced academic education.

The Minister's plan seems to have finally solidified with the exclusion of this transfer feature that I submit should be an important feature of these new colleges. I regret that his decisions have been arrived at in what appears to be a unilateral way. The Legislature has had little or nothing to say about this decision. He no doubt reads the letters

to the editors, as do we all on these matters. He was his own advisory committee in travelling across the United States and seeing what had been done there, but it was still his own judgment and those whom he employs which decided that the transfer courses should not be included.

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if you are right.

Mr. Nixon: His close friends.

Mr. MacDonald: I suspect it was in conjunction with the university presidents.

Mr. Nixon: There is more than one university president.

Mr. MacDonald: They are 12 to one on this issue.

Mr. Nixon: All of them have the right, as any citizen would have, to try to influence the hon. Minister. Here is a case surely, where a committee of this House might very well have been exposed to the same information and influence as has the Minister. He has reached this decision himself and if he persists in it this is a tremendously heavy responsibility to bear, even when his statue joins that of Sir John A. Macdonald and Wilf Spooner in front of the House.

Perhaps I should not have introduced any note of levity because I do feel that it is an extremely serious decision and a wrong decision regarding these colleges presently being instituted. His view on the transfer feature has been flexible until recently, and I believe he has now come down on the technical school side of the fence.

The schools, as he describes them, are going to be deluxe technical schools; there are going to be a lot of them; they are going to be expensive and they are going to do good work, but they do not fit the needs of modern education. In this the hon. Minister is going to meet his greatest failure. This is my opinion and I hold it strongly—as do a great many other people in this province.

Post-secondary education, in general, is still a disorganized mishmash in Ontario. It is divided between two departments and even though they have a common Minister it does not appear to provide a definite direction toward order. We are waiting for the Hall committee to tell us what the aims of education in this province should be. The members of this Legislature are consulted only in passing in this regard. We can tell you, but whether or not you listen is something else again.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is growing late. I know that the Minister has a good many problems in education that he has touched on in his remarks and I am not going to take the time of the House to deal with them now. We sympathize with his problems with the federal government with educational television. In this House, I for one and many others have brought to the Minister's attention the great value that educational television can provide. I feel he is convinced of this from his own studies and that he will be asked in the next two or three years to provide a lot of money to provide educational television. The federal government will surely provide the educational television licenses that we require. It may mean that the hon. Minister may have to have another lunch with the Prime Minister of Canada. If this is necessary, I for one, would be very quick to provide the funds.

Teacher training is going to need a lot of research and money—

An hon. member: And a lunch—

Mr. Nixon: —and all of these things could be assisted by a proper development of educational television.

The hon. Minister, as well as the members of the House, is deeply concerned about the provision of special classes for crippled children, retarded children and those with perceptual handicaps, and we know the problem that this places on the individual school board. Once again, in rural, low-population areas, it is just not right for an inspector to go to a small, rural board of education or school board and say: "You must provide a special teacher for this single student." It should be the responsibility of the province at large to provide these special education facilities to all areas.

Financial problems are involved in every one of these matters. We are ready to vote any reasonable amount within the capability of Ontario to support education. We await the Smith and Carter reports as we have in department after department. I know that when these reports are available they will by no means solve all the problems, but great changes are in the wind, and are expected, and are very much in order.

Federal participation in education is something that we must look for. I noted that the mayor of Hamilton, Vic Copps, in a statement to the mayors in Vancouver said that much more had to be done for education at the local level with provincial funds and federal funds.

We, of course, feel that much more must be done with federal funds. We realize that

the pressures from all departments and many responsibilities are on the Budget of Ontario. We on this side feel that this Budget is not properly allocated, and from time to time we have been able to bring this, I hope forcefully and effectively, to the attention of the government. I must assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we in the Liberal Party have no more vital concern than education. We assure you of our willingness to co-operate through our criticism of all types, because until the next election—that is why we are here.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committe rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with matters on the order paper, particularly second readings and possibly House in committee. There are a number of matters there that I think should be cleaned up, and if by any chance we should complete a tidying up of the order paper, we would then be in a position to continue with these estimates. I doubt if that will happen, but in any event, we will continue with the estimates of this department on Thursday and, subject to the members' hour, we will continue throughout the whole day.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, could the House leader tell us when the Budget debate is going to be called? Has the government any intention of winding this up? Putting it on so that it might—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There will be an opportunity for the Budget debate. There was some difficulty last week, hon. members will recall, in getting speakers for it, but I was given this afternoon—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No, no such thing occurred!

Mr. Singer: As a matter of fact, when the hon. member for Ottawa East moved the adjournment, he was still in the midst of his speech.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I was referring to the day before that.

Mr. Singer: Then the hon. member for Bracondale was in a three-day speech on—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Five hours, as I recall.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have a list of speakers for the Budget debate and it will be called in due time.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.00 o'clock, p.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCÉDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2